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Abstract

Jean Sibelius’s position in historical narratives of Western art music has always been precarious. This thesis interrogates existing approaches to his music, tracing their heritage to the turbulent political landscape of the 1930s so as to create a new analytical model that will complicate and reform the currently accepted view of Sibelius as an ‘early modernist’; reposition him in music history; and contribute to the understanding of the music of his contemporaries.

The early twentieth century saw a polarising rift emerge in the reception of Sibelius, whereby he was either venerated as Beethoven’s symphonic successor or seen as degenerative and anachronistic. Adorno is taken as representative of the latter reaction, yet his condemnatory critique of 1938 targeted Sibelius’s cultish advocacy, not necessarily his music. Much later in the century, the critique provoked defensive reactions from Sibelius scholars who frequently avoid the worrying questions that Adorno raises and instead treat him as a scapegoat to be sacrificially refuted.

James Hepokoski’s expansion of modernism into ‘early modernism’ – a periodization inclusive of Sibelius’s generation of symphonists – relies on an unspoken reconceptualization of Adorno’s Mahlerian categories of materiale Formenlehre into ‘sonata deformations’: specifically, ‘Suspension’ and ‘Breakthrough’. My thesis breaks new ground by reformulating these more transparently in light of their Adornian conception, and by challenging the interpretive tropes of nature and nationhood from the other side of the rift that are uncritically absorbed into Hepokoski’s other deformations. The thesis presents analytical theories of ‘sonorous’ or ‘multivalent’ voice-leading and ‘rotational projection’ that join Adorno’s and Hepokoski’s categories and demystify the processes of blurring and rupture at the rotational edges of Sibelian forms. At particular moments, Sibelius’s music contains two potential rotational pathways that are followed simultaneously to fulfil the form’s conflicting internal and external demands. These ‘projections’ paradoxically converge with a harmonic dissonance or formal rupture that points beyond the form itself to something spatially outside.
'Is there space on the island
land on the island’s mainland
for me to sing my
songs, to lilt long tales?
The words unfreeze in my mouth
on my gums they are sprouting.'\(^1\)
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Terms and Abbreviations

These terms and abbreviations are largely borrowed from James Hepokoski’s and Warren Darcy’s Elements of Sonata Theory.²

THEME ZONES

Superscript numbers are used to designate phrases within a theme, and decimal places indicate the units or motives within those phrases. Each new number (P¹, P², P³ and so forth) indicates a new phrase after a perfect cadence, or a significantly different phrase still within the same theme zone.³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Primary Theme-Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Secondary Theme-Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Closing Zone based on S material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Closing Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Retransition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Caesura-fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Medial Caesura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Rotation:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A cycle through musical materials (themes or motifs) in the order that they were first heard, with a sense of ‘return and rebeginning’⁴ at the onset of each subsequent rotation. The definition in this thesis differs from Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s. I argue that for rotation to imbue a sense of return, there also needs to be a sense of departure from the musical material at the beginning of a rotation, before it can return. Rotations must therefore contain more than one kind of musical material, whether that is different themes, keys, or topoi.

SR          | Subrotation: |

The definition used in this thesis is distinct from Hepokoski and Darcy’s, who refer to repetitions of phrases within a theme-zone as subrotations. In this thesis, subrotation refers instead to portions of whole rotations and must contain more than one kind of musical material.⁵

---

² James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata (Oxford University Press, 2006).
³ This numbering system is also based on Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s in Elements of Sonata Theory (71-72), but does not adhere to their guideline of only moving onto the next superscript integer – for example, P¹ to P² – after a PAC. My system places more weight upon the rhetorical contrasts within theme-zones in acknowledgement of the overwhelming rarity of PACs in fin de siécle music. New phrase material can be labeled with the next integer without a PAC.
⁴ Ibid., 612.
⁵ Examples of Hepokoski’s usage can be found in Hepokoski, Sibelius Symphony No. 5 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 82; and in James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 136.
HR Half-Rotation:
Part I or Part II of a full rotation through the referential material. Half-rotations are also subrotations, although subrotations are not always half-rotations.

**CADENCES, CHORDS, VOICE LEADING**

PAC | Perfect Authentic Cadence
IAC | Imperfect Authentic Cadence V-I without SD1 in upper voice HC
    | Half Cadence
EV  | Evaded
EEC | Essential Expositional Closure
ESC | Essential Structural Closure
Obscured | Sibelius obscures cadences, phrase beginnings and endings, and caesurae by layering other material directly on top of them.
SD  | Scale Degree
V/\x/x | An Active dominant of key, x.
+ / - | Major-mode key / minor mode key

**ARROWS**

— Elision of two themes or motives
→ Tonicization of a local key area
⇒ ‘Functional Transformation’ or *Becoming*: one theme dissolves into another or changes function.
⇢ Thematic fragmentation

**BAR NUMBERS**

Bar numbers are indicated with the abbreviation ‘b.’ for single bars or ‘bb.’ for multiple bars. Numbers following a colon refer to the specific beat within that bar. For instance, b. 4:3 refers to beat 3 of bar four.

---

6 This arrow is based on Julian Horton’s usage of it for elision. See Table 3.3: ‘Glossary of Terms and Symbols’ in Julian Horton, ‘Formal Type and Formal Function in the Postclassical Piano Concerto’ in Steven Vande Moortele, Julie Pedneault-Deslauriers, Nathan John Martin (eds.), *Formal Functions in Perspective: Essays on Musical Form from Haydn to Adorno* (University of Rochester Press, 2015), 77-122 at 86.

7 Hepokoski and Darcy use this arrow to denote the when a TR ‘becomes’ *Fortspinnung* (FS) in ‘continuous expositions’ in *Elements of Sonata Theory* (52-5), as well as when one type of sonata becomes another type (see 376-78). Janet Schmalfeldt has developed the concept of becoming more recently in her *In the Process of Becoming: Analytic and Philosophical Perspectives on Form in Early Nineteenth-Century Music* (Oxford University Press, 2011), and Horton also uses the arrow to denote ‘functional transformation’ in Horton, ‘Formal Type and Formal Function in the Postclassical Piano Concerto’, 86.
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Introduction

Jean Sibelius's compositional career spanned a period of exceptional global and national turmoil. World War I, the Russian Revolution, Finnish National Independence and the country's civil war all violently erupted within a few decades. In the sphere of Western Art Music, musical modernism emerged in central Europe. As a consequence, Sibelius's career does not easily slot into one historic or artistic period and he has proved particularly challenging to position within the context of music history. Attempts to associate his music with a particular movement or period have had diverse results, all tightly tied to their own historical-political contexts. Sibelius has been classified as a late romantic, post-romantic, neo-romantic, nationalist, modern classicist, neo-classicist, early modernist, proto-minimalist, and proto-postmodernist.¹

In the early twentieth century, contemporary opinion on Sibelius's music was 'polarized along ideological lines' with long-lasting implications for his reputation in the academic world: those that venerated Sibelius's music believed him to be the inheritor of the Beethovenian symphonic tradition, and those who did not saw his music as degenerative and anachronistic.² Sibelius's advocates in Britain, the United States, and Finland roughly represent the former category. Adorno falls into the latter, as an adoptive spokesperson for the pioneers of atonality and twelve-note composition: Schoenberg and his students, Berg and Webern, among others, grouped together

¹ For example, Peter Franklin 'reclaims' Sibelius's 'late romanticism' in his Reclaiming Late-Romantic Music: Singing Devils and Distant Sounds (2014), 75-81. Tomi Mäkelä argues that Sibelius is 'at least superficially' postmodern based on the plurality of styles to be found in his music in Mäkelä, ‘The Wings of a Butterfly: Sibelius and the Problem of Musical Modernity’, in Daniel M. Grimley (ed.), Jean Sibelius and His World (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011), 89-124 at 94-5. The early and middle periods of the composer’s career are characterised by Hepokoski as ‘national romanticism’ and ‘modern-classicism’, though this understanding predates his scholarship. Howell on the other hand, claims that the ‘the Neo-Classicism of the Sibelian Symphony may well be termed Neo-Romanticism in that it fused something of the intellect and economy of the Classical period with the emotion and extravagance of Romanticism’. See Hepokoski, Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 11; and Tim Howell, Jean Sibelius: Progressive Techniques in the symphonies and Tone Poems (Garland Publishing, 1990), 188. Hepokoski was first to describe Sibelius’s orchestra textures as ‘proto-minimalist’ in Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 28, and the term has been taken up subsequently by Grimley and Howell. See Grimley, ‘The tone poems: genre, landscape and structural perspective’ in Grimley (ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Sibelius (Cambridge University Press, 2004), 101; and Tim Howell, ‘Sibelius’s Tapiola: Issues of Tonality and Timescale’ in Sibelius Forum: Proceedings from the Second International Jean Sibelius Conference, November 1995 (Helsinki: Sibelius Academy, 1998). Hepokoski was also the first to coin the term ‘early’, ‘symphonic’, or ‘liberal-bourgeois modernism’ in Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, x, 15. The plurality of musical movements associated with Sibelius’s music was perhaps first observed by Harold E. Johnson in his Sibelius, (London: Faber & Faber, 1959), 189.
by the terms ‘New Music’ and ‘Second’ or ‘Young Viennese School’.\(^3\) The polarization of Sibelius’s reception has become an established tradition that continues to divide the critical reception of his work today.\(^4\)

We can only better understand Sibelius’s music and his position in Western art-music history by first investigating how and why his association with such a multiplicity of musical movements has emerged from this polarizing rift in discourse. One productive avenue of investigation is to trace the composer’s critical reception history outwards from what has become an epicentre: Theodor W. Adorno’s ‘Glosse Über Sibelius’ (‘Gloss on Sibelius’).\(^5\) This short and condemning critique was first published in _Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung_ (1938) as a review of Bengt de Törne’s _Sibelius: A Close Up_, although Adorno does not mention this text once.\(^6\) The reasons for such criticism included Sibelius’s lack of technical skill, the commercialization of his music, his use of superseded and ‘regressive’ musical materials, and the apparent claim made by using them: that they were profound and natural. Only amounting to a few pages, Adorno’s article ‘has gained significance in Sibelius criticism out of all proportion to its length’, as Daniel M. Grimley observes.\(^7\) The backlash it provoked echoed across the last century to the present. It has been described as ‘rabid’ by Erik Tawaststjerna,\(^8\) ‘dire’ by Alex Ross,\(^9\) and often referred to as an ‘attack’ on Sibelius’s music and reputation. It has therefore had a profound impact on the composer’s Anglo-American academic reception but not quite in the way, or at the time, that is often claimed.

Adorno’s controversial and condemning claims about many kinds of music have also incited extreme reactions outside Sibelius studies. The reaction to him is so severe in popular music studies that Adam Krims sees Adorno as its ‘primal trauma’. He

---

\(^{3}\) Those that have argued that Sibelius’s music is conservative or regressive include Adorno, Walter Niemann, René Leibowitz, Carl Dahlhaus, and most recently, Richard Taruskin.

\(^{4}\) The polarization of Sibelius’s reception has been observed by Johnson in his discussion of ‘the reputation of Sibelius’, in his _Sibelius_, 181-88, and by many more recent writers.


\(^{9}\) Alex Ross, _The Rest is Noise_ (Harper Perennial, 2009), 189.
argues that to ignore Adorno entirely, is a ‘repression that has offered little relief’ and while Krims claims that a ‘talking cure’ has proffered some productive discussion in popular music studies, the same cannot be said for the majority of scholarship on Sibelius.\(^\text{10}\) As Chapter 1 shows, many scholars respond in some way to Adorno’s claims as to justify pursing an academic interest in Sibelius and his music. An examination of Adorno’s place in the composer’s academic reception history is thus necessary before analysis of the composer’s music can proceed, in order to provide the ‘talking cure’ that is sorely needed to address the underlying ‘trauma’, or to continue the geological metaphor above, locate the ‘hypocentre’ that is masked by the scapegoating of his villain-like characterisation.

James Hepokoski’s theorization of nineteenth-century ‘sonata deformations’ has proved to be a particularly persuasive approach and has been accordingly influential on current analytical practice. The theoretical framework was first born out of his analysis of Sibelius’s Fifth Symphony and is applicable to his formal-historical category of ‘early modernist’ composers too: those symphonists writing on the cusp of the twentieth century.\(^\text{11}\) By reformulating some of Adorno’s Mahlerian formal material categories (Breakthrough and Suspension) with Carl Dahlhaus as an intermediary and then applying these to Sibelius’s works, Hepokoski ‘responds to Adorno’s challenge’ without making this his explicit aim or naming him directly.\(^\text{12}\) Nevertheless, Hepokoski’s theorization of deformations also uncritically absorbs tropes from mid-twentieth-century Anglo-American criticism that were intimately bound up with war-time ideologies of national unity, landscape, and even anti-German sentiments. Though Sibelius’s early reception seems long enough ago that one might imagine ‘the extreme positions of [his] promoters and detractors have gradually eroded, the cults have faded, and political issues that affected the interpretation and advocacy of his music


\(^{11}\) James Hepokoski, Sibelius: Symphony No. 5 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 2 and 6-7. The monograph was preceded by Hepokoski’s discussion of sonata deformations in ‘Fiery Pulsed Libertine or Domestic Hero? Strauss’s Don Juan Revisited,’ in Richard Strauss: New Perspectives on the Composer and His Work, ed. Bryan Gilliam (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1992), 135-75. These symphonists include Elgar (1857), Puccini (1858), Mahler (1860), Wolf (1860), Debussy (1862), Strauss (1864), Sibelius (1865), Glazunov (1865), Nielsen (1865), and Busoni (1866), amongst others.

have changed’ as Goss claims, this is not the case.\textsuperscript{13} These tropes have largely remained unchallenged in Hepokoski’s writing and in other Sibelius scholarship, and with the application of sonata deformations to other \textit{fin de siècle} composers, these ideologies are in danger of seeping into lots of scholarship on other composers. Rather than accepting the historical discourses in which they were formed, this thesis aims to confront the ideological foundations of analytical approaches to Sibelius’s music and assess their limitations. The thesis is as much about Sibelius’s music as the theoretical apparatus used to approach it, the history of that apparatus, and its application to nineteenth-century music. Several analytical examples of music by composers other than Sibelius are thereby used to add further nuance to such theoretical models throughout the following chapters.

In Part I, I argue that instead of engaging with Sibelius’s music from an analytical standpoint, Adorno’s assessment of the composer’s musical forms was almost entirely founded on the tropes that emerged in Sibelius’s early critical reception – reception that Adorno actually rejected and that Hepokoski later absorbed. The chapter identifies four main arguments in ‘Gloss on Sibelius’ and teases them apart (in section 1.1) before moving on to examine the established narratives of Sibelius’s various critical receptions (in section 1.2). This historiographical approach positions the thesis within the wider contemporary phenomenon of the meta-analysis of musicology itself. By addressing a concealed ideological ‘fracture’ in Adorno’s critique of Sibelius, section 1.2 will argue that scholarship can finally move beyond treating Adorno as a scapegoat to productively refine and apply his \textit{materiale Formenlehre} [‘theory of material form’] to Sibelius’s musical forms: Breakthrough and Suspension.

Part II begins with a theoretical interlude that critiques and defends these Adornian categories in relation to Hepokoski and Warren Darcy’s controversial concept of ‘deformation’ in order to begin redefining them in relation to recent theories of ‘early modernism’.\textsuperscript{14} The chapters following deal with other deformations that have


\textsuperscript{14} Examples of the abundant scholarship that makes use of Hepokoski’s sonata deformation-based definition of early modernism include Hepokoski’s own work on Elgar, Sibelius, and Strauss; Daniel M. Grimley on Elgar, Nielsen,
become self-contradictory since the publication of Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s *Elements of Sonata Theory* in 2006, each by identifying a music-theoretical issue and presenting a new approach before applying it to Sibelius’s music.\[115\]

Chapter 2 identifies the theoretical origins of the concept of *Klangfläche* in Adorno’s category of Suspension before reassessing its application to Sibelius’s music through an analysis of *The Swan of Tuonela*. As it is currently understood, the concept of *Klangfläche* or ‘sound-sheet’ is in danger of (re-)exoticising vast swathes of Sibelius’s music. *Klangflächen*, which are commonly interpreted as a musical kind of landscape representation, are accepted to be an idiosyncratically, although not uniquely, Sibelian trait after Hepokoski’s theorization of ‘Klang-meditation’ as a sonata deformation.\[16\]

Monika Lichtenfeld, followed by Carl Dahlhaus, and later James Hepokoski, theorize that such static passages function to connote natural landscape – or humankind’s confrontation with it – through their positive negation from the forward-directed momentum of the musical surroundings. Yet it is not just portions of Sibelius’s music but entire tone poems, like *The Swan*, that are categorized as *Klang*-meditations. Given the current understanding of *Klang’s* function, there is a danger that such works might be flung from the Western art music repertory against which they are juxtaposed – the teleologically driven music of *fin de siècle* symphonicism – back into an exoticised notion of ‘North’ that recent scholarship has made significant efforts to

---


\[16\] Hepokoski, *Sibelius, Symphony No. 5*, 27-9.
complicate and problematize.

The Swan of Tuonela has been critically received as the antithesis of goal-directed music and impossible to relate to its Kalevala-inspired programme: a heroic hunting narrative. Furthermore, its interpretation as a sonic ‘atmosphere’ seems to have acted as a repellent to rigorous analytical approaches and has ironically tended to ‘flatten’ any features that do not conform to its idealized hearing as a static landscape. The chapter thus provides a ‘sonorous voice-leading’ analysis of The Swan of Tuonela to show that it is the intrusion of hitherto overlooked ‘timbral outsiders’ that open a spatial dimension in the tone poem. Each time these outsiders obtrude into the work, they respond antagonistically to the solo cor anglais and profoundly disrupt the direction of the work’s wandering progressions to create a dialogue across an entirely musically conceived distance and present a hopeful second global tonic in a double-tonic complex. The progressions leading to these small tears in the work’s fabric are layers of ‘sonorous’ voices – orchestrated in close association with instrument groups – that move in conflicting directions but converge at the tears, a process that I term ‘multivalent voice-leading’. These concepts of voice-leading and the obtrusions of ‘timbral outsiders’ will be taken forth and developed on a larger-scale in Chapter 3 as ‘rotational projection’.

In Chapter 3, conflicting conceptions of rotation will be untangled to reassess the accepted formal definitions of early modernism. I argue that ‘rotation’ is not an early modernist kind of form and not, in fact, a kind of ‘form’ at all, but a process. The principle of ‘rotational form’ is foundational to Hepokoski’s formal definition of late nineteenth-century ‘sonata deformations’ outlined in his 1993 monograph, Sibelius, Symphony No. 5. Early publications from the development of Sonata Theory like this one, predominantly define rotation as a kind of form in its own right: a form unique to early modernists, particularly Sibelius. Strikingly, the concept of ‘rotation’ loses any deformational function in Elements of Sonata Theory (2006), as Hepokoski and Darcy extend its application back from the ‘early modernist’ music of fin de siècle symphonicism into the eighteenth century. This unacknowledged contradiction in the theorization of rotation poses significant aesthetic and interpretive problems to its
definition and also threatens to undermine the standing of composers in the generation of the 1860s as ‘early modernists’ on these terms.

Nevertheless, a discrete list of pieces that supposedly present rotational form ‘on its own’ appears in both publications. This list implies that the works it includes – Beethoven’s ‘Appassionata’ Sonata, first movement, for example – are in some way formally distinct from the thousands of other rotational movements. Nevertheless, current definitions do not account for whatever this particular distinction might be. To formulate a theory of a specifically nineteenth-century and deformational use of rotation, a rigorous analysis of these pieces and their recurring materials is required. This chapter will therefore present a Sonata Theory analysis of the Appassionata’s five-rotation Allegro Assai using voice-leading analysis and Schmalfeldt’s concept of becoming to demonstrate the presence of a process that I term ‘rotational projection’. In this movement, musical material is allowed to project forth beyond, against, or outside the formal expectations of its contextual function within the sonata by calling forth other material that cannot be predicted by the referential rotational ordering of the exposition, but nevertheless makes sense in context that it reappears. The result is a rotational form but not one that always conforms to the referential rotation in the way that Elements of Sonata Theory defines.

Following the development of a deformational kind of rotation the end of Chapter 3 will apply the concept of ‘rotational projection’ to Sibelius’s music. His kinds of projection differ from his predecessors is that while his rotations overflow the boundaries of formal sections, the boundaries of these formal sections are also sometimes upheld simultaneously: the rotational projections become multidimensional. Especially striking in Sibelius’s Second and Third Symphonies are the simultaneous pathways created as a result of rotational projection. In this chapter,
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17 See Table 3.1, 177 for examples that Hepokoski describes as rotational form ‘on its own’. His lists appear in Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 7 and 23-2 and again in Elements of Sonata Theory with several additions (see 323).
19 I use the term ‘multidimensional’ refer to the layering of themes or different parts of a sonata section directly on top of one another or when themes are chopped up or interspersed. The term is not to be confused with Steven Vande Moortele’s concept of ‘two-dimensional’ sonata form, which refers to the combination of movements of a work in a single-movement sonata form. See Vande Moortele, Two-Dimensional Sonata Form: Form and Cycle in Single-Movement Instrumental Works by Liszt, Strauss, Schoenberg, and Zemlinsky (Leuven University Press, 2009), 1.
analyses of these works are presented to show that in Sibelius’s music, transition and retransition materials are imbued with special structural significance and given a double function. They enable the existing rotation to continue cycling while also preparing for a new rotation to begin: primary and secondary theme-zones, normally confined to Parts I and II of a rotation, appear simultaneously and the rotations overlap. I argue that in the context of scholarship on Sibelius, reference to ‘rotational form’ and the sense that his music is in some way ‘more’ rotational and thus more ‘meditative’ or ‘ruminative’, than other contemporary music, emerges as a response to the phenomena created by his particularly disorientating treatment of transitional material at rotational boundaries.

The fourth Chapter explores the Adornian concept of ‘breakthrough’ (Durchbruch), a material formal category first theorized in relation to Mahler’s music.\textsuperscript{20} It is defined as a ‘rupture [that] originates from beyond the music’s intrinsic movement, intervening from outside’.\textsuperscript{21} After an investigation of breakthroughs in earlier symphonic works by Brahms, Schumann, and Beethoven, close analyses of Sibelius’s Second and Fifth Symphonies form the core of Chapter 4. The outcome of this chapter is a new theory of breakthrough as formal category, which locates these ‘interventions from outside’ at the perforations in ‘sonata-space’: the medial caesuras and interrotational caesuras. Breakthroughs therefore can be read as ‘parageneric’ and occupying a ‘liminal’ space. The chapter also explores rotational substitution and the fusion of movement types in Sibelius’s orchestral music in relation to the Adornian category of ‘Fulfillment’. It will critique Steven Vande Moortele’s concept of ‘two-dimensional sonata form’ along with Hepokoski’s analysis of Strauss’s \textit{Don Juan} in order to further understand the breakthrough at the juncture between first and second movements in Sibelius’s Fifth.\textsuperscript{22}

Finally, in Part III, a brief conclusion will meditate upon three pertinent quotations that sum up the critical aims of the thesis and its analytical findings.

\textsuperscript{20} Breakthrough is discussed by Adorno in Mahler’s First Symphony and defined in relation to his other categories. See Adorno, \textit{Mahler: A Musical Physiognomy}, 6, 8, 11 and 43.
\textsuperscript{22} Vande Moortele \textit{Two-Dimensional Sonata Form}; and Hepokoski, ‘Fiery-Pulsed Libertine or Domestic Hero?’. 
PART I
1 | Towards a Post-Adornian Gloss on Sibelius

1.1 Adorno’s ‘Glosse über Sibelius’

After four years as a resident at Merton College, University of Oxford, and over a decade after Sibelius’s last major work, Tapiola (1926), Adorno emigrated to New York in February 1938. It was also in this year that he published his ‘Gloss on Sibelius’. The critique is one of several of his interwar publications on the ‘Great Tradition’ of Western bourgeois art music and it casts Sibelius as a composer who sought to continue this superseded tradition. The arguments of ‘Gloss on Sibelius’ also appeared in embryonic form in Adorno’s footnote to Leo Löwenthal’s critique of Knut Hamsun’s novels, written in the previous year (1937). Like Adorno, Löwenthal was also associated with the Frankfurt School. In his essay, Löwenthal aims to dismantle the mythologization of the artist in Hamsun’s reception by probing the ideological motives in his writing, and it is here that we find Adorno’s footnote comparing Sibelius to the Norwegian author. The footnote is symptomatic of an ethical thread running through Adorno’s own critiques that seeks to uncover concealed ideological content (Gehalt), pretention, and dogmatic praise of art and artists. In ‘Gloss on Sibelius’, Adorno measures the ethical standing and societal value of Sibelius’s music by assessing the relationship of his music to central-European modernism and Capitalism.

Max Paddison sees both texts as a ‘sketch’ for Adorno’s larger-scale critique of Stravinsky’s reconstructivism in Philosophy of Modern Music (1949). In one of the only critical engagements with Adorno’s ‘Gloss’ and his footnote, Paddison summarises what

26 Adorno, Philosophy of Modern Music.
Adorno claims to be the threefold failure of Sibelius’s music, focusing himself on the ideology of nature:

1) Sibelius’s ‘sheer technical incompetence’ (a point which I shall address in section 1.1.1);
2) ‘Sibelius’s erroneous belief that the dialectic of the musical material could be circumvented or ignored, and tonality restored’ (see 1.1.2);
3) ‘the dangerous and overarching claim made by the music to heroic profundity and sublimity in its relation to nature – a claim that served both to mask the common-place character of the music itself and the falsity and incompetence of its technical means, while at the same time placing itself at the service of the dominant authoritarian mythologies of its time, namely Fascism and Nazism’ (see 1.1.4).27

To these three arguments can be added Adorno’s theory of ‘the fetish character [in Sibelius’s] music and the regression of listening’ (a point to which I return to in 1.1.3). While Adorno does not directly apply this to Sibelius’s music in his ‘Gloss on Sibelius’, it is clear that the commodification of music and its ramifications for listeners were phenomena that he strongly associated with Sibelius in particular. In the following section (1.1), the compacted meaning in Adorno’s language will be decompressed through reference to his texts and contexts in order to lay his arguments out clearly and subject them to a critique. While it is almost impossible to sever any finite number of the seemingly infinite interlocking gimmel rings of dialectical thought in Adorno’s writing, I will attempt to hold onto a few loops for a brief portion of this chapter.

1.1.1 Technical Incompetencies

It is unsurprising that the first of Adorno’s claims has antagonized scholars, whose chief aim is normally to remain impartial to the subjects they study. The assertions that ‘[Sibelius] obviously hasn’t mastered four-part harmony’ and that ‘[he] uses material that is appropriate for a schoolboy’, condemn the composer’s musical language in way that verges on unscholarly name-calling.28 He also expresses bewilderment at

Sibelius’s popularity, which seems to be based on the appeal of the very things Adorno believes to be deficient, and in the process, he questions the tastes of audiences in Britain and in the United States where Sibelius had found loyal enthusiasts. Adorno identifies several specific compositional features in Sibelius’s music that he believes reveal a lack of technical skill:

> a few ‘themes’ are set out, some utterly unshapely and trivial sequences of tones, usually not even harmonically worked out; instead, they are unisono, with organ pedal points, flat harmonies, and whatever else the five lines of the musical staff have to offer as a means of avoiding logical chord progressions.

He continues with a particularly unpleasant comparison:

> These sequences of notes are soon befallen by misfortune, rather like a newborn baby who falls off the table and injures its back. They cannot walk properly. They get bogged down. At some unpredictable moment the rhythmic movement ceases: forward movement becomes incomprehensible.

As Ilkka Oramo notes, this strangely specific analogy is in fact a reference to the narrative structure of a short story in Thomas Mann’s *Der Kleine Herr Friedemann* (1896). The short story’s protagonist is injured when his alcoholic nurse drops him from a table as an infant. Later in life, he commits suicide when the object of his affections sarcastically rejects him because of his physical disfigurement. Even knowing the source of this literary reference, it is clear that Adorno evokes the analogy simply for its tragicomic effect.

The main features in Sibelius’s music that strike Adorno as inadequate are the lack of musical development and forward motion, the presence of organ pedals, layering of motivic repetitions, and sparse harmonization of themes. It is ironic that the combination of many of these features form Adorno’s own ‘material formal’ category.
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29 Ibid., 333.
20 Ibid.
32 Theodor W. Adorno, ‘Footnote on Sibelius and Hamsun’ translated by Susan Gillespie, in Grimley (ed.), *Jean Sibelius and his World*, 336-7 at 337.
of ‘suspension’, which he revers in Mahler’s music. Adorno does not make any reference to specific passages or even pieces in his ‘Gloss on Sibelius’ to support his claims. Sections exhibiting such features can easily be located in Sibelius’s music and some commonly cited examples include the opening of En Saga and the Violin Concerto, The Swan of Tuonela, Luonnotar, and Tapiola. Detailed analysis is perhaps too much to expect for a ‘gloss’ yet some specific musical examples would not go amiss. Yet as Paddison reasons, to expect the reader to find these themselves ‘suggests a do-it-yourself approach that would not [and does not] find a sympathetic reception’ from most philosophers, musicologists, or analysts.

What is more, the lack of specific analytical content in ‘Gloss on Sibelius’ contradicts Adorno’s own insistence that music analysis is essential for the cultural interpretation of music, outlined in his Introduction to the Sociology of Music (1962) and posthumously published seminar, ‘On the Problem of Music Analysis’ (1982). For Adorno, music analysis is ‘meaningless except in relation to a wider context’ and ‘neutral’ analysis is not in fact possible or desirable. Conversely, he argues that it is only through analysis that the social meanings of musical forms might be revealed and lead to simultaneous interpretative and social critiques. As Julian Johnson summarizes, Adorno believes that ‘significant [analytical] work thrives off the tension between these two inseparable yet irreconcilable concerns’ and ‘neither pole can be sacrificed if such work is to succeed’. Yet in practice, analysis is frequently sacrificed in Adorno’s work, and perhaps as a consequence, it was abandoned almost entirely in the post-Adornian new musicology of the 1980s, when his theories, rather than analytical models, were used by scholars such as Rose Rosengard Subotnik to critique empiricism.

Ludwig Holtmeier notes in his essay, ‘Analyzing Adorno – Adorno Analyzing’, the
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33 See Adorno, Mahler: A Physiognomy, 41.
37 Ibid., 301.
remarkable disconnect between the status Adorno grants music analysis [in general] and the way in which he himself relates to it in his work’.  

Steven Vande Moortele also observes the inconsistent and ‘problematic position of analysis in Adorno’s writings’. He identifies three main problems: 1) that there is little of it; 2) that Adorno never laid out a coherent analytical method; and 3) where there is analysis, the results ‘often appear unconvincing, biased, or downright faulty’. While acknowledging that Adorno’s theory of music analysis was in its very early stages when he wrote ‘Gloss on Sibelius’ and still incomplete when he died in 1969, these three criticisms are all still critical to understanding his assessment of the composer.

The dissonance between Adorno’s theory and his own application of it leads Vande Moortele to question whether analysis is relevant to music’s cultural interpretation at all: ‘If the analysis is mediocre, but the cultural conclusions are nonetheless sound, what does that say about the usefulness or even the necessity of analysis?’ He suggests that this contradiction might, in theory, ‘disprove’ Adorno’s position that ‘the quality of cultural interpretation is dependent on the analysis that leads to it’. It is tempting to accept Vande Moortele’s diagnosis and although there is no specific analysis in Adorno’s gloss, it is nevertheless important to note that his arguments all arise from those features of form he finds deficient in Sibelius. Rather than rejecting the dialectic entirely, we might instead redirect Adorno’s claim that music criticism that does not arise from music analysis ‘deserves to be regarded with utmost suspicion’, back towards Adorno himself. ‘Gloss on Sibelius’ is an excellent example of the dangers of taking for granted what seem to be analytical ‘facts’ and this is perhaps due to Adorno’s own analytical-‘technical incompetence’. Instead of doing his own analytical work, Adorno not only puts his faith in the ideologically motivated, generalized, and, as a necessary consequence, flawed analytical remarks of unnamed scholars that
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41 Ibid., 414-5.
presumably include Bengt de Törne, but these scholars are also the very same Sibelius advocates that Adorno also condemns for their uncritical bias towards Sibelius’s music. Instead of questioning the ‘quality’ of this analysis, Adorno inadvertently treats these remarks as ‘neutral’ or even ‘natural’, despite his own claims that analysis cannot be severed from its cultural context. This is a considerable oversight on his part. It is important to note that the aims of de Törne’s Close Up were to give an insight into Sibelius’s compositional process while providing a romantic portrait of the ‘master’s genius’ and positioning himself as the composer’s chosen inheritor. As Mäkelä observes, ‘Adorno could not have suspected that de Törne was one of the worst examples in the history of music of a “student” taking advantage of his status, especially during his teacher’s lifetime.’

Even though musical analysis is always historically and culturally contingent, the context in which publications on Sibelius started to gain momentum – the 1930s – was an especially polarized and turbulent phase. Adorno therefore overlays his own interpretative criticism on analysis that is steeped in the very ideologies he finds problematic. By making weighty ethical claims about the role of Sibelius’s musical materials in their reception – which we will come to shortly (in Section 1.1.4) – Adorno himself enters dubious ethical territory too. This is surely not a ‘sound’ approach, as Vande Moortele suggests, nor does it move towards new thought on Sibelius’s music.

It is such ‘blind spots’ in Adorno’s writing generally – the concealed ‘fractures’ in his critical interpretations – that Paddison claims to be the ‘ideological moment in [his] theory’ elsewhere. While these moments do not undermine the importance of his work for musicology and philosophy, identifying such ‘lacunae’ is ‘part of the necessary demystification of [Adorno’s] terminology and approach’ that enables Paddison’s and my own work ‘to play a significant part in the gradual transformation of historical musicology, music analysis and music theory into less rigidly divided and more critical sub-disciplines’. It is the demystification both of Adorno’s approach to Sibelius and of Sibelius’s music that I hope this thesis will contribute to, and identifying this ‘blind
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43 Mäkelä, Jean Sibelius, 368.
45 Ibid.
spot’ is a first step.

1.1.2 ‘Gas station, lunch, death, Greta, plowshare’

Sibelius was a composition student in Berlin with Albert Becker (1889-90) and in Vienna with Robert Fuchs and Karl Goldmark (1890-91). To Adorno, however, he was a composer who passively absorbed the Western art-music tradition and simply regurgitated its clichés, an opinion no doubt formed in opposition to some of the outlandish assertions of Sibelius’s total originality made by his Anglo-American advocates. Adorno casts Sibelius as a composer of limited abilities who falls into ‘the category of those amateurs who are afraid to take composition lessons for fear of losing their originality, which itself is nothing but the disorganized remains of what preceded them’.47

The inadequacy of the ‘remains’ in Sibelius’s music and that of his contemporaries is the basis for Adorno’s second claim: that the musical system of diatonicism had been historically superseded by the atonality and serialism of the Second Viennese School (Schoenberg, Berg, Webern, and Adorno’s own ‘New Music’). This cultural ‘earthquake’ made Sibelius’s continuing use of diatonicism not only antiquated and regressive, but also no longer cadentially functional.48 Sibelius’s diatonicism was therefore ‘false’.

After the emergence of the radical New Music in Central Europe in the 1910s, contemporary composers identified by Hepokoski as the older ‘generational wave’ born in the 1860s – Sibelius, Elgar, Puccini, Wolf, Debussy, Strauss, Glazunov, Nielsen, and Busoni – were apparently cast aside ‘immediately’ as anachronistic.49 Adorno’s theory is widely acknowledged to be founded on a ‘Schoenbergian notion of historical necessity, a historical dialectic driven by the convergence of the most advanced stage of expressive needs in relation to the most advanced technical means at any particular historical period’.50 Sibelius’s continuing use of tonality amounted to

46 Mäkelä, Jean Sibelius, 170, 172, 174.
48 Ibid., 334. Hepokoski uses the metaphor of an earthquake to describe the same event in Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 8.
49 Hepokoski, Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 2, 5-7.
a rejection of the ‘emancipation of dissonance’ and therefore also a rejection of the most advanced ‘state of the musical material’ of the time. By the 1930s however, Adorno had seen his theory of the Schoenbergian historical dialectic crumble as even Schoenberg began to write what Heinz Klaus Metzger later termed ‘re-tonal’ music.\(^\text{51}\) Paddison suggests that Sibelius was part of the pre-history of that disintegration.\(^\text{52}\)

For Adorno, tonal music could not provide sufficient escapism from the traumas of its socio-political context in the early twentieth century – a war-torn and increasingly urbanized Europe. Indeed, it was complicit in the societal structures that had led to this state. Musical modernism, on the other hand, was born out of this context, addressed it directly, and revealed tonal music to be ‘impotent’, ‘trivial’, and ‘banal’. Any attempts to take refuge in this flawed system indicated a reactionary position, a denial of both the advanced stage of expressive needs and technical means, and thus was a kind of desperate repression. ‘As people flee from the dissonances’, claims Adorno, ‘they have sought shelter in false triads’.\(^\text{53}\) As it became increasingly urgent for people to question the ideologies that drove contemporary politics, economies, and social structures in the 1930s, Adorno argued that art too should be critical of its own structures and norms. Adorno proclaims that

\begin{quote}
no music can lay claim to being written, any more, that does not present a critical attack on what exists, down to the innermost cells of its technical methodology. This intuition is what people hope to escape by means of Sibelius. This is the secret of his success.\(^\text{54}\)
\end{quote}

Sibelius is cast as a reactionary composer who clung uncritically to the now flawed ‘remains’ of orthodox harmony and counterpoint, an out-dated ‘technical methodology’ that he could not even get right to begin with. This is one of the first appearances of Adorno’s thoughts on tonality in his output. It would be reworked into part of his essay on ‘Schoenberg and Progress’ in the early 1940s, which was later

\(^{52}\) Ibid., 182.
\(^{53}\) Adorno, ‘Gloss on Sibelius’, 334.
\(^{54}\) Ibid., 335.
published as the opening of *Philosophy of New Music* (1949).\(^{55}\)

It was not just in its sudden juxtaposition to the New Music that tonality was made false and ‘out of date’, according to Adorno. Making generalized formal observations about the specific use of tonality in those works where the system ‘still’ appeared, he argues that contemporary tonal music could not avoid ‘the cracks and fissures that are a feature of the modernist work’.\(^{56}\) These cracks also found their way into the technical surface of the ‘little works’ to change their tonal language and make it ‘ravaged and crooked’.\(^{57}\) In other words, diatonic gestures and progressions were strewn across works as the ‘desiccated’\(^{58}\) or ‘disorganized remains’ of tonality. These chunks of tonal rubble are severed from their functional contexts and as a consequence, what they signify too. They are recognizable and feel ‘familiar’ but are floating signifiers and relics of the superseded system of tonality. ‘They no longer fulfil their function’ and are ‘impotent clichés’.\(^{59}\) Such ‘rubble’ does not and cannot make up a cohesive or coherent musical whole. Adorno describes this effect in Sibelius’s music through comparison with linguistic syntax:

> Each individual thing sounds quotidian and familiar. The motives are fragments from the current material of tonality. We have already heard them so often we think we understand them. But they are placed in a meaningless context: as if one were to combine indiscriminately the words *gas station, lunch, death, Greta, and plowshare* with verbs and particles. An incomprehensible whole made up of the most trivial details produces the false image of profundity. We feel good that we can follow from one thing to the next, and are pleased in good conscience, while realizing that in actuality we don’t understand a thing.\(^{60}\)

It is the shuffling of familiar sounds into an unfamiliar order that leads Adorno to claim that Sibelius’s music ‘is the configuration of the banal and absurd’.\(^ {61}\) The comfortable sounds of nineteenth-century diatonic symphonicism – the banal – crumble into chunks
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\(^{55}\) Adorno, ‘Schoenberg and Progress’, *Philosophy of New Music*, 19-94, esp. 23.


\(^{58}\) Adorno, ‘Footnote on Sibelius and Hamsun’, 337.


\(^{60}\) Adorno, ‘Gloss on Sibelius’, 335.

\(^{61}\) Ibid., 335.
that are reconstructed into an incoherent form or indeed formlessness – the absurd. Worst of all, for Adorno, is that Sibelius’s advocates seemingly reveled in the absurd incomprehensibility of his musical forms, finding them profound and mythic.62

Although it does not invalidate Adorno’s criticism, it is interesting to note that Sibelius himself was also aware that ‘our modern tonality is shaky’. In his only public lecture at the University of Helsinki, Sibelius argues that it cannot ‘be done by building […] a [new] tonal system – it must be found living within the folk tune’.63 Two more related issues emerge from Adorno’s second argument. Firstly, it is not clear if there is a difference between the diatonic musical features that Adorno considers to be ‘impotent’ because of Sibelius’s amateurish compositional technique – an internal compositional responsibility – and the antiquated rubble that makes his forms incoherent as an unavoidable symptom of its historical and cultural context – ie. the inescapable influence of an external phenomena. If there is indeed a formal distinction between the manifestations of these factors in Sibelius’s music, Adorno does not provide any explanation of what it might be. ‘Illogical’ chord progressions might well be the same as shuffled up bits of tonal debris. This weakness in Adorno’s argument, another lacuna perhaps, is evidence of Sibelius’s difficult historical position in relation to musical modernism. The composer may have fulfilled Adorno’s historical narrative better if he had used straightforwardly diatonic language before the emergence of modernism in the 1910s, but because he did not, Adorno ambiguously casts all his music as incompetent and incoherent.

Secondly, in the early 1960s, Adorno described similar moments of decontextualization as self-conscious, critical attacks in Mahler’s music: ‘the flaws in musical logic, at which Mahler’s self-criticism is directed, are produced by an intention that walks the narrow ridge of meaning between the absurd and the qualitatively

62 This aspect of Adorno’s critique is likely a direct response to Gray’s anti-analytical claim that ‘the most ordinary and even commonplace progressions, especially in his later works, with a profound meaning and significance for which there is no adequate word but “magical,” for it triumphantly defies any attempt at analysis or rational explanation’. This follows a description of the importance of magic and wizardry in Finland’s cultural history. Gray, Sibelius, 38.

new’. By directly revealing the cracks in the systems of Western art music, Mahler was able to show their limitations and write ‘truly’ novel music. In fact, Adorno goes as far as to claim that Mahler’s music ‘was so convincing that anyone able to grasp its import would be immunized against anti-Semitic propaganda’, as Stefan Müller-Doohm summarizes. Adorno claimed that ‘Music [like Mahler’s] generates an indestructible minimum of morality that will prove its worth even in these times’. Adorno never changed his mind about Sibelius even when examining these moments of Mahlerian novelty, which raises the question as to why moments of incoherence are fetishized in Mahler but heard in Sibelius as accidental and passive incoherencies? Without musical examples to support Adorno’s claims, it is difficult, if not impossible, to know what specific kinds of musical gestures he refers to or if those he finds deplorable are specific to Sibelius’s music or not. One might suspect that this too is down to Sibelius’s difficult historical position. Mahler died in 1911 and was therefore unable to either respond to the ‘emancipation of dissonance’ or be embroiled in the radio culture and dubious political alliances that tainted Sibelius by the time Adorno came to write his gloss in 1938.

1.1.3 The Fetishism of Sibelius and his Secret

Historical narratives like Hepokoski’s emphasise Sibelius’s ‘crisis’ and ‘withdrawal’ after his rejection of modernist techniques of serialism and atonality, and some, like Dahlhaus, even claim that Sibelius was suddenly negated from the historical progress of music after his Fourth Symphony (1911) reached a “‘state of the material” [...] that he was never to surpass’. Contemporary public engagement with Sibelius’s music, however, could not have been more different. ‘Come to England, or even America’, claims Adorno,
and the name [Sibelius] begins to become boundlessly inflated. It is dropped as frequently as the brand name of an automobile. Radio and concerts resound with the tones of Finland.  

This is likely a direct reference to Cecil Gray’s 1931 observation that Sibelius’s ‘name is a household word’ and that he is the ‘most popular of living composers’.  

In the same year that ‘Gloss on Sibelius’ was published, Adorno wrote elsewhere that such success was a ‘manufactured popularity’. In a study on ‘Music in Radio’, he claimed ‘radio voice [to be] an “expert commodity marketer”’ and decried the ‘name that “tune” trend.’ As Laura Gray and Glenda Dawn Goss observe, the enormous boom of record sales and radio broadcasts of his music in the 1930s and 1940s did indeed boost Sibelius’s reputation as his music became increasingly present outside the concert hall and away from the parlour piano. In 1935, the audiences of the New York Philharmonic radio broadcasts voted Sibelius to be their favourite living composer. Yet it was not only technological advances in record production and radio that increased public consumption of Sibelius’s music. Rarely if ever mentioned in this context is the use of his music in Classic Hollywood cinema. Warner Brothers used a number from Sibelius’s *Pelléas et Mélisande* Suite, Op. 46/II (1905), in the soundtrack of the very first sound film, *The Jazz Singer* (1927), without his knowledge or crediting him. It is also widely acknowledged that orchestral music written specifically for Hollywood narrative films in these decades was ‘steeped’ in late nineteenth-century romanticism. According to Mervyn Cooke, this ‘indestructibly tonal romanticism was […] deeply ingrained in the consciousness of movie-goers and film composers’. As the most popular period of musical history in concert performances at the time, late
romanticism gave film composers a ready-made bank of musical signifiers to draw upon for film cues that bourgeois cinema-goers were already familiar with from their concert-going. Even when Sibelius’s music was not used directly, it was often a stylistic influence, whether consciously or not, in the film music cues of Hollywood composers, many of whom were European émigrés aspiring to continue the symphonic and operatic traditions.\(^7\) The Austrian-born émigré composer, Erich W. Korngold (1897-1957), for example, was frustrated by the realization that a theme in his score for the Hollywood film, *Kings Row* (1942), resembled the melodic contour of Sibelius’s *Finlandia*.\(^7\)

Much to Adorno’s disgust, the musical marketplace in the US where he had recently moved was just as saturated with Sibelius than it was in the UK. According to Tawaststjerna, performances of Sibelius’s music began increasing rapidly in the 1930s, reaching a peak two Sibelius Festivals in London, one while Adorno was living in the UK, in 1937, and on the following year.\(^7\) Even reflecting on Sibelius’s popularity in the late 1920s, Adorno noted that ‘the trumped-up glory surrounding Elgar [that had seemed to be] a local phenomenon’ and the ‘exceptional case of critical ignorance’ that boosted Sibelius’s fame, had both become the norm by the late 1940s.\(^8\) When connoisseurs were replaced with those who could afford a ticket, ‘an abyss developed between public taste and compositional quality’ and ‘the reactions of the listeners appear[ed] to have no relation to the playing of the music’ or its quality.\(^8\) Instead, taste was driven by a circular selection process whereby ‘the most familiar is the most successful and is therefore played again and again and made still more familiar’.\(^8\) Ilkka Oramo sums up the consequence of this phenomenon in Adorno’s eyes: ‘all kinds of dilettantes were celebrated as great composers, and Sibelius was a dilettante’.\(^8\)

---

\(^7\) Film music has no doubt changed the way audiences receive Sibelius’s music. This includes those who are trained in performing and listening to Western art music.


\(^1\) Ibid., 4; Adorno, *The Culture Industry*, 35. Adorno does not question the privileges that might have led to this connoisseurship.

\(^2\) Adorno, *The Culture Industry*, 36. Adorno’s argument here is very close to the widely-observed psychological phenomenon known as the ‘mere-exposure effect’.

Adorno’s likening of Sibelius’s name to an ‘automobile brand’ has a greater significance than to simply point out his all-encompassing popularity. To Adorno, the secret of Sibelius’s success was not just a result of excessive plugging and the bourgeois public’s over-exposure to his ‘impotently’ tonal music, but also a direct result of the underlying Capitalist mechanism that drove these phenomena: commodity fetishism. Capitalism had cleaved the ‘musical sphere’ in two and Adorno’s aforementioned historical dialectic is based on an ‘irreconcilable’ binary antagonism between its halves: 1) mass culture: ‘light music’ that accepts its character as a commodity, and 2) musical modernism: ‘serious music’, some of which denounces Capitalism and thereby alienates itself from society by becoming unacceptable to it. Paddison labels these Categories 1 and 2, respectively. Adorno saw the veneration of Sibelius’s music and the loyalty that it inspired from contemporary music critics as a kind of fetishism cultivated by commercial radio, which places his music firmly in Category 1.

Published in the same volume of Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung as Adorno’s ‘Gloss on Sibelius’, is his essay entitled ‘The Fetish Character in Music and the Regression of Listening’. This study would later be printed as the first chapter of The Culture Industry. Karl Marx’s interpretation of Capitalism as a cultural phenomenon in ‘The Fetishism of the Commodity and its Secret’ opened his economic theories to the philosophical domain and Adorno’s essay applies these to music. Although there is little direct interaction between the 1938 essays, it is evident that his thoughts on their topics were intertwined. In this essay he claims that

the composition business which extends peacefully from Irving Berlin and Walter Donaldson – ‘the world’s best composer’ – by way of Gershwin, Sibelius and Tchaikovsky to Schubert’s B Minor Symphony, labelled The unfinished, is one of fetishes. The star principle has become totalitarian.

---

86 Adorno, The Culture Industry, 29-60.
88 Adorno, The Culture Industry, 35.
At the end of ‘Gloss on Sibelius’, Adorno also alludes to the effect of the fetish character in Sibelius’s music by claiming that

he contributes, in art music, to the great degradation at which industrialized music easily outdoes him. But such destruction masks itself in his symphonies as creation. Its effect is dangerous.  

For Adorno, the effect commodification had on music like Sibelius’s was not quite as bad as the more obviously commercial music like popular hit songs or advert jingles, but it was still complicit in a system that perpetuated the oppression and exploitation of labourers, concealed the alienation of these workers, and had other dangerous implications too.

Marx theorized that in a Capitalist society, the ‘exchange value’ of a product – the price a consumer might pay for a Sibelius concert ticket, for instance – has the illusion of being an innate quality of the commodity itself – the concert performance. Put perhaps over-simplistically, the labour that goes into creating a commodity and its ‘use value’ – in other words, its ability to satisfy the needs of the user – are both concealed from the consumer and ‘mystified’ when an abstract ‘surplus value’ is added to it before it is sold. The latter value is the profit-earning portion of its price. The resulting exchange value becomes abstracted from these elements and to the consumer, it seems that the value they encounter is tied to something ‘natural’: ‘that’s just what a Sibelius concert costs’. It is through this abstraction that a commodity takes on an external reality or a ‘life of its own’ and is imbued with ‘mysterious forces’. It is fetishized. It is also by this mechanism of concealment in nature (a sense of naturalness, rather than the specific flora-and-fauna type of nature) that Marx believed ideologies were formed.

Applying this theory to the ‘realm of cultural goods’ and music, in particular, Adorno observes that ‘exchange value exerts its power in a special way’.  

90 Adorno, The Culture Industry, 38.

musical commodities effectively buffets audiences away from the object they hope to consume in a circular motion: ‘music [...] serves in America today as an advertisement for the commodities which one must acquire in order to be able to hear music’. 91 Like naming the brand of an automobile, Adorno protests that ‘naming that tune’ on the radio does not engage with the music in any meaningful way because this kind of knowledge is ‘in any case inescapable’ and it does not encourage new thought. 92 In films like the Jazz Singer, music by Sibelius, Tchaikovsky, and others was chopped up, ‘literally faded out, and thus figuratively oppressed’. 93 On the other hand, music written specifically for film was created to be ‘unobtrusive’ and ‘inconspicuous’, so the result was ‘banal and overfamiliar’, much like Sibelius’s music according to Adorno. 94 When it came to the concert hall, he claims that ‘the consumer is really worshiping the money that he himself has paid for the ticket to the Toscanini [or Sibelius] concert’. 95 If the price of a concert ticket is the only important thing, the ‘quality’ of the music does not really matter, nor what happens at the concert. Ultimately commodified music is often not comprehended. The commodification of Sibelius’s music through its use on the radio, in film, as gramophone records, and in concert performances, concealed and thereby legitimized what Adorno found to be its malformed structures – Sibelius’s darkest secret – because his music fell on ears that were all too easily led by the ‘pantheon of bestsellers’ and the ‘star principle’. 96 Adorno makes his point clear with a typically damning example: ‘where they react at all, it no longer makes any difference whether it is to Beethoven’s Seventh Symphony or to a bikini’. 97

Taken out of context, some of Adorno’s language in his essay is markedly unsympathetic to bourgeois consumers who he seemingly accuses of ‘neurotic stupidity’, gullibility, and lazy listening in his essay. 98 He also uses an ableist analogy to describe those who are complicit in ‘the regression of listening’: ‘they are childish;

91 Ibid.
92 Ibid., 39.
95 Adorno, The Culture Industry, 63.
96 Ibid., 36.
97 Ibid., 37.
98 Ibid., 47
their primitivism is not that of the undeveloped, but that of the forcibly retarded’.99 Yet it is not the listeners, but the Capitalist structures that Adorno, and Marx, claims are at fault. Not only were such absurd structures masked in their own fetishization but their concealment and mystification actually made sense in a Capitalist world where human relationships had also become ‘mysterious, hidden and apparently other-worldly’.100 What is more, because art cannot help but reflect the structures of society, it mirrors these relations in its forms. Sue Wolton observes that for Marx the ‘alienation’ caused by Capitalist commodity fetishism ‘was the estrangement of man from himself, from his life activity and creativity, and, at the same time, the reappearance of that collective work in an atomised, distorted and mystified form’.101 It is both by the mechanisms of Capitalism that this ‘false’ music became so popular, and that its forms were made ‘false’. If a listener did engage critically with Sibelius’s music or any other commodified bit of music – they put some amount of effort or ‘work’ into understanding it, instead of passively coming to contact with it – they would find that his music was as incomprehensible as Capitalism had made human relationships. It is this kind of ‘falseness’ or ‘distortion’ that Adorno presumably refers to as the ‘great degradation’ in Sibelius’s music.

1.1.4 ‘It’s all nature’

Though de Törne only mentions this facet of Sibelius’s reception in the last few pages of his monograph, the third of Adorno’s points refers to the pictorial imagery of nature and landscapes (especially Finnish forests) commonly associated with Sibelius’s music by scholars, critics, and audiences.102 This hermeneutic has been consistently attached to Sibelius’s music throughout his reception and his diaries have been used to give it additional authorial weight since the 1960s.103 Nature is not often associated with

99 Ibid., 46-47.
101 Ibid.
103 Extracts from Sibelius’s Swedish-language diaries, letters, and other documents were first published in Tawaststjerna’s five-volume biography in Finnish, which was later compressed and republished as a four-volume edition in Swedish and as three-volumes in English. See Erik Tawaststjerna, Jean Sibelius trans by Tuomas Anhava
Sibelius’s music by direct evocation – musical onomatopoeia or mimesis – or through impressionism, according to Adorno, but through various timbres ‘standing in’ for nature, as Paddison puts it. Such passages are not ‘nature itself’, but the appearance of nature. These timbres are identified as static tableaus of drones, ostinato figures, and sustained harmonies. They are the same features that Adorno identifies as ‘deficient’ in his first arguments and are also similar to his descriptions of the aforementioned Mahlerian category of suspension, discussed at length in Chapter 2. Adorno claims that in Sibelius’s music, ‘the constructed opaque repetitions lay claim to an eternal rhythm of nature: which is also expressed by a lack of symphonic consciousness of time’. These textures stand in sharp juxtaposition to the forward momentum of music informed by Beethovenian ideals of motivic development and goal-directed diatonicism, which are intimately bound up with conceptions of human progress and agency.

Another facet of Adorno’s critique of nature representation relates back to the second argument: the presentation of art, its materials, and systems as ‘natural’ and ‘naturally’ derived via artistic intuition or ‘unconscious creation’. By continuing to use tonality in spite of the emancipation of dissonance, Sibelius and his contemporaries were ‘implying an absolutist claim that tonality itself was the natural state of music – indeed, that the tonal system itself was “nature”’, as Adorno claims. After the ‘Event’ of musical modernism, major-minor tonality could only maintain its status as ‘natural’ if the artificiality of its construction and historical origins as a Western music system are ignored, and if all music that does not conscribe to this system is unjustly deemed ‘unnatural’ such as atonal and serial music, and a huge amount of folk and non-Western music. To Adorno, Sibelius’s persistent diatonicism made him complicit in this kind of nature ideology and the cultural discrimination that it results in.


105 Adorno, ‘Footnote on Sibelius and Hamsun’, 337.
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A clear example of the interpretive attitude that Adorno reacts to can be found in the autobiography of one of the first British writers on Sibelius, Cecil Gray (1895-1951). Gray describes his use of the twelve-tone method in his unperformed and unpublished opera, *The Temptation of Saint Anthony*, Op. 33, composed in 1935-37 shortly before ‘Gloss’ was written. Gray claims that Schoenberg’s method plays God in the way it creates music ‘consciously and mechanically […] like a homunculus in a test tube’. Denying his own agency in the act of composition, Gray claims his own music is ‘born naturally’, unlike Schoenberg’s unnatural alchemical processes. Gray’s opera is not atonal but rather based on an antagonism between the interval of a tritone – the *diabolus in musica*, which ‘aptly symbolizes the power of Evil’ – and the most diatonic and tonal of all possible harmonic progressions – tonic, dominant, and sub-dominant – which can be found to underlie every musical system in the world, past and present […] which was called by the Ancient Greeks “the body of the harmony”. It may consequently be regarded as the musical embodiment of the eternal, the everlasting, the absolute; in a word, God.\(^{108}\)

Diatonicism and non-diatonicism are thereby directly cast as good and evil, natural and unnatural. Both ‘principles are contained in the twelve-tone scale motive which represents man, Saint Anthony, in whom all potentialities for both good and evil exist – it is in this polarity that the musical as well as the literary plot of the work consists’.\(^{109}\) In an example of the extravagance that Gray was prone, he proclaims that it is an ‘objective fact’ that his opera ‘is probably the largest organic structure in the history of music’: a totalising statement of holism that Adorno would likely be deeply suspicious of.\(^{110}\) It is beyond the scope of this thesis to investigate whether Gray’s opera reaches a organic synthesis of what could be an Hegelian dialectic, or if dissonance is simply purged from the opera, as Anthony’s desert temptations are overcome. Given the opera’s subject matter and Gray’s writings, the latter seems most likely. In sum, it was not just Sibelius’s music, but the cultural climate of contemporary music determined by Gray and others like him who wrote the early scholarship on Sibelius, that


\(^{109}\) Ibid., 312.

\(^{110}\) Ibid., 305.
Adorno critiqued in 1938.\footnote{It is of interest that Gray did not discuss the role of the tritone in Sibelius’s Symphony No. 4 in his Sibelius (London: Oxford University Press, 1931).}

***

Adorno’s main point of contention with Sibelius’s nature representations – and those in art generally – is the transcendental meanings that are ‘mistakenly’ ascribed to them: ‘feelings of mystery, profundity, awe, freedom, and hope, a sense of being at the origin of all things’.\footnote{Paddison, ‘Art and Ideology of Nature’, 174.} Adorno argues that the ‘all-embracing’ character of nature’s representation in Sibelius’s music and its false evocation of the sublime ultimately ‘evade critique’ and self-reflection.\footnote{Adorno, ‘Footnote on Sibelius and Hamsun’, 336.}

\[
\text{The dominant conviction is that nature’s mood is bound up with awe-struck silence. But if the concept of “nature’s mood” should not remain unquestioned even in the real world, then surely not in works of art. Symphonies are not a thousand lakes, even when riddled with a thousand holes.}\footnote{Adorno, ‘Glosse über Sibelius’, 334.}
\]

With this last sentence, Adorno ties all three of his arguments together. A ‘thousand holes’ alludes to Sibelius’s poor compositional technique manifested in static passages of music, which he interprets as banality masquerading as ‘nature’.

At the core of Paddison’s interpretation of ‘Gloss on Sibelius’, he traces Adorno’s and Löwenthal’s motivations back to Immanuel Kant’s \textit{Third Critique} (1790).\footnote{Immanuel Kant, \textit{Critique of Judgement}, trans. Werner S Pluhar (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1987), esp. 120-1.} Paddison observes that when Adorno discusses Sibelius’s nature representations, he is ‘really referring’ to the evocation of the sublime. He also notes that Adorno does not distinguish between nature and the sublime at this point, despite his later sensitivity to the difference in the 1960s writings that became \textit{Aesthetic Theory} (1970).\footnote{Paddison, ‘Art and Ideology of Nature’, 179.} In Löwenthal’s critique, he claims that Hamsun’s novels depict humankind as helpless in the face of nature’s sublimity. In Hamsun’s novel \textit{Pan}, for example, the raging ‘storm reminds one of their own insignificance’.\footnote{Ibid., 180.} Kant’s ‘dynamic sublime’ reverses this
relationship between humans and nature. It is humankind’s knowledge, rational thinking, consciousness – it’s ‘humanity’ – that allows us to see nature as subordinate in the face of humanity and thus humans can experience the sublime in nature, not just be crushed by their own insignificance (or, quite literally crushed). Rational thinking also leads to the self-conscious realization (enlightenment) that it is human experience, which has certain limits, that allows us to perceive nature in an overwhelming way in the first place. A dialectic between overwhelming and subordinate nature is created and the realization itself is ‘obscure’ because it suddenly comes from nowhere, like an act of creation. That we are able to retain a ‘sense of self’ and not disappear into the experience of the sublime, or die, is a crucial aspect of human experience for both Löwenthal and Adorno. According to the former, Hamsun’s writing retreats fully into a violent overwhelming nature and thereby rejects humanity.

Paddison argues that this aspect of Löwenthal’s critique could just as well be applied to nature in Sibelius, but Adorno ‘does not bring his argument to an equally convincing conclusion’.118 Adorno does establish that Sibelius’s music precludes the possibility of rational thinking because it is incoherent for the three reasons outlined above. Nevertheless, this kind of incoherence is different from the specific moment of obscurity that constitutes the Kantian sublime, although it can be easily mistaken for it, because as established, irrationality is masked and makes sense in a Capitalist society. To take Adorno’s argument further and join the aesthetic claims in ‘Gloss on Sibelius’ to its formal claims, the chant he imagines Sibelius’s followers singing can be taken as a cue: ‘The song [of Sibelius’s supporters] echoes the refrain: “It’s all nature; it’s all nature.”’119 According to Adorno, Sibelius uses apparently naturalized musical materials. His music is tonal and it is totally filled with those ‘deficient’ features that ‘stand in’ for nature (identified above), which appear as negative identities when juxtaposed with the Beethovenian ideals of forward-momentum and development. If Sibelius’s music is all nature and elemental forces – it is all and only these formal

118 Ibid.
features – it presents a very literally one-sided representation of nature that excludes the human agency associated with such compositional ideals. In their absence, ‘rational’ musical form is thereby sacrificed and as Adorno states, ‘such destruction masks itself in [Sibelius’s] symphonies as creation’: a false sense of the sublime.120 There is a retreat from modernity and rationality into nature and myth. This is a convincing and worrying interpretation but again, the problem with this Adornian reading is that it has naturalized de Törne’s analysis, as Adorno does in his ideological moment. The reading takes for granted that Sibelius’s music is unquestionably full of these formal features and therefore accepts the socio-historical discourses it attempts to dismantle.

Adorno’s third criticism necessarily raises ethical questions. If art may evade critique by evoking ‘nature’ in a way that creates a false sense of ‘the sublime’, it may conceal all manner of transgressions including lack of skill or even sinister intent. ‘Its effect is dangerous’, Adorno warns at the end of his gloss.121 By its very ‘nature’, the elusive category of the ‘natural’ leads to the exclusion of the ‘unnatural’. It is for this reason that ‘nature’ and the ‘natural’ has a murky history of being used to draw seemingly incontrovertibly true and ‘silencing’ conclusions about whom and what should be considered unnatural and unethical. Art that encourages a dogmatic acceptance of itself, as Sibelius’s music does according to Adorno, is especially susceptible to such political exploitation. To Adorno, the false kinds of nature representation in Sibelius’s music keep good nature-fearing citizens – or whatever atrocity might be masquerading for nature – in line. As the social structures of Europe were receding from ‘rationality’, the National Socialists unfortunately propagandized Sibelius’s music. As Lydia Goehr summarizes, ‘a dialectic between nature and art, according to which nature came, in the civilized name of reason, to be dominated by humanity [through industrialization and Capitalism] at the same time that it was reincorporated into an uncivilizing discourse of myth’ by populism and fascism.122
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Though he does not say that Sibelius’s forms are fascist directly, Adorno does imply that political appropriation is not just culturally and historically contingent but is actively encouraged by the dogma-inducing musical forms themselves. He accepts Löwenthal’s demonstration of the ‘motivic affinities with the symbolism of Nazi Germany’ in Hamsun’s writing and in his footnote to the essay, states that the symphonies of Sibelius ‘are of Hamsun’s ilk in their material construction as well as their effect’. Nevertheless, the footnote does not relate directly to Löwenthal’s accusations of literary fascism either. Adorno also decries Sibelius’s reception as a kind of false idolatry. This was likely in reaction to the widely acknowledged ‘Sibelius cult’ that had formed, as discussed below in Section 1.3. Adorno likens Sibelius’s fandom in Britain and the US to a kind of nature-worship. When Sibelius’s follower’s chant ‘It’s all nature’, they invoke Sibelius in the form of Pan – the Greek god of nature and folk music – and it is their summons that invoke Nazi ideology:

The great Pan, and as needed Blood and Soil [Blut und Boden] too, appears on the scene. The trivial is validated as the origin of things, the unarticulated as the sound of the unconscious creation.124

Adorno’s use of the phrase ‘Blood and Soil’ alludes to the (mis)appropriation of Sibelius’s music by the Third Reich. It was the slogan of Joseph Goebbels’ propaganda campaign to return Germanic culture to ‘its native soil’: an agrarian romanticism that valued bucolic over urban life and sought to instate hereditary rights for land ownership to restore what the Nazis considered to be the ‘natural order’ of a racially defined society.

Although Adorno’s reference to fascism places the blame on Sibelius’s audiences, it has been taken as a direct accusation by some, including Timothy L. Jackson in his infamous conference paper, ‘Sibelius the Political’. He aims to consider ‘all the evidence’ to answer a troubling and difficult biographical question.125 While this
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‘evidence’ is beside the point for the current issue, ‘Blood and Soil’ may perhaps refer to events involving Sibelius himself prior to the publication of Adorno’s critique. In 1934, Sibelius had accepted Goebbels’ invitation to become vice-president of the Permanent Council for the International Co-operation between Composers, which was founded in opposition to the International Society for New Music, although his specific role on this council is unclear. In 1935, he was also awarded the Goethe Medal for Science and Art on Hitler’s personal recommendation. The Times reported the award in surprisingly neutral language at the end of an account of Sibelius’s 70th birthday celebrations: a reminder that at this time, it was unknown what atrocities the National Socialists were capable of. Although Sibelius did not collect the award in person, he also did not refuse it. To do so would have had international significance for Finland, which was in a precarious position under the threat of ‘Russification’ from the Soviet Union, even after Finland had won national independence in 1917. By the summer of 1940, the country was also under threat of invasion by Nazi Germany and on the brink of a famine. As Claes Johansen argues, ‘some form of coöperation with Germany seemed unavoidable’. In their allegiance with the Third Reich, Finland chose ‘the devil they knew’ to protect their recently officialised language and culture from eradication by the USSR. Attempts to solidify a cultural bond between the nations continued through the war. In 1942, Goebbels’ wrote in his diaries: ‘The Finns ask us to do something more for Sibelius. I give my consent to the founding of a Sibelius Society.’

For many of the same reasons that Sibelius had become popular with music critics and musicians in Britain during and after WWI, he also became the ‘paragon of the “Nordic” composer’ to the German National Socialist Movement. In this context, Sibelius’s music was heard through the noise of contemporary theories of race and nationality.

---

128 Ibid., 168.
In the 1920s and 30s, the writing of the racial anthropologists like Madison Grant and Hans F. K. Günther (1891-1968), amongst others, helped popularize the fallacious racial and political theory known as ‘Nordicism’ in the US and Nazi Germany respectively, as well as in the UK and many other parts of Northern Europe. Their theory fallaciously declared that ‘Nordics’, associated with a ‘purity of nature’, were at the top of the hierarchy of European ‘sub-races’, who had each taken on specific characteristics according to their adaptation to the landscapes that they inhabited. It was believed that Nordic people had descended from the upper tiers of ancient civilizations, specifically the Aryans, whose geographic origin was thought to be situated in North-Western Europe. According to racial anthropologists, the ‘austere’ Nordic landscapes had caused a particularly ‘rigorous process’ of natural selection to produce superior mental and physical characteristics. Nazi ideologues believed that the Germanic people owed most of their genealogical heritage to the Nordic race, whether eugenicists agreed or not. By the same token, the Jews were perceived to be a landless people and a ‘counter-race’ (Gegenrasse), who not only parasitically inhabited the natural ecology of nations but also flourished in urban landscapes, which were seen to be ‘toxic to the best elements of German Volk’, as historian Christopher M. Hutton writes. Untethered from their own territory, the Jews were ‘understood as antithetical to nature’. Nordicism, on the other hand, fuelled an interest in Nordic heritage, mythology, and culture in Germany and elsewhere, which included the music of Sibelius, a Swedish-speaking Finn, and the writing of Hamsun, a Norwegian.

Sibelius’s ‘Nordic’ blood, his involvement with Finnish national independence from
Russia, the association of his music with a harsh Finnish landscape, and the seemingly prehistoric mythology in The Kalevala (the Finnish epic) all produced an image of a Pan-like composer that fitted in conveniently with National Socialist ideology. Composed in the midst of what was presumed to be the barely habitable, icy environs of Finland, his music was perceived to be ‘virile, manly, nature-orientated, and nationalistic’.  

Erik Levi has shown that during Hitler’s leadership, between 1933 and 1945 – a period in which the Nazi’s came into power, Adorno was forced to emigrate, and the Second World War began and ended – Sibelius was indeed the most frequently performed non-German composer by the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra. His music appeared in twenty-five performances and was sixth most performed after the German composers Reger (33 performances), Pfitzner (53), and Bruckner (65), although he was nowhere near as popular as Strauss (130) and Brahms (198). Levi’s research is compelling, yet it is alone in its engagement with contemporary sources, and as yet, there is little to research to suggest how exactly national socialist audiences engaged with Sibelius’s music beyond the knowledge that it was indeed performed.

The contemporary perception that Sibelius’s music was primitivistically tonal – it contained sparse harmonies and pedals – and was therefore ‘natural’, seemed to also fulfil the strongly anti-modernist sentiment of Nazi ideology, which fiercely rejected the ‘unnatural’, ‘degenerate’, atonal, and serial music associated by the Jewish Schoenberg. This reactionary tendency had been growing in the few years before the Nazi’s rise to power in 1933 and came to a peak when they began to vigorously campaign against modernism in the arts using new media technology, like radio, for the purposes of cultural propaganda. As Levi, and more recently Pamela M. Potter have shown, however, Nazi policy was applied to music ‘only intermittently’ due to the diverse and often contradictory cultural aims of the National Socialist hierarchy.

---

138 Erik Levi, Music in the Third Reich (Macmillan Press Ltd., 1994), 217. Though Beethoven was performed by the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra to German soldiers and workers around Europe in 1940 he is strangely absent from Levi’s performance statistics. Nevertheless, David B. Dennis has shown that he too occupied a central role in National Socialist musical propaganda as a ‘Nazi hero’, once doubts about the ‘purity’ of his racial heritage were quashed by ideologues. See David B. Dennis, Beethoven in German Politics, 1870-1989 (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1996), 167, and 142-74, especially 149.
Levi claims that music policy was ‘riddled with ambiguities, compromises and inconsistencies of outlook’. Nevertheless, contemporary music festivals ceased to be held and there was a mass exodus of both traditionalist and modernist composers, performers, and administrators. The National Socialist understanding of contemporary eugenic theories naturalized discrimination against anyone outside the ordained ‘sub-races’, thereby justifying the hateful Nazi policy of Racial Hygiene that aimed to speed up the ‘inevitable’ process of natural selection by eliminating those whom they considered defective and increasing the proportion of Nordic blood in the population (Aufnordung). Sibelius’s music therefore seemed to align with National Socialist conceptions of natural and unnatural that were rooted in deeply sinister and racist ideologies. To Adorno, Sibelius’s supporters from all over the Western world were complicit in the idolization of an unskilled composer whose music was used by the Nazi’s to prop up their cultural agenda and inhumane ideology, which had very recently caused Adorno’s exile from his home. This is not to say that Adorno’s writing was simply ‘philosophy caught in the headlights of Fascism’ or a pessimistic product of its time, as became ‘received wisdom’ in academia from 1969 to the late 1980s, as Paddison observes. ‘Gloss’ is a piercing reception critique of Sibelius’s music in the 1930s and one that is no less relevant now for demanding to be understood within its own context.

It is crucial to recognize that Adorno’s chief accusation is that Sibelius’s musical forms might encourage themselves to be exploited for political purposes, not that his music was directly fascistic, and most importantly, not that Sibelius was a fascist himself, which Adorno had little evidence of, other than Finland’s continuing co-belligerence with Germany against Russia. While Sibelius’s personal political leanings are of relevance to biographical enquiries, they are not relevant to an aesthetic argument that derives its conclusions from musical analysis, which Adorno nevertheless attempts (and fails) to produce. To those who cannot help wondering about the former, however, Sibelius and his family were undoubtedly to the political right. In 1930, Sibelius
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composed a song called *Karjalan Osa* (‘Karelia’s Fate’), JS 180, for the anti-communist Lapua Movement in Finland that was banned the following year after it became increasingly violent and ardently fascist.\(^{144}\) Nevertheless, he did not compose anything in celebration of the Third Reich and biographical comparison with Hamsun is unfair. Löwenthal’s identification of proto-fascism in the novelist’s writing was confirmed when Hamsun became openly enthusiastic about National Socialism after Nazi collaborator, Vidkun Quisling, came to power in Norway (1941).\(^{145}\) Sibelius, on the other hand, never publicly or privately (to the best of my knowledge) expressed support for Nazi policies and Finland did not have any concentration camps. As Mäkelä argues, ‘it is hard to reconstruct the exact context’ of his fragmentary diary entries from this period and he was ‘not at all interested in articulating his ambivalent views in public’.\(^{146}\)

It is worth emphasising again that Adorno’s contention was with the idolatry of the public figure of Sibelius in Germany, the UK, and US in the 1930s, not with Sibelius the man or really with Sibelius’s music.\(^{147}\) Worship of Sibelius as an idol does not necessarily make his music false, only the superficial process of idolization itself. It is Sibelius’s ‘followers’ that take the ultimate step in summoning fascist ideology, according to Adorno.

In conclusion, the ideological ‘moment’ of ‘Gloss on Sibelius’ makes Adorno’s critique no better at engaging with the composer’s music than anyone else consuming it as a commodity or worshiping it as natural, other than that it reveals these ideological structures ‘transparently’. It is a great irony that the strength of these ideologies prevented Adorno from seeing past them too. He therefore presents only an antithesis to the thesis of Sibelius’s advocates. It is unsurprising then, that at this early stage in Adorno’s philosophical output, he had not developed Hegel’s dialectics into his own ‘negative dialectics’: a kind of dialectic that points beyond itself to new thought.
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\(^{144}\) Andrew Barnett, *Sibelius* (Yale University Press, 2007), 333.

\(^{145}\) Paddison, ‘Art and the Ideology of Nature’, 181. Hamsun was so enamoured with the national-socialist movement that he even gave Goebbels his Nobel Prize as a sign of his admiration.


\(^{147}\) Sibelius scholarship has had much greater access to the biographic details of Sibelius’s life since access was granted to his diaries and letters in the 1960s, although these remain largely unpublished. It is all too easy to counter Adorno’s accusations of fascism with quotations from the composer’s diaries or letters to prove his innocence, but this misses the point of the Adorno’s claims: that it was the reception of Sibelius’s music, not the composer himself, at fault.
by identifying its own limits, much like Kant’s sublime.\textsuperscript{148} Adorno makes claims about the ethical implications of Sibelius’s musical materials without analysing them and as a result, he allows Sibelius’s music to remain mystified at every moment. What is more, applying his critical theories to generalized analytical remarks made by Sibelius’s advocates—which he does not disclose—actually accepts those very ideologies that drove Sibelius’s cultish following. Uncovering the concealed flaw in his argument is critical in reassessing analytical approaches to Sibelius because many subsequent scholars respond indirectly, if not explicitly, to Adorno’s criticisms. It is only through new analyses that something else might appear through the all-encompassing nature representations that Adorno and many others before and after him, claim to fill Sibelius’s forms.

1.2 Adorno the Scapegoat

In December 1941, Adorno sent what he described as a ‘rough draft of an English version of my little article on Sibelius’ to American music critic and composer, Virgil Thomson (1896-1989), with the hope that he might publish some or all of it in his New York Tribune Herald column.\textsuperscript{149} After receiving ‘reams of protest’ letters in response to his own negative remarks about Sibelius in his first review for the paper, Thomson sent Adorno’s draft back in July the following year and prophetically warned that

I don’t really like it very much. The article has good ideas and good phrases in it, but there is too much indignation. The tone is an aggravated one more likely to create antagonism towards yourself than toward Sibelius.\textsuperscript{150}

Thomson’s apprehension was not misguided, and Adorno’s review sent long-lasting ripples through Anglo-American Sibelius scholarship when the German version was

\textsuperscript{148} See Theodor W. Adorno, Negative Dialektik (Frankfurt/Man: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1966).

\textsuperscript{149} Letter from Thomson to Adorno, December 19, 1941 quoted in James Schmidt, ‘Unbottled Manuscripts: On the Curious Relationship of Theodor Adorno and Virgil Thomson’, Persistent Enlightenment, April 22, 2015, https://persistentenlightenment.com/2015/04/22/. James Schmidt has recently shown that Thomson published several of Adorno’s early writings in his columns. The letters are held in MMS 29, Series 3, Box 19, Folder 22, Virgil Thomson Papers, Music Library, Yale University. The unpublished English draft, which has not yet been linked to the letters, is likely to be ‘The Sibelius Habit’, Ts22682-22687, Theodor W. Adorno Archiv, Akademie der Künste, Berlin. I am very grateful to Sebastian Wedler for making me aware of the versions of Adorno’s Sibelius critique at the Adorno Archiv and for sharing his transcriptions.

\textsuperscript{150} Letter from Thomson to Adorno, July 29, 1941 in Virgil Thomson, Selected Letters of Virgil Thomson, Tim Page and Vanessa Weeks (eds.) (New York: Summit books, 1988), 181-82, see also 150-52 for reader’s letters of protest.
finally discovered in the 1960s. As noted above, it is unsurprising that the critique provoked such a reaction. What is surprising however, is that this backlash largely mirrors the most unscholarly aspects of Adorno’s language and does not engage with the other worryingly convincing criticisms he puts forward. Various musicologists scold Adorno for his claims that Sibelius was not a good composer evidently to justify their own writing on his music or ‘rescu[e] Sibelius from silence’ as Alex Ross aims. Despite provoking such strong feelings, Adorno’s critique has been examined in varying degrees of detail by only Erik Tawaststjerna and Antti Vihinen in Finnish, by Ruth Marie Gleissner and Mäkelä briefly in German, and Jackson and Paddison in English. Paddison and to a certain extent Mäkelä, are the only scholars who do not take a defensive stance against the critique.

Chastising Adorno became a rite of passage into the scholarship on Sibelius and has almost reached the status of a meme. Between 1993 and 2011, ‘Glosse über Sibelius’ was referred to as ‘Adorno’s bitterest attack’, a ‘virulent defamation’, a ‘special denunciation’, and an ‘ill-tempered tirade’, as well as ‘deleterious’, ‘vitriolic’, ‘blistering’, and ‘an expression of ‘enormous rage’. Adorno was ‘truly vexed’. This trend is most pronounced in Ross’s journalistic language: Thomson

153 Hepokoski, Sibelius, Symphonic No. 5, 93, ‘Preface’, n. 4.
156 Peter Franklin, Reclaiming Late-Romantic Music: Singing Devils and Distant Sounds (University of California, 2014), 79.
160 Murtomäki, Symphonic Unity, 282.
‘tore lustily into the Sibelius myth’ while Adorno’s ‘Glosse’ was ‘rabid’, ‘dire’, and a ‘venomous attack’. Sibelius’s critics also take on a bizarrely vampiric characterisation, which becomes particularly sinister with regard to Adorno. Ross is at risk here of unintentionally renewing the anti-Semitic accusation of the blood libel and the trope of the ‘blood thirsty’ Jew. It is deeply ironic given Adorno’s personal position in society at his time of writing: an émigré forced to flee from Nazi Germany and living in Oxford. It appears that some of the unpleasant language used to describe the New Music and its advocates in the early twentieth century has been unconsciously internalized into modern scholarship. Given the re-emergence of populism, it is pertinent to examine such language in musicological writing.

Such an approach to ‘Glosse’ is apparent in Byron Adams’s survey of Sibelius’s reception in Britain between 1905 and 1957, which is bookended with vilifications of Adorno. The beginning of his essay refers to the early 1940s correspondence between Adorno and Ernest Newman, a champion of Sibelius and the chief music critic for The Sunday Times. Adorno recounts their conversation years later in his Introduction to the Sociology of Music:

I once asked Ernest Newman, the initiator of Sibelius’s fame [sic.], about the qualities of the Finnish composer. After all, I said, he had adopted none of the advances in compositional techniques that had been made throughout Europe; his symphonies combined meaningless and trivial elements with illogical and profoundly unintelligible ones; he mistook aesthetic formlessness for the voice of nature. Newman, for whose urbane all-round scepticism someone bred in the German traditional had much to learn, replied with a smile that the qualities I had just criticized – and which he was not denying – were just what appealed to the British.

Adams claims that Adorno misunderstood Newman’s intentions: ‘Certainly Adorno seems to have understood nothing about the British art of pulling an interlocutor’s leg’. Adams goes on to imagine Newman ridiculing Adorno’s apparent stupidity

161 Ross, The Rest is Noise, 189.
162 The blood libel is an historical accusation that Jews murdered Christian children to use their blood in religious rituals to justify witch hunt-like trials and torture.
163 Theodor W. Adorno, Introduction to the Sociology of Music, trans. E. B. Ashton (New York: Seabury, 1976), 172-73. Rosa Newmarch was the original initiator of Sibelius’s fame in the UK.
164 Adams, Byron, “‘Thor’s Hammer’: Sibelius and British Music Critics, 1905-1957”, in Grimley (ed.) Jean Sibelius and his World, 125-172 at 125.
with delight:

Newman himself never appears to have alluded to this colloquy, but it is easy to
conjure up a picture of the relish with which he must have told the story of this
Teutonic bore to his fellow critics at the Wigmore Hall Bar. How Newman must have
enjoyed imitating Adorno’s obtuseness while the philosopher’s dismissal of Sibelius – a
composer whose music Newman had long championed – was being rebuked in such a
sly fashion. That Adorno, blinkered by his own perceived superiority, failed to see that
the joke was on him must have provided Newman with a final, delicious twist of the
knife. 165

Adams’s essay focuses on racial profiling in early English critics’ writing on Sibelius. In
light of this focus, his reference to Adorno as a ‘Teutonic bore’ and his stereotyping of
British humour is contradictory and strange. He ends the essay, which does not return
to Adorno’s critique before its last paragraph, by simply stating ‘Adorno got it
wrong’. 166

It must again be emphasised that the body of Adams’s essay is insightful and will be
drawn upon to support my own arguments regarding Sibelius’s early reception (2.2).
Nevertheless, his treatment of Adorno at the essay’s beginning and end needs to be
critically dismantled. Despite directly quoting Adorno’s own summary of his Sibelius
critique, recurring reprimands like Ross’s and Adams’s rarely offer any critical
engagement with the third and fourth of Adorno’s arguments: Sibelius’s treatment of
tonality, the potentially problematic depictions of nature in his music, his political
alliances and by implication, the possibility that his music is charged by far-right
ideologies. Scholars only reverse the first, which as Paddison notes, is the easiest of
his claims to dismantle because it is unsupported by musical ‘evidence’. No counter-
evidence is provided by Ross or Adams and Adorno’s claim that Sibelius was a bad
composer is only undermined superficially by simply reflecting the most unscholarly
aspects of the critic’s approach back at him. It seems enough to call Adorno names
rather than confront why he dismissed Sibelius’s music in his second, third, and fourth
arguments.

165 Ibid., 125-26.
166 Ibid., 152.
Other antithetical responses to Adorno’s criticisms involve stressing Sibelius’s mass appeal. This is evident in Ross’s anti-intellectual and populist defence of Sibelius, whereby Adorno is juxtaposed against ‘the people’ as an insidious elite. He argues that ‘mainstream audiences may lag behind the intellectual classes in appreciating the more adventurous composers, but sometimes they are quicker to perceive the value of music that the politicians of style fail to comprehend’.167 Peter Franklin too argues against Adorno’s claim that Sibelius’s popularity indicates a lack of ‘genuine contemporary relevance’ by asserting that the popularity of his symphonies ‘contrarily stresses their relevance’.168 These responses merely accept Adorno’s oppositional categories – the modernist musical artwork and the mass-produced musical commodity – and simply reverse the value judgments attached, to replicate the same populist arguments found in 1930s and 40s Sibelius scholarship that Adorno critiqued in his ‘Gloss’.

Tawaststjerna’s extended discussion of Adorno’s ‘Gloss’ (1979) is a more moderate exception. Written eight years after his multi-volume biography of Sibelius in which he refers to Adorno’s critique as ‘rabid’, Tawaststjerna recounts that ‘I tried to settle into Adorno’s thoughts a little, and now I see things differently’.169 He goes on to write that ‘one does Sibelius wrong and, I think, also Adorno, if one takes Gloss at its word and quotes outside its context.’170 Tawaststjerna’s comment is strikingly apt for the general reaction to Adorno in Sibelius studies over a decade after writing. Nevertheless, he too attempts and fails to refute the first of Adorno’s claims by providing a theoretical but not analytical account of Sibelius’s organicist compositional method, and with appeals to authority. He endeavours to combat Adorno’s negative remarks with positive ones from ‘trusted’ sources like Sibelius’s German teachers, as well as from Strauss, and

167 Ross, The Rest is Noise, 175.
170 Ibid., 122.
even Schoenberg.

Instead of exploring Adorno’s claims, there is a mutual denial of any of the disturbing things that ‘Gloss’ might reveal about Sibelius’s music or those who like it in the large majority of Sibelius scholarship. The focus is shifted instead to Adorno, who is misrepresented by Ross, Adams, and several others as a bitter opponent, intellectual villain, and ringleader whose only aim is to belittle Sibelius and ruin his reputation. Oramo even suggests that Adorno’s critique might be responsible for Sibelius’s compositional silence after 1928 and the fate of the incomplete and lost Eighth Symphony, despite it being very unlikely that Sibelius even knew the critique existed.\footnote{Oramo, ‘Sibelius’s Eighth Symphony – Fact and Fiction’ in Daniel Grimley, Tim Howell, Veijo Murtomäki and Timo Virtanen (eds.), Jean Sibelius’s Legacy: Research on his 150\textsuperscript{th} Anniversary (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017), 51-63 at 62.} The frame of Adams’s chapter serves to communicate that firstly, Adorno was an aloof elitist and smug ‘self-appointed arbiter of modernism’; secondly, that the ‘Schoenberg camp’ was resentful of Sibelius’s public success; and thirdly, that ‘Gloss on Sibelius’ was to blame for the scholarly neglect of the composer.\footnote{Adams, “‘Thor’s Hammer’”, 126.} If Adorno is not suspected of being ‘motivated by a personal agenda’ to promote the Second Viennese School, Adorno’s critique is dismissed as a bad case of sour grapes.\footnote{Goss, ‘Interlude V’, 276.} Following Layton, Veijo Murtomäki and Phillip Bullock claim that the cause of Adorno’s condemnation was that he was ‘particularly affronted’ by the comparable lack of interest in Mahler’s music while Adorno was living in Oxford in the mid-1930s, even though ‘Gloss’ does not mention him.\footnote{Layton, Sibelius, 196-97; Murtomäki, Symphonic Unity, 282; Bullock, The Correspondence of Jean Sibelius and Rosa Newmarch, 33.} Mäkelä too argues that the critique ‘needs to be understood in the context of his promotion of the Schoenbergian model of atonal modernism and Gustav Mahler’s music’.\footnote{Mäkelä, ‘Sibelius and Germany’, 175.} By second-guessing his motivations, noting only the most surface claim in ‘Gloss’, and ignoring the rest, Adorno is knotted into a strawman. His effigy is propped up by a collection of other negative remarks about Sibelius and these are not sufficiently engaged with. Adorno is therefore as unjustly blamed as he unfairly dismisses Sibelius’s music. No support for either claims are
Frequently mentioned alongside Adorno’s critique is a 1955 pamphlet written by French composer, conductor, and music theorist, René Leibowitz, who was a student of Schoenberg and Berg, and later Boulez’s teacher. Entitled ‘Sibelius, the worst composer in the world’, Leibowitz supposedly wrote his critique in jest for the composer’s ninetieth birthday.\(^{176}\) In an interview with Ernst Tanzberger in 1962, Leibowitz claimed that the title was a reaction to ‘a survey going around in France about who was the best composer. Sibelius was mentioned. In response to the exaggerated glorification, I said he was the worst – as a joke.’\(^{177}\) The title seems to also be a play on Toscanini’s claim, echoing several earlier English scholars, that ‘Sibelius was the greatest Symphonist since Beethoven’, which Leibowitz cites.\(^{178}\) In Sibelius scholarship, Leibowitz’s critique, like Adorno’s, is taken as evidence that Sibelius’ reputation needs salvaging after the damage that this ‘propagandist of the Second Viennese School’ caused by his ‘vindictive words’.\(^{179}\) As Mäkelä observes, ‘in the nationalist Finnish scholarship on Sibelius [Leibowitz] is cited one-dimensionally as a representative of the colonialist “Other” almost as often as Adorno’.\(^{180}\) What is more, the pamphlet’s title is assumed to be self-explanatory to the extent that the rest of what Leibowitz writes seemingly does not warrant examination. Other than a short discussion by Oramo in French, the content of the pamphlet has never been engaged with at all.\(^{181}\)

Upon further investigation, there is much to take issue with in Leibowitz’s critique. Oramo’s side-by-side comparison of Adorno’s and Leibowitz’s texts show that the latter is plagiaristic to the extent that it might even be mistaken for an abridged
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\(^{176}\) René Leibowitz, *Sibelius, le plus mauvais compositeur du monde* (Liège, Belgium: Éditions Dynamo, 8 December 1955).
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Leibowitz regurgitates all the same examples and analogies almost sentence by sentence without any reference to Adorno at all. His criticism focuses almost solely on Sibelius’s supposedly deficient compositional technique – Adorno’s first argument – and only very briefly touches on the falseness of ‘making new music with old means’ – the second of Adorno’s arguments. Leibowitz does not provide further justification for the overarching sentiment of derision in his critique with musical examples or reference any of Adorno’s more convincing arguments concerning nature representation. In an interview with Sibelius biographer, Ernst Tanzberger (1961) Leibowitz admitted that although he had conducted Sibelius’s Violin Concerto and Fifth Symphony and had heard the First and Fourth, he knew no other music by the composer. It is ironic that Leibowitz’s critique engages as superficially with Adorno’s ‘Glosse’ – it only repeats rather than develops – as those scholars that use both critiques as intellectual springboards to discuss Sibelius and it is this surface engagement in both that is indefensible in the context of scholarship.

Along with Adorno’s and Leibowitz’s infamous criticisms, Sibelius is defended from various other remarks that are called upon by musicologists in a sensationalist manner, despite their tenuous relation to Adorno’s argument. These include what Andrew Barnett claims to be Wilhelm Peterson-Berger’s ‘cantankerous ravings’ and Walter Niemann’s 1917 monograph on Sibelius, which Barnett and many others believe is a ‘misrepresentation of Sibelius’s intentions’, supported by Sibelius’s own dislike of the book. Hepokoski for instance, describes Niemann’s position as ‘a priestlike gesture within the cultic institution intended to keep pure the sacred space of Germanic symphonism’. Mäkelä has subsequently shown that Niemann’s writing itself has ‘been misunderstood [for generations] as constituting an exceptionally malevolent

182 Toscanini’s claim is an exception to this plagiaristic tendency and it appears only in Leibowitz’s critique. During their long correspondence between 1946 and 1965, it is entirely possible that Adorno sent a version of his ‘Gloss on Sibelius’ to Leibowitz for the same reason that he sent Thomson an English version in 1943: to publish it outside the context of German scholarship. Leibowitz’s version appeared a year before Adorno republished ‘Gloss’ in German (Adorno, ‘Glosse über Sibelius’, Dissonanzen (1956)). Their letters are held in the archives at the International Music Institute Darmstadt and are an area for further research.
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criticism of Sibelius’. In his defence of Sibelius, Ross also includes Virgil Thomson’s contention that Sibelius’s Second Symphony is ‘vulgar, self-indulgent, and provincial beyond all description’ and Benjamin Britten’s comment about the composer upon seeing the score of the Sixth Symphony: ‘he must have been drunk when he wrote it’. He claims that such slander forms a body of ‘anti-Sibelius bile’ that is apparently instigated by Adorno and has supposedly corroded the composer’s reputation in academia. The significance of Ross’s journalistic remarks should not be underestimated as his list of ‘collective scorn’ is quoted on the first page of Jackson’s ‘Preface’ to *Sibelius Studies*. None of these condemning remarks, their contexts, or relation to one another are examined.

Adorno’s assertion that Sibelius’s followers summon ‘Blood and Soil’ ideology, seems to be reflected back at Adorno in a bizarre manifestation of what J. P. E. Harper-Scott has elsewhere termed the ‘European → German → Nazi short-circuit’. The aforementioned use of the words ‘vitriolic’ and ‘rabid’ as descriptors of Adorno’s ‘Gloss’, for example, are adjectives commonly attached to Hitler’s speeches and to Nazi behaviour. He is also described as a ‘propagandist’ of the ‘Schoenberg party line’ and accused of musical colonialism. Analysing Sibelius’s idolization in Finland from a post-colonial perspective in 1999, Eero Tarasti claims that Adorno writes in the manner of the dominant cultural power of Germany and that ‘in his short-sighted conjectures about aesthetics Adorno proves himself to be an adherent of colonialist discourse though his persuasive rhetorical style often conceals this fact’. Tarasti also claims that ‘Adorno echoed politically backward ideas in Germany of the 1930s’. In 2000, Antti Vihinen took this one step further to accuse Adorno of ‘chauvinistic thinking’
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and denounced him as ‘far more nationalistic in his writings and criticisms of Sibelius than Sibelius ever was in his music’. These views were echoed by Andrew Barnett in 2007 when he claimed that ‘Adorno’s attacks were motivated as much by political posturing and a desire to uphold the German musical hegemony as by musical arguments’. As recently as 2017, Oramo too accused Adorno of indoctrinating his readership against Sibelius in a way that is no better than the Nazi’s inculcation of the German people in the first half of the twentieth-century. He argues that after World War I, the rise of Nazism and fascism in Germany ‘brought about the unprecedented politicisation of music’ and this development was manifest Adorno’s ‘Gloss on Sibelius’:

Expressions such as ‘Blood and Soil’ and ‘cultural Bolshevism,’ which belong to the language Viktor Klemperer called the LTI, or the lingua tertii imperii, reveal that Adorno applies to Sibelius the same strategy of discreditation that the Nazi’s used against what they called entartete Musik, namely the, ‘political denunciation of aesthetically undesirable works’.

Adorno is thus imagined to be a policing and propagandizing force within musicological scholarship, and although his personal contexts do not automatically exempt him from ‘musical colonialism’, this collection of remarks is astonishing in its lack of historical accuracy and sensitivity. It was Adorno’s music and music theories that were oppressed by contemporary ‘German musical hegemony’, which considered them degenerate (Entartete), and it was that same hegemony that made Sibelius’s music popular in the country. Yet the positions of the oppressor and the marginalized are reversed in much of Sibelius scholarship. By indirectly calling reductio ad Hitlerum and miscasting Adorno’s accusation as hyperbole, these scholars censor and silence him, despite the direct relevance of National Socialist ideology to Nazi Germany can convincingly be considered an oppressive military force in light of the destruction that German troops left in North Finland during the Lapland War. Despite Finland’s co-belligerence with Nazi Germany against the Soviet Union for the majority of the Second World War, conflict broke out between September 1944 and April 1945 during the Lapland War when Finland signed a separate peace treaty with the USSR. During their enforced retreat back into Norway, the German troops systematically destroyed mining roads, bridges, and properties in a ‘scorched earth’ strategy in Lapland. Nevertheless, none of the Sibelius scholars mentioned refer to that devastating period of the country’s history. See Philip Jowett and Brent Snodgrass, Finland at War, 1939-45 (Bloomsbury Publishing, 2012), 17.
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Adorno’s own context and the reception of Sibelius’s music.

While critiquing the inward turning of Finnish neo-patriotism in the 1990s, Tarasti considers the ‘anti-subject’, a concept that might be used productively to understand Adorno’s position in musicological scholarship too. Tarasti explains that an anti-subject emerges in the consciousness of young and patriotic nation-states upon winning independence from the dominant colonial power of their oppressors. Without a national enemy to unite the nation, ‘an anti-subject is concocted because patriotism must always have one’ to discharge discomfort towards, even in the absence of a real physical threat of suppression. Though Tarasti does not further develop the concept within the context of Finnish nationalist discourse or identify what or whom the ‘concocted anti-subject’ might be on a national scale, it is arguable that Adorno fulfils this role in Sibelius scholarship as a scapegoat, in addition to a strawman. It is something of a technical exercise and rite of passage to exorcise Adorno from the body of scholarship before proceeding to write about Sibelius, as if he really is the only ‘arbiter of taste’. By uncovering potentially disturbing problems that arise from Sibelius’s music and by implication, the moral corruption of those who value it, ‘Gloss’ provokes a defensive reaction that excludes Adorno from discourse. To avoid what could be a chaotic breakdown in scholarship, he is sacrificed to the nature-god, Sibelius, and in a balancing of the scholarly humors, all other ‘anti-Sibelius bile’ is purged too.

Once Adorno is expelled, any ethical doubts that ‘Gloss’ raises about Sibelius’s reception are allegedly eliminated. We no longer have to worry if liking Sibelius’s music means we have ‘no taste’ or be troubled that it was used by the Nazis to strengthen their fascist agenda and these worries are reflected back towards Adorno, in whom they are wholly invested. With Adorno as a scapegoat, scholars need not dwell on such disturbing notions and we can continue to listen to and write about Sibelius guilt-free. Every time this written ritual is performed, it provides a moment of social catharsis that reinvigorates Sibelius scholarship and prevents it from self-destruction. Sibelius is redeemed; the reputations of those scholars who wish to write about him
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are recovered, and they are bestowed with a sense of moral righteousness. Given that Adorno’s ‘Gloss’ has frequently been understood as vampiric, it is ironic that the critique is used parasitically to revitalise Sibelius scholarship in this way. Krims observes a similar phenomenon elsewhere in musicology:

Adorno’s presence in popular music studies [standing in for Marxism] seems most often to resemble that of a pinball bumper, against which we all at some point fling ourselves in order to bounce somewhere else with renewed energy and theoretical momentum’.201

Yet as Krims warns, there is a ‘horrifying threat that gravity will bring us [...] down in the same direction’ back to Adorno, as has evidently been the case in Sibelius studies. By only rejecting the claim that Sibelius is a technically deficient composer and blaming Adorno for various issues that he is highly unlikely to be responsible for and are exaggerated – Sibelius’s academic neglect and negative reception – his other claims are left to lurk unexamined and unchallenged. If Adorno is the primal trauma of Sibelius scholarship, ignoring most of ‘Gloss’s content is merely a kind of repression that results in an obsessive return to it and Adorno’s recurring sacrifice: a profoundly irrational act for the supposedly rational realm of academia.

Slavoj Žižek’s critique of James Cameron’s film Titanic (1999) provides another productive frame for understanding how and why Adorno is scapegoated in Sibelius scholarship. Žižek sees the film’s working-class protagonist, Jack, as a ‘vanishing mediator’. Jack restores the self-image of the upper-class Rose by quite literally painting her portrait, among other things but after he has served this purpose, he vanishes into the depths of the Atlantic. Žižek further clarifies what he decrees to be reactive Hollywood Marxism in this narrative:

beneath this sympathy for the poor [indicated by the caricatured evil upper-classes], there is another narrative, the profoundly reactionary myth, first fully deployed by Kipling’s Captains Courageous, of a young rich kid in crisis whose vitality is restored by a brief intimate contact with the full-blooded life of the poor. What lurks behind the compassion for the poor is their vampiric exploitation.202
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If the class structure in this relationship is removed but the foundational power structure retained, we might understand the scapegoating of Adorno in Sibelius scholarship as an attempt to restore the discipline at the moment of musicology’s identity-crisis in its confrontation with post-modernism in the late 1980s and 1990s. In a strange historical twist, Adorno’s critique had the opposite effect to what has been claimed: its greatest impact was on this very literature. Sibelius’s exoticism and neglect – which were tropes in his early reception too – were taken up again to justify writing about a European art-music composer in this new context. Adorno is an expedient figure to use to restore the scholarship’s vitality before he is discarded. This ‘vampiric exploitation’ is reflected back at Adorno in his monstrous depiction as a demon or vampire that in turn supports his ritualistic expulsion in the first place.

In spite of such a hysterical approach, Adorno is not the ‘primal trauma’ of Sibelius scholarship, but he does point directly at it. Jackson notes the tendency for the years between 1933 and 1945 to be skipped in biographies and Grove Dictionary entries on twentieth-century composers. Likewise, Levi notes that ‘the conspiracy of silence and misinformation about the Nazi era has extended to some of the most highly respected academic publications’. Sibelius scholarship is no exception and these years constitute a relatively unexplored hole in reception histories. Jackson rightly proclaims: ‘If several generations of post-war historians and musicologists have behaved as sanitizers – collectors of the detritus of history – so that nothing should mar our pristine image of our musical heroes, our current task is to present the truth and let the reader draw his or her own conclusions’. By presenting as much information as possible, Jackson addresses what he perceives to be biographical sanitization and the ‘temptation to touch up and paint over the offending parts’ of Sibelius’s life and works. The essential question of Jackson’s essay in reaction to Adorno’s critique (‘Was Sibelius a Nazi sympathizer?’) is beside the point because Adorno’s accusation of fascism is to Sibelius’s followers, as established above, yet he

---
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does identify a crucial blind spot in Sibelius scholarship that, as this chapter has so far shown, has evidently caused discomfort and blame to be vigorously diffused towards Adorno.

***

Before moving on to consider the thesis to Adorno’s antithesis, it is worth considering how plausible it is that Adorno and those he supposedly indoctrinated against Sibelius’s music – Thomson and Leibowitz – exerted such a far-reaching influence, that Sibelius’s music was almost entirely neglected for periods of the twentieth century in Germany, France, the US, and UK. Howard Pollack claims that once settled in America, Adorno and Thomson ‘proved particularly influential in galvanizing knowing opinion against the Finn’. After the Second World War in 1949, Adorno and Max Horkheimer returned to Frankfurt. According to Laura Gray, he was an ‘important influence on subsequent German critical reaction to Sibelius’. Barnett claims that in post-war France and ‘perhaps especially’ Germany, the ‘genuine hostility’ towards Sibelius’s music ‘cannot be ignored’ and Murtonmäki goes as far as attributing Adorno’s negative influence in German-speaking countries to the ‘third phase’ of Sibelius’s reception: the post-war years. Vihinen claims that ‘gradually Adorno’s opinions and writings gained support, especially among university intellectuals and even among the radical student’s movement’. He states that in post-war Germany, Adorno’s association of Sibelius’s name with Blood-and-Soil ideology immediately threw his status into question. Tawaststjerna quotes two negative German reviews in 1977 as evidence of Adorno’s damaging influence outside academia, one of which quotes ‘Gloss’ directly. Overlooking Herbert von Karajan’s Sibelius performances and recordings with the Berlin Philharmonic from decades before, Tom Service claims that the ‘demolition’ of Sibelius’s reputation was so long lasting in Germanic concert halls

---

that it required ‘rehabilitation’ by Sir Simon Rattle in 2010.\textsuperscript{211} Howard Pollack claims that Sibelius’s political ‘associations [also] became increasingly problematic in Britain and the United States’.\textsuperscript{212} Giving a brief review of attitudes in Anglo-American Sibelius studies Tim Howell also claims that ‘critical orthodoxy became suspicious of an artist who enjoyed such immense public acclaim during his lifetime so that Sibelius’s death (1957) prompted something of a negative reaction’. The attitude was apparently prevalent in the 1970s.\textsuperscript{213} Despite such certainty that Sibelius’s reputation was damaged, none of these claims, except Tawaststjerna’s, are backed up by any evidence to show that less Sibelius scholarship was written in this period or if what was published was indeed more negative.

Even if Adorno’s text was not known about, it is still possible that audiences and scholars turned away from Sibelius’s music during and after the war in reaction to its appropriation by the Third Reich. Mäkelä, however, notes that Adorno’s critique ‘does not reflect the German reception of Sibelius as a whole’ and draws attention to Ernst Tanzberger’s 1962 monograph on the composer as a more typical and worrying example of Sibelius’s continued positive critical reception in Germany.\textsuperscript{214} Despite the fact that it was published after ‘Gloss’ had appeared twice, Tanzberger’s thesis does not mention Adorno once. What is more, the book is ‘still wedded to ideas’ of national identity and landscape inspired and approved by National Socialists such as Heinz Drewes and Alfred Rosenberg from his 1943 doctoral thesis on Sibelius, although these political affiliations are removed in the later text.\textsuperscript{215} Julian Anderson has also found ‘surprisingly little concrete evidence’ of an ‘influx of continental European serialism’ into Britain that was supposedly responsible for throwing Sibelius’s music into doubt.\textsuperscript{216} In fact, reviewing Sibelius research in the twentieth-century, Fabian Dahlström claims that between the end of WWII and 1965, biographic literature on
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the composer increased ‘significantly’ in multiple languages resulting in more than 1,400 entries in Blum’s 1965 Sibelius bibliography and according to Goss, towards the end of the century, the number was multiplied many times over.217 Richard Taruskin’s Oxford History of Western Music is an exception. Unlike his treatment of Sibelius’s German and French ‘maximalist’ contemporaries, Taruskin folds Sibelius’s entire career, including the first three decades of the twentieth-century, back into the nineteenth-century where he inhabits a chapter with other ‘national monuments’ from Northern Europe like Elgar, Vaughan Williams, Grieg, and Nielsen. Nevertheless, Sibelius is not entirely neglected, and does receive a few paragraphs dedicated to his ‘tight-lipped’ and ‘downright anticlimatic’ symphonies.218 Other than Taruskin’s anachronistic treatment, which seems less to do with Adorno’s influence and more to a cold-war distortion of music history – as Harper-Scott puts it – it may be concluded that claims of neglect are unfounded, within musicological writing at least.219 Adorno’s influence was limited to his own intellectual circles and his views were certainly not hegemonic. The trope of Sibelius’s ‘neglect’ caused by German misunderstanding is in fact a trope found in the early twentieth-century scholarship that was uncritically absorbed into late twentieth-century scholarship, as will be traced in the following section (1.3).

When Sibelius’s diaries and letters were made partially available in Tawaststjerna’s 1960s and 70s biographies, however, it was apparent that Sibelius actually had quite an interest in Schoenberg’s music. In Berlin during January and February 1914, Sibelius heard Schoenberg’s music. While one of his songs ‘made a deep impression’, the Second Quartet, Op. 10, gave him ‘a lot to think about’. He concluded a letter to his wife: ‘He interests me very much’ and the following year in an interview with the New York Musical Courier, Sibelius publicly stated that ‘there is one composer whom I greatly

admire and that is Arnold Schoenberg’.\textsuperscript{220} Schoenberg could no longer an opponent to Sibelius advocacy, if the composer himself had expressed such praise. In fact, Schoenberg’s reciprocal interest is even used to show just how wrong Adorno was about Sibelius. Jackson, for instance, claims that ‘Schoenberg himself was careful to dispute Adorno’s overly simplistic equation of post-tonal modernism with innovation and quality’ when he declared that Sibelius and Shostakovich ‘have the breath of the symphonists’.\textsuperscript{221} The simplicity of the statement masks its ambiguity, however. It could just as well mean ‘Sibelius uses the old means’ – as Adorno would have it – as ‘Sibelius is a great composer’, as Jackson seems to take it. When Adorno was revealed by Tawaststjerna to be a false opponent, defence was subsequently shifted to Adorno.

Before Robert Layton described ‘Gloss’ as ‘venom’ in 1965, it was not mentioned in Sibelius scholarship at all. It has been widely noted that unreliable translations from the 1960s and 1970s have impeded the initial reception of Adorno’s writings in Anglo-American academia and Paddison observes that easy access to late 1970s and 1980s translations of French structuralist and post-structuralist theory meant that engagement with Adorno’s theories and German critical theory were ‘eclipsed’.\textsuperscript{222} In keeping with this trend, it was Leibowitz’s 1957 criticism of Sibelius in French that attracted the attention of Sibelius scholars first, when it was mentioned in Harold E. Johnson’s \textit{Sibelius} (1959).\textsuperscript{223} For most of the twentieth century, Adorno’s critique and other publications were ‘not widely read outside specialist circles’.\textsuperscript{224} With a new surge of academic interest in both Sibelius and Adorno in the 1990s, the number of publications on the former grew greatly in number, and the quality and quantity of English translations of Adorno’s texts also increased. Though ‘Gloss’ was only wholly translated into English in 2011, it was singled out at the end of the twentieth century and retrospectively blamed for a kind of negligence that has been claimed throughout Sibelius scholarship.
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1.3 The Salad Days of Sibelius Studies: ‘The Apologists’

The trope of Sibelius’s neglect that characterises 1990s responses to Adorno’s ‘Gloss’ was present not only in the literature pre-dating this text, but also in the very literature that the gloss responded to. As Section I.I argues, this body of early scholarship contains not only the grandiose claims that attracted Adorno’s suspicion – a veneration of musical features that Adorno considered vacuous, assertions of the naturalness of diatonicism and broader appeals to nature – but also descriptions of Sibelius’s musical features that he uncritically absorbed as analytical facts. To explore Adorno’s ‘blind spot’ further and readdress it, as well as the discourses that have been absorbed into later Sibelius scholarship, it is thus necessary to explore these early texts and their ideologically charged analytical writing about Sibelius.

Bengt de Törne’s (1891-1967) Close Up of his orchestration teacher – as he proudly advertises on the dust jacket – was translated from Swedish into English amid a flurry of other English-language publications about Sibelius in the 1930s. After Rosa Newman published her talk from an early Sibelius performance at the Concert Goers’ Club in London (22 February 1906), a trickle of proto-musicological literature on the composer was printed through the 1910s and 1920s. By the late 1930s, however, de Törne’s book (1937) was merely the latest publication in what was becoming a significant body of Sibelius scholarship. Composer and music critic, Cecil Gray (1895-1951) had published a monograph entitled, Sibelius (1931); Constant Lambert (1905-1951), another composer and critic, as well as conductor, had ended his Music Ho! (1934) with a chapter dedicated to ‘Sibelius and the Music of the Future’; Karl Ekman’s Sibelius was translated from Swedish to English (1936); and Ernest Newman (1868-1959), who established the UK Sibelius Society in 1932, continued to promote Sibelius’s music in a steady stream of Sunday Times articles.

In the United States too, conductors and orchestras championed his symphonies and tone poems, and the

---

advocacy of The New York Times critic, Olin Downes, even earned him the title of ‘Sibelius apostle’.227 These were the ‘chief soldiers in this pro-Sibelian vanguard’ or the Sibelius cult, as it was knowingly referred to by its members.228 Constant Lambert, for instance, wrote

when two or three years ago someone said to me a trifle sneeringly, ‘I see you’ve joined the Sibelius cult,’ I replied with characteristic modesty, ‘I haven’t joined it. I started it.’229

When Adorno refers to ‘the apologists’ and the appearance of ‘longs essays’ on Sibelius, it is clear that he is not just referring to de Törne’s book, but to the general climate of Sibelius reception in Britain, as Tawaststjerna, Grimley, and Paddison have noted.230 Mäkelä too has characterised Adorno’s ‘Gloss’ as ‘an extreme symptomatic expression of the one-dimensional Sibelius cult that sought to elevate the Nordic composer at the expense of other contemporary figures’.231 These publications were ‘extreme in their praise’ and it was not only Adorno that noticed.232 Writing in 1939, following the Sibelius Festival, Robert Lorenz noted that ‘there is no lack of biographies, studies and analytical notes, but they are all as uncritical as were the pioneer books on Wagner’.233 He suggested a ‘scholarly counterblast’ to remedy the situation – perhaps something akin to Adorno’s ‘Gloss’, of which he was evidently unaware.

De Törne’s Close Up, in particular, verges on a hagiography. It is autobiographical and novel-like in tone, and mixes narrative embellishments, recollections of Sibelius’s character, and bold claims about his place in music history, with the specifics of de Törne’s orchestration lessons and some insightful comments on Sibelius’s own

---
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orchestration. De Törne also describes Sibelius’s remarkable ‘mastery’ of all areas of life. He is depicted as a polymath and romantic genius with a rich knowledge of Classics, history, current affairs, and ‘perfect’ hosting. At one visit to Sibelius’s home, even the ‘salad […] proved to have been prepared by the hand of a master’. The unreliability of his anecdotes and quotations, along with those in Ekman’s biography, has since been widely acknowledged, not least as many of them conflict with the events and opinions expressed in Sibelius’s letters and diaries. Tawaststjerna describes it as a ‘somewhat naïve bagatelle’ and Mäkelä sees it as a ‘well-meaning but poorly prepared attempt to provide a “close-up” of Sibelius’. A letter drafted by Sibelius in 1946, illustrates this point. He complains that de Törne, who had promised him that it would contain nothing biographical, had not given him ‘an opportunity to look through it’, which ‘accounts for the many inaccuracies’.

The ‘excessive zeal’ of the 1930s Sibelius advocates has received wide criticism from late twentieth-century scholarship on Sibelius. Adams, for instance, suggests that the ‘pernicious tendency toward aesthetic ranking long beloved by British critics’ may have actually damaged Sibelius’s later reception in academia. It has even been blamed specifically for attracting the condemnatory claims made by Adorno, which then supposedly caused Sibelius’s neglect. Like Adorno’s ‘Gloss’, Newman, Gray, and Lambert’s hyperbole is even suspected to have created Sibelius’s anxious silence after the Seventh. Nevertheless, returning to this literature can be productive because it reveals that tropes of neglect and a ‘cold’ German reception have a long history in the writing on Sibelius. It appears that despite the recognition of unscholarly levels of praise and the unreliability of biographical information in 1930s scholarship, more recent scholarship has inherited other similarly unreliable ideologically motivated aspects of Sibelius’s early reception in the same manner that Adorno did, despite, or perhaps because of the detachment of these ideas from their historical context. This half of
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Chapter 1 will unravel how and why this trend first emerged to show that Anglo-American understandings of Sibelius’s music have always been negatively defined against the Austro-Germanic tradition.

1.3.1 Beethovenian Inheritance

Irrespective of the unreliability of de Törne’s Close Up, it is an expedient and exaggerated example of Sibelius’s appropriation by a younger generation of composers, who aimed to construct a respectable musical heritage of symphonicism divided along national lines from the well-established Austro-German canon. Yet by the late 1930s, Sibelius had already entered into his ‘silence’ and ceased to write new works. As Grimley notes, the Close Up is ‘eulogistic’, and written with a sense of loss. Sibelius, the paragon of the symphony’s future, had disappeared back into the darkness of his Finnish forest home in Järvenpää, and it seemed less and less likely that he would complete the long-awaited Eighth Symphony. There became an increasing urgency – perhaps the reason for such ardent proclamations – for these composers to establish Sibelius’s musical authority in order to justify and distinguish their own ‘marginalized’ tonal practices from the overtly modernist compositional schools in Central Europe, a move that was closely related to the formation of national musical identity in the years approaching the outbreak of WWII. Although constructing an alternative trajectory of music history is unproblematic in itself, the way that it was attempted by Sibelius writers in the 1930s was contradictory, absurd, xenophobic, and exoticist.

Still clinging to an aristocratic and patriarchal kind of inheritance, de Törne and Anglo-American composers and writers attempted to peel back recent musical history by lionizing Sibelius as true inheritor of the Beethovenian symphonic tradition. De Törne declares that a ‘careful and unprejudiced study of the scores will show that they continue the line of Beethoven’, though like Adorno, he also gives no musical examples. Sibelius himself was apparently ‘as much flattered as embarrassed’ by being placed by

the side and sometimes above Beethoven. This revisionist approach to music history emphasised Sibelius’s originality, universalism, progressiveness, and intuitive – in other words, natural – mode of composition. These proclaimed qualities came with the contradictory disclaimer that they arise spontaneously from a spiritual rather than music-specific inheritance, so as not to diminish Sibelius’s own musical individuality.

Various sycophantic anecdotes in the Close Up imply the literal spiritual transmission of ‘greatness’ through the eyes of the masters. He quotes Sibelius:

‘In my young days I studied in Vienna, and my piano was once tuned by an old man who used to tune Beethoven’s piano during his last year’. Sibelius suddenly grew silent and remained so for a while. Then, as if continuing the thoughts that had absorbed him, he said solely and in a low voice: ‘And it was wonderful to look into those eyes, which had seen the master of the Ninth Symphony’.

Reflecting the contemporary vogue for spiritualism, he describes another occasion when Sibelius instructed him to look ‘straight into [his] eyes’ and in his slow and low voice, gave de Törne the ‘most perspicacious psychological analysis’ that demonstrated an ‘amazing intuition’. For de Törne, good music should be intuitively, even religiously, conceived, through something like divine inspiration, not intellectual working out. The Close Up is full of such boasts of first-hand encounters only thinly veiled in humility. It seems almost solely aimed at establishing de Törne as ‘the chosen one’ through his proximity to Sibelius, and Sibelius’s proximity to Beethoven.

While the model of Beethoven’s career and his epic symphonies were revered by these critics, it was at the expense of most other nineteenth- and twentieth-century music. To emphasise Sibelius’s direct musical descendance from Beethoven, almost all composers in between were dismissed, particularly by de Törne and Gray. The latter, according to Laura Gray, ‘segreated [Sibelius] completely from the nineteenth-century romantic movement, which he considered “essentially irrelevant”’. De
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Törne’s dismissals are characteristically unreflective. His Chapter VI responds to the assertion by an unnamed contemporary composer that the ‘symphony is dead’ and unrevivable, by proceeding to cull numerous symphonic composers from the canon, in order to emphasise that Sibelius alone was capable of such musical necromancy. De Törne demonstrates his anti-romanticism when assessing Mahler whom he finds to be ‘one of the most pathetic cases in the history of music’, his music ‘lifeless’, and ‘of no importance for the further development of the symphonic form’.\footnote{De Törne, \textit{Sibelius: A Close Up}, 74.} Tchaikovsky is no better. To de Törne, he is like a child that cannot resist ‘eating bonbons’ in his inability to look past the present musical moment.\footnote{Ibid., 77, 81.} In its surreal imagery, this last remark has its parallel in Adorno’s \textit{Little Herr Friedemann} analogy, whether Adorno intended this or not. De Törne also erroneously claims that Sibelius believes Wagner’s ‘whole school has been disastrous to the evolution of music’.\footnote{Ibid., 60.} This is one of the specific ‘inaccuracies’ that Sibelius notes in his aforementioned letter.

By ridding the Beethovenian line of its ‘unappealing’ characteristics – decadence, indulgence, and effeminacy – de Törne and Gray’s version of Sibelius was thus presented as a historical point of convergence. His music was considered ‘much more virile, heroic and organically connected’, than Mahler’s, Wagner’s, Tchaikovsky’s or any other composer’s music.\footnote{Ibid.\footnote{Ibid., 79.}, 79.} Adorno’s statement that ‘if Sibelius is good, then the criteria of musical quality that have endured from Bach to Schoenberg – a wealth of relations, articulation, unity in diversity – are done in once and for all’, is clearly a reposte to these absurd claims.\footnote{Adorno, ‘Gloss on Sibelius’, 336. Adorno’s claims that Sibelius’s materials are ‘impotent’ take on a new clarity in this context.}

Gray, Newman, and Lambert, also position Sibelius as a direct line to the heroic symphonic tradition by reviving the Beethovenian myth of the neglected and misunderstood artist, which according to Gray, had come under recent criticism. In \textit{Music Ho!} Lambert declares that ‘Sibelius, it is true, has a popular following to-day
but, like that of Beethoven, it is mainly a tribute to his worst works. The Fourth symphony is as unappreciated now as were the later sonatas and quartets of Beethoven in their day’. Gray also complains that although Sibelius’s *Finlandia* and *Valse Triste* are ‘to be heard in every picture-palace, restaurant, café, tea-shop, and cabaret in the civilized world’, the ‘great mass of work’ and that which is ‘most important’, has remained ‘consistently and steadily ignored’.

In *Sunday Times* article in 1933, Ernest Newman too, complains that the ‘Finnish’, nationalist Sibelius represents only a small portion of his output. He expresses his frustration at the continued performances of the same works mentioned by Gray – the works of ‘popular conception’ – and the neglect of the rest. Sibelius is therefore presented as a neglected genius akin to Beethoven whose best work does not reach the ears of contemporary audiences. It is particularly important to note that variations of the idea that Sibelius’s music is neglected were already established in the 1930s texts that Adorno encountered. Noting the composer’s neglect is therefore not just a late twentieth-century observation of the alleged backlash caused by Adorno’s criticisms, as 1990s scholarship makes it seem, but instead an enduring trope of Sibelius’s critical reception.

In fact, Adams observes that the Fourth symphony’s lack of public popularity with concert audiences paradoxically boosted Sibelius’s reception among critics and contributed to its status as Sibelius’s ‘most modernist’ symphony. In rejecting commercially plugged pieces in favour of the intellectually demanding compositions that require some work to understand – repeated listening and consulting the score, as Newman emphasises in the case of the Fourth – the musical values of early Sibelius scholars actually line up roughly with that of Adorno. Adorno condemns the ‘filler pieces’ of ‘a rather vague physiognomy’, such as *The Swan of Tuonela* and *The Oceanides*, and *Valse Triste*, which were commonly programmed at the time.
Admittedly, he also seems to dismiss the rest of Sibelius’s music too. Yet without naming any specific pieces, the scope of his dismissal is left ambiguous.256

1.3.2 Sibelius’s Musical Nationality

Phillip Bullock has convincingly shown that de Törne’s contempt for other composers was motivated by nationalistic anti-Russian feeling in Finland. Following the October Revolution and the Russian Civil War in 1917, Russia had lost territory to Finland, which left the latter in a precarious position. At the end of 1939, the Soviet Union did indeed invade, marking the onset of the Winter War.257 Although he dismissed many nineteenth-century composers, de Törne was ‘keen to emphasise Sibelius’s Teutonic influence’ – specifically of Mozart, Haydn, and Mendelssohn – in turn emphasising how he was therefore free from ‘the existential traits of the Russian soul’. Bullock observes that ‘any arguments in favour of Sibelius’s exclusively and essentially Nordic identity are, whether consciously or not, indebted to a whole set of stereotypes about the national and emotional character of Russian music’.258

In Britain, Sibelius scholarship was no less ideologically charged, but with the contrary aim of denying any Teutonic influence except for Beethoven’s, whose perceived universalism seems to have exempted him from such nationalist discourse, at least within this Sibelius scholarship. Writing on the influence of Sibelius on William Walton’s First Symphony, Harper-Scott argues that Sibelius was specifically chosen for this role because ‘he could function as a politically safer, non-German influence’, in comparison to continental composers from the Axis.259 A review of Ekman’s biography brings the contemporary political lens through which his music was viewed into sharp focus. On 8

256 In fact, Adorno directly dismisses the Fourth Symphony in an early draft of his ‘Gloss’ entitled, ‘Zum Fall Sibelius’. The draft seems to be written in partial reaction to Newman’s brief comparison of the ‘cross-hatching’ in the Fourth’s first movement with that in Beethoven’s Egmont Overture. Unfortunately, the meaning of Newman’s term is lost in translation and Adorno takes it to be the same technique as the much more tightly defined ‘Durchbrochene Arbeit’ (‘openwork’). Adorno disputes any use of this technique in the symphony. Any mention of the Fourth Symphony along with any other musical specifics are removed from the later ‘Gloss on Sibelius’. See Adorno, ‘Zum Fall Sibelius’, (transcription provided by Sebastian Wedler), at Theodor W. Adorno Archiv, Akademie der Künste, Berlin, Ts22694-22695; Newman, ‘Sibelius No. 4: Its English History’, 29 August 1937 in Essays from the World of Music, 127-32 at 130.
February 1936, *The Times* reported that ‘Sibelius like everyone else, could learn much from the great German tradition, but it was his mission to break down its domination’. Anti-German sentiment in the inter-war years, reflected in this musical criticism, only grew stronger during WWII and in its aftermath. Not only was the anti-romanticism of Newman, Gray, and Lambert aimed predominantly at Austro-German music, these critics found it especially important to emphasise that Sibelius also had a negative reception in Germany, where he was presumed to be widely misunderstood because of his Finnishness. As Levi has evidenced, this was far from the case. Yet if it was widely acknowledged that these British critics and German audiences had something in common, they would be in the moral danger of being in ‘cahoots with the enemy’. In 1935, G. D. Skelton imagined that in answer to the question, ‘Who is the greatest living composer?’ a German would give Strauss and an Englishman, Sibelius. If his question was altered very slightly to ‘Who is the greatest living foreign composer?’, both nationalities may have given the same answer.

Distancing Sibelius from the musical centres of Europe was achieved in three ways, firstly by defending Sibelius from negative critics, usually German; secondly by detracting the compositional methods of continental modernism using an anti-intellectual line of attack; and thirdly, by insisting that Sibelius was simply too unorthodox, and too Northern, for the Germans to understand, all the while asserting the individuality of his music. This is all infused with a strongly anti-intellectual flavour that, as Mäkelä observes, was the ‘focal point’ of Adorno’s critique in this literature. Sarah Collins’s compelling examination of early twentieth-century British music criticism more broadly also suggests that anti-intellectualism was a way to marry conceptions of English national identity with aesthetic modernity, and, most critically, as distinct from, but no less progressive than, central European models. She sums up this discourse as follows:

anti-intellectualism allowed British critics to cast their native composers as internationally competitive for the very reason that they were not competing according to the same criteria as their Continental counterparts. This exempted them from the need to seek
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prestige on the basis of deep structural unity, technical complexity, conceptual weightiness or innovative theorization, given that these were held to be antithetical to the English temperament.²⁶⁴

Sibelius, as an appropriate model for British composition, was also described in antithetical formal terms, with prestige given to his use of timbre – a “surface” element’, considered to be more ‘intuitive’ than continental intellectual compositional pursuits, according to Collins – along with his unusual formal shapes.²⁶⁵

Long before Adorno entered the picture, monographs and biographies on Sibelius reserved a position for detracting composers of the Second Viennese School – sometimes specifically naming Schoenberg, but often just politely euphemistic – to defend Sibelius from the (sometimes imagined) charge that his music was regressive. Little did Adorno know that he would slot into this designated position later in 1990s scholarship. The composers of the New Music were seen to be writing ‘incomprehensible’ music that was mechanic and artificial, as demonstrated by Gray’s remarks above (see Section 1.1.4), or just a passing fashion for the sake of shocking audiences.²⁶⁶ Harper-Scott summarizes Lambert’s aims: ‘Although Lambert’s Music Hol of 1934 is by no means intended solely as a paean to Sibelius, the Finn is held up as the standard by which all other composers should be judged – the symphonic master-craftsman who can offer convincing answers to the problems of the modern symphony, and at the same time show up the shoddy work of Stravinsky and the Schoenbergians’, which was threatening to eclipse symphonic music altogether.²⁶⁷ As Daniel Grimley puts it, Sibelius’s music was used as a ‘stick with which to beat’ continental modernism.²⁶⁸

Examples of such bludgeoning are not hard to find and it was these attitudes in early writing on Sibelius that Adorno refers to in ‘Gloss’ when he notes the ‘mean-spirited hatred’ of New Music.²⁶⁹ In the next decade, Gray wrote on the long-lasting appeal of
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Sibelius’s music as opposed to the music written to gratify audiences’ desires to ‘be astonished’ by ‘attracting the most immediate attention’. To him, these composers are ‘the novel, striking, picturesque, frequently original, always interesting, but essentially second-rate talents’. Relating his judgment back to the Beethovenian myth of neglect, Gray claims that while these kinds of composers ‘arouse the violent controversies […] the really great figures [like Sibelius] pass comparatively unnoticed amidst a throng of mediocrities’.270 De Törne similarly wrote that ‘like all true innovators – and unlike those whose bloodless, intellectual productions aim at overthrowing the great traditions in art – Sibelius believes that the new and transforming ideas must come from within, not from the exterior form’.271 Jeremy Dibble and Julian Horton observe that the particular ‘suspicion of Schoenberg’s dodecaphony married to a feeling that composition should be spontaneous rather than mechanical with a marked hostility towards theoretical abstraction’ was, in fact, widespread in British musical criticism.272

While Adorno characterises Sibelius as someone who ran in failure from ‘the critical eye of his school-masters’ in Berlin and Vienna back to the ‘land of a thousand lakes’, Sibelius’s music was portrayed by British critics in the 1930s as too unorthodox for German audiences to understand.273 In much the same way that ‘anti-Sibelius bile’ is purged in the 1990s and 2000s, Gray establishes a polemic with those he believes treat Sibelius as a marginal composer because they do not understand his historico-cultural context. This is established against the imagined accusations that ‘Sibelius could not ‘handle’ the universalism of the ‘great classical forms which they are jealously disposed to regard as the exclusive apanage and inalienable prerogative of the larger and more “civilized” European countries’.274

Though Gray aims this criticism at German writers, he is addressing Sibelius’s

270 Gray, Sibelius, 607.
274 Gray, Sibelius, 25.
exoticisation in his British reception too. He expresses his frustration at the ‘patronizing’ tendency to call Sibelius’s music ‘primitive’ and ‘quaint’, attributing this attitude to the assumption that Finland’s cultural (or uncultured) position in Scandinavia was akin to the ‘same obscure and lowly position that Albania’ has in the Balkans. He goes on to explicate this misunderstanding:

A hazy conception that most people in south-western Europe have of Finland is that of a desolate wilderness enveloped in perennial ice and snow, and sparsely inhabited by Eskimos or some equally uncouth and primitive race which subsists chiefly upon a diet of whale-blubber and pemmican, and ekes out a dreary and precarious existence by bartering furs and hides with traders in exchange for the bare necessities of life.

Gray’s observation could be applied to Donald Tovey, for example, who writing in the 1930s, betrays a stereotyped approach to Sibelius’s music when he conflates the Finnish with the Nordic. He describes the finale of Sibelius’s Violin Concerto as a ‘polonaise for polar bears’ and the theme in the Finale of Sibelius’s Fifth Symphony as the swinging of ‘Thor’s hammer’. As Mäkelä points out, Finland does not share the Norse mythology of the other Scandinavian countries nor is it home to any polar bears.

Gray was also particularly keen to dispense with the kinds of nationalist images that had been propagated by Finlandia’s ubiquity in the concert hall. He also critiques Adolf Weissmann’s and Niemann’s ‘misconception’ that Sibelius based his themes on folk songs and that his compositions were thus the ‘musical expression of the Finnish folk-soul’. Basing his reposte on the faulty assumption that nationalist music is only music based on folk song, Gray argues that what is mistaken for exotic national characteristics in Sibelius, are ‘in fact the individual qualities of the composer’s mind and method of working’.

Despite presenting themselves as authorities on Finland and the Finnish music of Sibelius, both were ultimately understood in naïve nationalist terms by Gray, Lambert,
Newman, and even de Törne, himself a Swedish-speaking Finn. Though Gray’s attempt to safeguard Sibelius’s music against exoticising and mystifying impulses initially seem nuanced, his denial of folk music quotations or Finnish inflections in Sibelius’s music was nevertheless an ideologically motivated attempt to further emphasise the total originality of Sibelius’s music.\(^{282}\) While Gray initially dismantles these kinds of exoticist views of Finland in his monograph, he nevertheless goes on to note that the ‘quality of utter difference from everywhere else, the curious sense of “otherness” […] is the distinctive feature, not only of the capital, but of the whole country, its people, their art, their entire culture’.\(^{283}\) To him the ‘otherness’ is bound up, on the one hand, with Finland’s lakes, forests, and ancient granite rocks, and on the other, with the futuristic architecture of the modern capital, Helsinki. Despite calling out the regrettable tendency of exoticisation in the interpretation of Sibelius’s music, Gray, like Newman and Lorenz, only reinforces this tendency in slightly more sophisticated terms. He even goes on to provide a racial profile of Sibelius later on in the monograph.\(^{284}\)

In 1930s writing on Sibelius, there is general agreement that an ‘otherness’ could be heard in his music, and that it came down to national identity. In Newman’s writing, Sibelius’s exoticism emerges directly from the national difference between British listeners and the Finnish composer, and much of his writing on Sibelius’s music offers explanations for its perceived otherness. To him, the strangeness that first strikes the listener and makes it incomprehensible is overcome with ‘a little imaginative insight’ when it is realized that what they are experiencing is a ‘different national and cultural-heredity from ours’.\(^{285}\) It is significant that what Newman experienced as ‘otherness’ in Sibelius was put down to Finnishness and Sibelianism at this crucial moment of ‘cult’ formation. Such musical features were as baffling to Newman, as they were to Adorno – as their conversation indicated – the only difference being that the former

\(^{282}\) Murtomäki has since found several examples of Finnish folk song quotation in Sibelius’s music. See Murtomäki, ‘The Influence of Karelian runo singing and kantele Playing on Sibelius’s Music’ in Timothy L. Jackson, Veijo Murtomäki, Colin Davis, and Timo Virtanen (ed.), Sibelius in the Old and New World (Peter Lang, 2010), 199-218.

\(^{283}\) Gray, Sibelius, 29.

\(^{284}\) Ibid., 55.

found it diverting and the latter condemned it to obscurity. Robert Lorenz was more questioning of the compatibility of Sibelius’s music with the sentiments of British audiences, yet his scepticism was also based on national stereotypes that were becoming increasingly reified in the inter-war imagination. After the Sibelius Festival in 1938, Lorenz reflected: ‘It is not a case of the ear becoming more accustomed to unwanted sonorities, but of a definite Finnish element in the music – stark, cruel, and exotic, which I decline to believe will ever become congenial to a cosy, fire-loving folk like ours’. 286

Though Section 1.1.4 primarily deals with the appropriation of Sibelius’s music by the National Socialists, Adorno’s claim that Sibelius’s followers summon ‘Blood and Soil’ ideology applies to Sibelius’s British followers too, at whom Adorno’s critique was predominantly aimed. It is too far to claim that this writing was proto-fascistic, but there are similarities between the 1930s nationalist receptions of Sibelius in the context of Nordicism, as discussed in Section 1.1.4. As Adams and others have demonstrated, the cultural appropriation of Sibelius’s music by British critics ‘rested upon deeply problematic assumptions regarding race and national character’. 287 Goss too observes that Sibelius’s reception relied on ‘Nordic purity of thought and racial “authority”’. 288 The body of Sibelius’s musical forms were found to match his Nordic ‘Viking’ physique in their ‘austere’ and ‘rugged’ ‘purity’. This is especially apparent in writing on the Fourth Symphony, which Gray and Newman both find to be athletic and devoid of ‘superfluous flesh’ in Sibelius’s omission of transitional passages. 289

1.3 From a Negatively Defined Tradition to a Negative Dialectic

Sibelius’s music was therefore presented as not Russian, Austro-Germanic, or even sometimes Finnish, but as negatively defined against these national musical traditions. By bashing continental critics like Niemann and composers of the Second Viennese School,
as well as denying any musical influence from these national musical traditions or at least reversing the value judgments attached to certain groups of musical features like those in Adorno’s polemics with Newman, Sibelius was given an individualistic compositional identity that could pave the way for a progressive tradition of composition in Britain, in particular. For these composers and critics who wished to establish themselves, Sibelius acted as vanishing mediator – as Adorno did later in the century – and a foothold to boost British music into a position akin to the central European repertory.

The unfortunate result was that Sibelius’s music has been placed at an unreasonable distance from the Austro-German symphonic tradition, an aspect of his reception that has been inherited by later scholarship. After all, Sibelius read A. B. Marx’s *Die Lehre von der musikalischen Komposition* in Helsinki as a student, studied composition a few years later in Berlin and Vienna (as stated in Section 1.1.2), continued to tour his compositions in central Europe where he attended concerts, and wrote enthusiastically of the music he heard there. His exposure to Austro-Germanic musical culture and its influence on his music is undeniable. Later chapters in this thesis will show that his music shares formal affinities with not only Beethoven but many other nineteenth- and early twentieth-century composers from central Europe too.

Sibelius scholarship has become circular and self-perpetuating and it seems that ‘strawmanning’ is an essential ingredient for writing about his music. As Goss has discerned, ‘one of the first lessons to be learned from the Sibelius literature is that long before recycling became the watchword of environmentalists, the practice was widely used by those writing about Sibelius.’ She traces the recycling back to early Finnish writers before Rosa Newmarch, and claims that at the time of writing in 1998, it was ‘infecting even the present scholarly climate’. In 1990s literature to the present, establishing that Sibelius was neglected or not well received in Germany earlier in the century, gives the appearance of an ethical distance both from the problematic writing of his early British advocates and his appropriation by the Third Reich. In
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other words, it is necessary for these receptions to have died off, for it to be acceptable
to write about his music again. If there has been neglect in Sibelius studies, it is in the
form of a lack of self-critical thought and in the lack of renewed efforts to investigate
what appear to be historical and analytical ‘facts’. Sibelius’s floating ahistorical
position as a composer who cannot be associated with any ‘ism’s – as Gray puts it
and as was introduced at the beginning of this thesis – is therefore one that has
been constructed in various ideological acts of self-justification throughout the
twentieth-century.

In conclusion, Adorno’s ‘Gloss’ aims to find the ideologies within the Sibelius cult’s
advocacy, and thereby identifies an antithesis (or several) within its thesis. But Adorno’s
position also contains its own negation, and his argument collapses from beneath its
feet when he assumes that the interpretative arguments presented by Anglo-American
Sibelius writers were the only possibility for interpretation. A post-Adornian Gloss on
Sibelius will therefore respond to this self-perpetuating ideological moment of
Sibelius scholarship by indicating that there are other possibilities for interpretation
outside the ones presented by early and more recent scholarship. The details left
uncovered by Sibelius scholarship are those that do not cohere the form and confirm
the now fixed and all-encompassing nature representations, expressions of nationalism,
and totalizing metaphors of organic unity that allow Sibelius to be placed at the centre
of his own lonely canon. These details are the ones that this thesis focuses on – the
bits and pieces that Adorno refers to as the ‘fissures’ characteristic of modernist artworks
– using Adorno’s materiale Formenlehre in spite of his ‘Gloss’ to understand Sibelius’s
music.
PART II
Reappraising Hepokoski’s Sonata Deformations and Adorno’s *materiale Formenlehre*

Hepokoski’s repositioning of Sibelius in music history as an ‘early modernist’ – achieved via an expansion of the formal terms by which modernism can be understood – approaches the composer’s work in neutral terms that are distant from the early twentieth-century polemics that circled around Sibelius. He identifies the challenge that the apparently fiercely opposing positions of Sibelius advocates and detractors poses to scholarship on the composer in his monograph, *Sibelius, Symphony No. 5*:

> These inappropriate – though seemingly ineradicable positions – have by now so muddied the Sibelius waters that one wonders whether any attempt to reconfront these works in less prejudicial terms is even possible in our times. This book is a modest attempt to try.\(^{293}\)

Yet several of the innovative structural features that Hepokoski formulates as ‘sonata deformations’ do in fact have an unacknowledged genesis in both the Mahlerian categories of Adorno’s *materiale Formenlehre*, as has been noted in Chapter 1, and in early British analytical writing on Sibelius. Not only does Hepokoski’s expansion of modernism silently respond to the accusations of conservatism in Adorno’s ‘Gloss on Sibelius’, but an Adornian influence can also be found in at least two of Hepokoski’s sonata deformations. These radical treatments of form are paradoxically conceived as the shared musical characteristics of the music of the 1860s-generation of symphonists – the ‘early modernists’ – and taxonomized as types in Hepokoski’s list of common ‘sonata deformations’:

1. Breakthrough deformation
2. Introduction-coda frame
3. Episodes within developmental space
4. Various strophic/sonata hybrids
5. Multimovements in a single movement\(^{294}\)
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\(^{293}\) Hepokoski, *Sibelius, Symphony No. 5*, x.

\(^{294}\) Ibid., 6-7.
Hepokoski supplements these deformations with a related selection of ‘compositional principles reassessed’ by Sibelius upon his confrontation with the ‘emancipation of dissonance’ (1912-15):

1. Content-based forms
2. Rotational form
3. Teleological genesis
4. Klang meditation
5. Interrelation and fusion of movements\textsuperscript{295}

Whilst Hepokoski’s ‘breakthrough deformation’, and less obviously, ‘Klang meditation’ are redefined Adornian material categories (as discussed in Chapters 2 and 5) several other ‘sonata deformations’, in their deformational position as ‘parageneric’ or conceptually ‘outside’ musical form, might be reinvigorated as analytical tools when read back into the context of Adorno’s materiale Formenlehre.\textsuperscript{296} In particular, ‘Introduction-coda frames’, ‘episodes within developmental space’, and certain ‘fusions of movements’, function as interruptive substitutions or interpolations into a form from its outside. In order to reconsider these categories, and how portions of music can be conceptually ‘outside’ however, it is first necessary to define Adorno’s ‘material theory of form’ (material Formenlehre) and defend the controversial concept of sonata deformation, before joining the two theories.

In \textit{Mahler: A Musical Physiognomy} and in fragments of several other 1960s texts, Adorno devises his material theory to interpret Mahler’s symphonic music.\textsuperscript{297} The title of the monograph refers to the ancient Greek practice of physiognomy: assessing a

\textsuperscript{295} Ibid., 21-30.
\textsuperscript{296} For Hepokoski and Darcy’s use of the term ‘parageneric’ to denote ‘zones’ outside sonata form, see Elements of Sonata Theory, 218.
person’s personality and character – their ‘inner’ attributes – from their outer appearance – their facial features and expressions. Adorno’s material theory also seeks to determine the character of Mahler’s music from its surface features: its ‘material’. He codifies five new ‘material’ formal categories or ‘characters’ in Mahler’s music. The first of these categories is ‘breakthrough’ (Durchbruch), but Adorno’s monograph also discusses ‘the world’s course’ (Weltlauf), ‘suspension’ (Suspension), ‘fulfillment’ (Erfüllung), and the rarely-explored, ‘collapse’ (Zusammenbruch or Katastrophe). This thesis focuses on ‘suspension’ in the following chapter, and ‘breakthrough’ in Chapter 4.

As John Scheinbaum observes, Adorno’s categories should be understood within the more general context of German musicology, ‘in which there is a tendency to emphasise “material” as the most essential domain of music, and “logic/deduction/development” of that material as the primary principle of composition’. Within this context, the material theory of form aims to deduce ‘formal categories from their meaning’, rather than by simply categorizing bits of music under abstract Formenlehre labels which, Adorno argues, do not adequately explain the function of every bit of music, and are in danger of self-confirmation in their applications. Nevertheless, Formenlehre is not rejected by Adorno entirely. Vande Moortele notes his emphasis on demonstrating the ‘interconnectedness’ of these categories and traditional formal ones. Adorno’s material categories are intended to interact and overlap with, as well as critique ‘abstract’ Formenlehre categories such as primary theme, transition, and secondary theme. Adorno explains that

In Mahler the usual abstract formal categories are overlaid with material ones; sometimes the former becomes specifically the bearer of meaning; sometimes material formal principles are constituted beside or below the abstract ones, which, while continuing to provide the framework and to support the unity, no longer themselves supply a connection in terms of musical meaning.

298 See Adorno, Mahler: A Physiognomy, esp. 41-46.
301 Adorno, Mahler: A Musical Physiognomy, 44.
To Adorno, it was not just the language of tonality that was ‘ravaged and crooked’ but
the abstract formal principles that organized the order of formal sections laid out by A.
B. Marx, among others, in the mid-nineteenth century.  

Gianmario Borio explains that in Marx’s organicist conception of sonata form, ‘sections
are not juxtaposed with equal meaning, but rather follow one another according to
the specific function they must fulfil within the large-scale formal dynamic: the internal
structure of a specific section, its position in the temporal flow and the logic of
succession of the sections all closely connected’. For instance, the logic that ‘primary
themes begin sonatas, therefore the opening theme of a sonata is a primary theme
(P)’, is upheld within the framework of *Formenlehre* applied to late-eighteenth century
and early nineteenth-century music. The abstract category, P, and the material –
what an individual piece actually does at its opening - are aligned, and there is
seemingly no need to separate the concepts. Yet the same ‘logic’ did not hold water by
the turn of the next century. As soon as it was reified in pedagogical texts,*Formenlehre*
came to represent a ‘conformist trap’ that composers sought to avoid in
the pursuit for innovation. Borio summarizes Adorno’s understanding of the shift in the
relationship between musical material and its character in the temporal flow of a piece
at this point in music history:

> the formal schemes, or, more precisely, the internal organization of musical time, no
longer function as vehicles to transport character. Here the categories are so specific
as to be forced themselves to produce the formal categories that support them.  

There is a mismatch between what should go where, and what actually is there: the
opening of a sonata might not be P-like at all in a movement by Mahler or Sibelius, so
in order to come up with an adequate way of understanding what might be in its
place, Adorno’s theory aimed to consider the ‘musical materials at hand’ in the ‘specific

---
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context in which they are found'. Adorno’s theory therefore calls for the analyst to arrive at each work without theoretical preconceptions (arguably an impossible feat), as well as for the composer to reject abstract, historically-mediated, categories altogether to create their own, on a piece-by-piece basis. This ‘bottom-up’ way of understanding and composing music was theorized as Adorno’s musique informelle. Nevertheless, in his material theory of form, Adorno does not reject Formenlehre entirely – as the quotation above demonstrates - but suggests that ‘sometimes’, composers like Mahler, are capable of diverting from these ‘textbook norms’ while still operating within the ‘framework’ of sonata language that forms the background expectations of listeners, composers, musicians, and scholars. The material theory is an attempt to open up a space in music theory and analysis for these particular moments, ‘beyond the scope of Mahler’, so they can be endowed ‘with speech’.

Adorno’s categories are not just able to critique form and Formenlehre because of tensions that arise in the moment-to-moment dialogue between the material of individual pieces and the Formenlehre or organicist expectations that condition responses to them. Adorno theorizes that the ‘top-down’ approach, involving traditional formal designations, as well as the bits of music that it was created to refer to, are no longer capable of showing the relationship of individual parts to the whole work in his music – and arguably that of most symphonists – because that relationship itself is momentarily destroyed by the specific material categories that he identifies. Adorno argues that Mahler’s music strives to reveal the inadequacies of the forms that Formenlehre was created to describe, exposing them as ‘reified, empty shells’. Borio explains that to Adorno, ‘the organization of the relations between parts and whole imitates the constitution of living organisms, so much so that the artefact
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308 Adorno, Aesthetic Theory, 199. Adorno placed particular weight on rebuilding musical form from the ‘bottom-up’ from the perspective of leftist politics whereby in a communist revolution of an organically-defined society, it is the proletariat – the feet of society – that are the only ones capable of over throwing the head. By overthrowing it, the proletariat destroy the class system to rebuild a utopian society from what was previously considered its ‘bottom’.
309 Adorno, Mahler: A Physiognomy, 44.
310 Scheinbaum, ‘Adorno’s Mahler and the Timbral Outsider’, 44.
winds up looking like Nature and not like a linguistic creation’. Adorno’s material categories of fulfilment, breakthrough, and suspension, dissolve and disrupt the process of cohering the individual part to the whole, thereby throwing the totality of the organic work into question. Excluding Weltlauf, the Mahlerian categories are characterised by their ability to critique the ideals of ‘logic/deduction/development’ in an organic artwork by intruding into the work from ‘outside’ its form as well as ‘outside’ Formenlehre to replicate the cognitive structure of the sublime, described in Section 1.1.4 above.

It is this particular characteristic of Adorno’s categories – their ability to suspend the ‘normal’ workings of a form and thus momentarily throw the entire concept of ‘form’ into question – that can enrich Hepokoski and Darcy’s concept of sonata deformation. Though individual sonata deformation types have accrued some inconsistencies across time, the definition of deformation itself has remained fairly constant throughout the development of Sonata Theory from the 1990s to the present day. Its lengthiest explanation appears in Elements of Sonata Theory where it is defined as:

> the stretching of a normative procedure to its maximally expected limits or even beyond them – or the overriding of that norm altogether in order to produce a calculated expressive effect. It is precisely the strain, the distortion of the norm (elegantly? beautifully? wittily? cleverly? stormily? despairingly? shockingly?) for which the composer strives at the deformational moment.

A work is thus able to retain a ‘dialogue’ with a formal type like a sonata (although the concept does not prescribe that it has to be) while a part of it, a breakthrough perhaps, radically departs from and even rejects the ‘abstract’ ideas that define the type. For Adorno’s categories to retain their expressive power as extreme reactions to and negations of an organic holism, they require some semblance of that holism to be upheld. A similar relationship between sonata deformations and sonata norms is present in Hepokoski and Darcy's theory. Yet the concept of ‘deformation’ remains controversial within music theory as it stands in tension with theoretical ‘norms’. The concept of ‘deformation’ therefore requires unpicking and defending.

311 Borio, ‘Dire cela, sans savoir quoi’, 63.
312 Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 614.
The concept’s critics – formal function theorists, Julian Horton and Paul Wingfield in particular – question the appropriateness and difficulty of establishing a norm that non-norms and deformations can work against. Concerns over the term’s negative connotations are also raised. In Wingfield’s review of *Elements of Sonata Theory*, for example, he uses Joseph Straus’s cultural history of disability in music and music theory to support a complaint that ‘the very word ‘deformation’ carries unfortunate connotations of damage and disability that are not dispelled by Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s lengthy defence’ in their Appendix 2. Taking the colloquial connotations of ‘deformation’ as the only point of reference, however, results in an oversimplification and collapse of the term’s meaning into its most visually prominent and shocking manifestations, at the expense of the full spectrum of meaning that the term has to offer to scholarship. The usefulness of the theory itself is in fact acknowledged by Straus, who, whilst claiming that the term ‘participates in the construction of the culture and history of disability’, also argues that Sonata Theory ‘manifests a progressive, liberational impulse’, an impulse that can also be found in Adorno’s material theory of form. Sonata Theory does dispel deformation’s connotations of ‘damage’ by reversing – or at least, neutralizing – the negative valuations of normativity/non-normativity. To Straus, himself, this is a ‘central and extremely attractive feature’ of Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory because it encourages an embrace of the non-normative. In contrast to Wingfield’s response to *Elements of Sonata Theory*, Julian Horton’s critique of deformation in the publications leading up to the book engages more directly and substantially with the concept of sonata deformation itself. Horton’s rejection of deformation is twofold. Firstly, he finds Hepokoski and Darcy’s source of normative features problematic and secondly, he notes that the statistical occurrence of pieces
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315 Straus, ‘Normalizing the Abnormal’, 131. Reclaiming Type 2 as a form in its own right as a neglected and misunderstood Type (examples have often been treated as ‘incomplete’ sonatas) is one example of this ‘liberational impulse’ in *Elements of Sonata Theory*. See Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 365-6.
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with deformations in nineteenth-century instrumental music paradoxically out-numbers pieces without deformations, a position that makes the supposed norms appear to be in the minority, which to Horton, undermines the concept.\footnote{317} Additionally, Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s use of A. B. Marx’s \textit{Formenlehre} as the standard against which they measure non-normativity and deformation in sonata forms is found to be problematic by Horton.\footnote{318} He claims that this approach denies the multiplicity of mid-nineteenth-century theoretical approaches to sonata form and that Marx is only one theorist among a great diversity of others in the nineteenth-century (Czerny, Reicha, and so forth). It is therefore ‘inadequate to condense the nineteenth-century into a single aggregate definition’.\footnote{319} Horton argues that deriving a theoretical model of normativity from Marx’s \textit{Formenlehre} or any other treatise, rather than from musical works and their material, requires an investigation into the specific texts that condition each composer’s conception of sonata form before any conformation of or deviation from sonata norms can be ‘verified’ in their music.\footnote{320} He claims that ‘if the origin of deformation is theory, then a separate model of the relationship between norm and deviation is required for each instance of the reception of theory’.\footnote{321} Not every composer accessed Marx’s ideas and even if we know they did – as in Sibelius’s case – their encounter with it is no guarantee of its influence.

Admittedly, deriving sonata theory norms from only one theoretical treatise is questionable and narrows the possibilities of what can be considered a sonata considerably.\footnote{322} Yet if Marx’s treatise is viewed as a response to a wider compositional climate, which contemporaneous composers and earlier composers also accessed and responded to, then the inclusion of Marx’s theory within Sonata Theory poses less of a problem. After all, Marx was only able to theorise his \textit{Formenlehre}}
because he was enculturated in that particular compositional tradition. But it is not just the compositional climate that overturns this aspect of Horton’s critique. As Vande Moortele acknowledges, Marx actually no longer plays a role in EST and the norms are derived instead from late eighteenth to early nineteenth-century repertoire and a ‘dialogic’ sense of form from a ‘constellation’ of norms and defaults.\footnote{Steven Vande Moortele, \textit{Two-Dimensional Sonata Form: Form and Cycle in Single-Movement Instrumental Works by Liszt, Strauss, Schoenberg, and Zemlinsky} (Leuven University Press, 2009), 195.}

This leads us directly to Horton’s second criticism of deformation: the paradoxical situation where non-normative features and deformations outnumber normative pieces, and yet more paradoxical, a situation where there are identifiable kinds of deformation. Horton refers to the huge number of pieces that do not conform to Marx’s treatise, but the paradox is also still evident in EST where norms are repertoire-derived. Hepokoski and Darcy explain the logic behind this in EST, relating deformation to the process of canonization. If a work contains no deformations, it

\begin{quote}

is more likely to be sidelined by historical consensus as unimaginative, composition-by-numbers, a boiler-plate product. This means that in the case of sonata form – and certainly in the hands of classical masters – it was perfectly ‘normative’ to intersperse into the individual work instances of the ‘non-normative’ or rivetingly deformational.\footnote{Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, 617. See also 314: ‘second- or third-tier repertory – encompassing thousands of less ambitious and now largely forgotten works – is where, from the perspective of the five sonata types, numerous hard cases are likely to be found’.}

\end{quote}

This again refers to the reversal of negative valuation that Straus finds so appealing, as well as an extension of the above paradox whereby the unexpected is expected of artworks. Considering the possibility of a repertoire-based norm, Horton questions the existence of these boiler-plate compositions at all and argues that evidence for them is ‘patchy’ at best. He also finds no evidence for Hepokoski or Darcy’s investigation into this ‘hinterland of neglected works by neglected composers’ that would make their normativity visible. If this is to be the backdrop against which deviation is judged, Horton’s is a valid criticism: a decade later, there is still no evidence that Hepokoski or Darcy have investigated these ‘hinterland’ compositions.\footnote{Horton, ‘Bruckner’s Symphonies and Sonata Deformation Theory’, 10.} He concludes: ‘without a normative repertoire against which deformation can be measured, the idea of the
normative model has no palpable form, existing purely as an aggregation of theory’.\(^\text{326}\)

It might nevertheless be suggested that many pieces that contain a deformational feature also contain many features that together, across a body of works, create a dialogic sense of a ‘norm’, though admittedly this hypothesis needs careful analytical support. It is in a dialogue with the constellation of norms collected across works that an individual piece can subtly critique sonata conventions from the inside out, which is arguably, precisely what nineteenth-century music is ‘about’.

Furthermore, *Elements of Sonata Theory* does focus on the musical features of canonical composers and therefore does not paint an accurate historical picture of eighteenth-century music: predominantly Mozart, Beethoven, and Haydn, whose musical deformations are numerous. This canon-centred focus has not escaped *Elements of Sonata Theory*’s reviewers. William Drabkin notes a bias particularly towards Mozart – predominantly caused by the focus of the Type 5 chapters, three of which are dedicated to Mozart’s concertos – in his review of *Elements of Sonata Theory* entitled, ‘Mostly Mozart’.\(^\text{327}\) Wingfield also proclaims it ‘a book about Mozart’ and goes as far as drawing up a table of composers and pieces it contains to prove just how biased it is.\(^\text{328}\) He shows that out of the 87 musical examples in the theoretical text, 66 are from Mozart (75.9%); 10 from Beethoven (11.5%); 8 from Haydn (9.2%); and 1 each from C. P. E. Bach, J. C. Bach, and Scarlatti (1.1% each) (Wingfield’s percentages are represented graphically in Figure 1.1 below).\(^\text{329}\) But yet again, Wingfield misrepresents the content to support his somewhat superficial dismissal of Sonata Theory. By counting only inset musical examples, he excludes all other compositions that are discussed without score extracts. The ‘Index of Works’ in *Elements of Sonata Theory* indicates that a much greater array of composers and kinds of composition are mentioned.\(^\text{330}\)

\(^{326}\) Horton, ‘Bruckner’s Symphonies and Sonata Deformation Theory’, 11.

\(^{327}\) William Drabkin, ‘Mostly Mozart’: Review of *Elements of Sonata Theory*, *The Musical Times*, Vol. 148, No. 1901 (Winter, 2007), 89-100; It is worth noting that three of the Type 5 chapters were originally intended as a separate publication. See Chapters 19-22 in Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 430-602.

\(^{328}\) Wingfield, ‘Beyond “Norms and Deformations”’, 145.

\(^{329}\) Ibid, 141. Percentages are rounded to the nearest decimal place.

When the 871 movements of this index are considered, these figures change significantly. Mozart’s music drops drastically to 31.5%, followed closely by Haydn at 27.6%, and Beethoven at 14.7%. There is no doubt that the book includes discussion of more compositions by those three composers than others, but they were also more prolific than Schubert, Mendelssohn, Brahms, and so forth. The point is thus: these other composers are discussed. Behind Beethoven, Schubert’s music makes up 4.4% of the movements mentioned, C. P. E. Bach 3.6%, Mendelssohn 2.4%, and J. C. Bach 2.1%, Clementi 1.7%, Brahms 1.4%, and J. S. Bach 1.2%. The remaining 9.4% of movements discussed are by 34 other composers (Figs. 1.2 and 1.3). These percentages do not account for the length that each piece is discussed, of course, but they are more representative of the scope of repertoire referred to in *Elements of Sonata Theory* than Wingfield’s table. The emphasis would no doubt shift once again if the chapters on Mozart’s concerto forms, initially conceived as a separate text, were to be excluded.

**Figure 1.1** Wingfield’s Analysis of Musical Examples in *Elements of Sonata Theory*331

---

331 The percentages are calculated (and rounded to the nearest decimal place), based on the total number of pieces and each composer in Wingfield’s table, Figure 1. See Wingfield, ‘Beyond “Norms and Deformations”’, 141.
The representation of composers in *Elements of Sonata Theory* is, nevertheless, orthodoxly canonical and, as the title suggests, it is a treatise on the late-eighteenth-century sonata. This puts the application of the theory to Sibelius’s late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century music in an uncertain and problematic position. Yet as Chapter 1 revealed, Sibelius had a solid education in counterpoint and harmony, read A. B. Marx’s theoretical writing, and was actively engaged in the contemporary music of central Europe, where his music was performed alongside the earlier canonical music that forms the focus of *Elements of Sonata Theory*. To ignore this context and the frame of reference for its ongoing reception would not do his music justice.

---

332 Hepokoski and Darcy, ‘Index of Works’, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 639-48. Percentages are rounded to the nearest decimal point.
Figure 1.3  ‘Index of Works’ in *Elements of Sonata Theory*
Number of movements per composer, arranged in chronological order by birth.
Though the publication of *Elements of Sonata Theory* complicated concepts in earlier Sonata Theory writing (as the following chapters explore), their otherwise productive and influential application to Bruckner, Sibelius, Strauss, and Elgar among others, in early 1990s scholarship by Hepokoski and Darcy demonstrate that the theory has had, and still has relevance to music beyond Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven. There is also a rich plethora of other analytical scholarship on the form and syntax of Romantic music that are tantalizing in what they would offer in their future application to Sibelius’s music. Peter H. Smith’s exploration of ‘tonal pairing’, Julian Horton’s theory of ‘orbital tonality’, and Benedict Taylor’s theorization of memory and temporality in Mendelssohn along with his in-depth analysis of ‘scalar modulation’ in Sibelius’s *Tapiola*, represent just the tip of the iceberg. Yet because Sonata Theory and Adornian approaches are the theoretical traditions that have shaped the critical reception of the composer, the following analyses will employ a post-Sonata Theory approach – with its flexibility and focus on gestural, rhetorical, and thematic components – in place of the Formenlehre that Adorno calls for in conjunction with his material categories. Schenkerian-based voice-leading analysis will also be used to identify how symphonic sonata form and diatonic conventions work in dialogue with suspensions, breakthrough, and rotational projections to create distinctly early modernist forms in Sibelius’s music in order to redefine understandings of his music, Adorno’s categories, and sonata theory itself.

It is the final issue with deformations that may yet encourage a dialectical mediation between pro- and anti-deformation arguments. At issue is the possibility that a particular deformational type may become habitual in a repertory, to the point that it should be considered a new norm, statistically speaking, or new form entirely. This possibility is

---


built into the foundations of *Elements of Sonata Theory*: Hepokoski and Darcy see normative sonata form as a flexibly changing ‘constellation’ of generically available options across time. In practice however, the authors continually assess deformations of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries against late-eighteenth-century conventions. This practice is certainly not condonable, and as Vande Moortele notes, ‘the classical norm turns out to be remarkably stubborn’.335

At the core of the issue of sonata deformations is perhaps a (no less difficult) question of hermeneutics. If a once infrequent musical feature, which might statistically be considered a deformation on Hepokoski and Darcy’s terms, appears more frequently in a particular repertory over time to the point of becoming a trend, does it retain the expressive associations attributed to it when it was statistically rare (shock, tragedy, loss, splendour…)? Likewise, does the gradual increase in breakthroughs in orchestral music in the nineteenth-century make the impact of the material category any less by the time Sibelius was writing his own, to the point that Hepokoski and Darcy’s definition of deformation – a stretching and even breaking of formal conventions, and the very function of breakthrough – no longer holds water? In fact, both pro-deformation and anti-deformation arguments are played out in works that contain Adornian breakthroughs or suspensions. As soon as one of these material categories enters into musical form it provides a momentary ‘glimpse’ of something radically new, different, or *deformational* by throwing the relationship between the work’s whole and the material of the breakthrough or suspension into relief. Yet, as soon as it is sounded, the material becomes ‘reified’ and immediately integrated into the perceived whole of the artwork, where it is no longer a norm or deformation.

335 Vande Moortele, *Two-Dimensional Form*, 4.
As Chapter 1.1.1 established, Adorno argued that Sibelius’s music was full of formal features he associated with incoherence and banality. These features include Sibelius’s sparsely harmonized themes, layering of motivic repetitions, sustained organ pedals, and illogical chord progressions that represent a rejection of the ideals of Austro-Germanic musical form – motivic-development and goal-directed harmonic progressions – and thus in turn enact a retreat from human rationality into an all-encompassing, destructive nature that eradicates anything considered ‘unnatural’. In the previous chapter it was noted that Adorno found works like The Swan of Tuonela, op. 22, no. 2 (1893) to be of ‘a rather vague physiognomy’.¹ He also recalls articulating a similar sentiment in his exchanges with Ernest Newman, during which Adorno claimed that Sibelius ‘mistook aesthetic formlessness for the voice of nature’.² It was for this reason that Adorno argued that Sibelius’s music was particularly vulnerable to insidious appropriation.³ Yet Adorno also reveres the same kinds of ‘physiognomy’ in Mahler’s music for the very reason that he dismisses them in Sibelius’s. He theorises that within Mahler’s works, which otherwise uphold an overarching musical unity, there are ‘sedimented episodes’ that are able to intervene, reject, and critique that unity by suspending the musical features associated with human progress and rationality.⁴ He claims that these ‘suspensions’ are able to do so precisely because they are defined against the ideals of musical form. They operate dialectically to suggest something beyond and outside this musical tradition. This interpretation therefore renders their material incoherent in a particular way, and in the examples that Adorno gives, the

episodes frequently involve imitative nature sounds like cuckoo calls, cow bells, and hunting horn signals.

In the 1970s, Adorno’s category of ‘suspension’ was redefined as Klangflächentechnik by Monika Lichtenfeld, and later Carl Dahlhaus, as a kind of music that is able to represent nature through its ‘definite negation’ from the forward-directed processes of musical form.⁵ Though similar concepts were theorized in earlier German musicological literature by Ernst Kurth for instance, it is through this particular path in the history of the idea that it arrived at Sibelius’s music and into Anglo-American music.⁶ Shorn of its Adornian associations by virtue of chronological distance and recontextualisation, the concept was later reformulated as a sonata deformation, ‘Klang meditation’ and applied to Sibelius’s music by James Hepokoski as well as by Daniel M. Grimley, who, preferring the term ‘sound-sheet’, observes that it ‘became one of Sibelius’s most powerful and characteristic formal procedures’.⁷ These are understood to be idiosyncratically Sibelian traits that are intimately tied up with conceptions of Finnish landscape and nature. Hepokoski thereby joined Dahlhaus’s redefinition of Adorno’s material category to a long-standing interpretative tradition of hearing whole tone poems and movements of Sibelius’s symphonies as static atmospheres, in turn reaffirming both the early Anglo-American reception of Sibelius that sought to define him against the Austro-Germanic tradition, and, indeed, the very tropes of reception that Adorno condemned.

Dahlhaus’s definition of Klangfläche directly follows a discussion of stylistic interpolations of folk and exoticism, which he argues have ‘analogous aesthetic functions’, many of which also appear in his descriptions of Klangflächen:⁸

---


⁶ See for instance, Ernst Kurth’s theorization of Klangschattierung (‘harmonic shading’) in Wagner’s Tristan in Ernst Kurth, Romantische Harmonik und ihre Krise in Wagners ‘Tristan’ (Georg Olms Verlag, 2005), 159ff. Originally published by Nachdruck der Ausgaben, 1923.


⁸ Dahlhaus, Nineteenth-Century Music, 302-11, especially 305-6. Dahlhaus includes examples by Weber, Glinka, David, Gounod, Saint-Säens, Balakirev, Grieg, and Bizet.
Regardless of the milieu being depicted, exoticism and folklorism almost invariably make do with the same technical devices: pentatonicism, the Dorian sixth and Mixolydian seventh, the raised second and augmented fourth, nonfunctional chromatic coloration, and finally bass drones, ostinatos, and pedal points as central axes.⁹

On this basis, he goes on to conclude that

we can speak of exoticism and folklorism per se without having to specify the folk tradition or exotic land involved. This indicates that the key issue is not the original ethnic substance of these phenomena so much as the fact that they differ from European art music, and the function they serve as deviations from the European norm.¹⁰

Implicit in his assessment is the judgment that these composers can only engage naively with non-Western art music at best, and their music is culturally appropriative at worst, though the latter issue is not of concern to him here. Most importantly, he claims that these features are merely evoked as a kind of empty deviation from the hegemonic form of Western art music, and that the ‘content’ of these deviations are otherwise irrelevant in their non-specificity. He goes on to argue that folk music is intimately related to musical landscape depiction as a permanent component of ‘national musical style’ that runs against the mainstream of compositional evolution.¹¹ Though Dahlhaus applies the concept of Klangflächen to music by several central-European composers including Beethoven and Wagner, the same structure of thought applies. Certain passages – the Nile Scene in Verdi’s Aida for instance – are representative of a landscape through their ‘definite negation’, as Dahlhaus puts it.¹²

When it comes to Sibelius, it is not just individual passages of Sibelius’s works, but entire tone poems that display the characteristics of Klang-meditations. Hepokoski includes examples such as Sibelius’s mythology-inspired En Saga, Luonnotar, Aallottaret, and Tapiola – the ne plus ultra of Sibelian sound-sheets, according to James Hepokoski – as well as the first movement of the Fifth Symphony and The Swan of Tuonela.¹³ The concept’s reliance on a ‘definite negation’ – to use Dahlhaus’s turn of phrase – of the material it defines from both nineteenth-century ideals of musical form and historical

---

⁹ Ibid., 306.
¹⁰ Ibid., 306. Italics are my own.
¹¹ Ibid.
¹² Ibid. 307.
¹³ Hepokoski, Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 28.
progress therefore also threatens to negate Sibelius and his works like The Swan of Tuonela, which are received as a synecdoche of his musical style, from Western art music history. As the concept is currently understood, the concept of Klangfläche or ‘sound-sheet’ is therefore in danger of (re-)exoticising vast swathes of Sibelius’s music.

This chapter aims to address this problem by nuancing the current understanding of Klangfläche in Sibelius’s works through a demonstration of the concept’s affinity with the material category of ‘suspension’. A detailed analysis of The Swan of Tuonela will then proceed, via a voice-leading analysis, to uncover small disruptive ‘tears’ or ‘slashes’ in the piece’s fabric (See Fig. 2.1 for an example of this embroidery technique). At these breaks in the cor anglais’s melody, the string ‘sheet’ parts and ‘timbral outsiders’ – to use John Sheinbaum’s term – sound instead. These ‘outsiders’ are a group of instruments whose sonority is reserved only for these moments.¹⁴ They respond to the solo cor anglais to create a sonically, not just symbolically or negatively, defined kind of landscape. After an elucidation of the work’s complex publication history (2.2.1) and the impact that the publisher’s prose programme has had on the work’s static reception (2.2.2), an outline of the work’s form will be the basis of an initial consideration of Klangfläche and suspension (2.3). Sibelius’s extracts for the Lemminkäinen suite’s premieres will then be outlined before The Swan of Tuonela’s own text is reconstructed from its implied Kalevala narrative (2.4), and a detailed programmatic interpretation of the work will then proceed (2.5). Finally, a discussion of musical distance and space will conclude the chapter with an analysis of a non-orchestral work: Sibelius’s song, Sydämeni Laulu, op. 18 no. 6 (2.6).

Figure 2.1  ‘Slashing’ is a decorative textile technique that involves small cuts made in the surface of several layers of fabric to reveal different patterns below.
2.1 *Klangfläche, Suspension, and Sibelius the ‘Timbral Outsider’*

Lichtenfeld hears Mahler’s *Klangflächentechnik* as a historical convergence of nineteenth-century sound-sheets – its ‘origins’ being in Beethoven’s *Pastoral Symphony* and ‘prototypical’ manifestations in Wagner’s opera preludes – and twentieth-century examples such as in Berg’s *Wozzeck*. Like Mahler’s use of the technique, her theorisation also represents a music-theoretical convergence. Lichtenfeld’s musical examples of *Klangflächentechnik* overlap significantly, albeit without acknowledgement, with the Mahlerian ‘suspensions’ in Adorno’s earlier *Mahler: A Musical Physiognomy* and also with Carl Dahlhaus’s later examples and definitions of *Klangflächen* in his *Nineteenth-Century Music*. She provides detailed explorations of the introduction to Mahler’s Symphony No. 1 in D major (1887-88), which opens Adorno’s monograph, as well as the introduction to the finale of Mahler’s Symphony No. 2 in C minor (1896), the second section of which (bb. 26-43) recurs later in the movement as the ‘Bird of Death’ episode (bb. 448-471) and is also one of the suspensions identified by Adorno. Another example included in Lichtenfeld’s essay is the developmental episode of intermittent cowbells in the first movement of Mahler’s Symphony No. 6 (bb. 196-250), which Adorno considers to be a ‘suspension’. The overlaps go further than shared examples. As mentioned above, Adorno conceived of Mahlerian suspensions as ‘sedimented episodes’ that ‘stretch themselves out’ and suspend the ‘immanent context’ of the work in question. In a suspension episode, ‘the conventional formal path of logical progression is left behind’. There are echoes of this

---

15 Lichtenfeld, ‘Zur Klangflächentechnik bei Mahler’, 121. Sibelius is not included in this history.
16 Lichtenfeld’s ‘Zur Klangflächentechnik bei Mahler’ has no references or bibliography, and Dahlhaus’s passage on *Klangfläche* does not cite her either, though he was the editor of ‘Zur Technik der Klangflächenkomposition bei Wagner’). Thomas Peattie acknowledges Lichtenfeld’s coinage of the term in Gustav Mahler’s *Symphonic Landscapes* (Cambridge University Press, 2015), 97. Daniel M. Grimley also mentions her essays in a footnote to Dahlhaus’s definition of *Klangfläche* in *Carl Nielsen and the Idea of Modernism* (Boydell Press, 2010), 61, n. 2. See Dahlhaus, *Nineteenth-Century Music*, 36-9.
conception in Lichtenfeld's own description of *Klangflächentechnik* as ‘the suspension of musical progress’ as well as her definition of the concept more broadly.\textsuperscript{20}

The recurring musical features that make *Klangflächen* distinctive can be garnered from Lichtenfeld’s essays on Mahler and Wagner, the latter of which does explicitly refer to Adorno’s *In Search of Wagner*.\textsuperscript{21} These include persistent organ pedals and the absence of harmonic progressions, which are replaced by non-functional harmonies like polytonal chords or superimposed notes. Examples include the combination of F major (Horns I, II) and C minor (Horns III, IV) chords at the opening of *Tristan’s* Act II, scene 1, or the open fifths of the same chords in the finale of Beethoven’s *Pastoral Symphony*, which Dahlhaus believes to be the ‘origin’ of this particular device.\textsuperscript{22} Superimposed notes can be heard in the *Klangfläche* at the opening of Mahler’s First Symphony too, when several woodwind instruments hold B♭ over the string’s pedal A (from b. 9): a moment also noted by Adorno.\textsuperscript{23} According to Lichtenfeld, *Klangflächen* also feature a sudden timbral contrast with a texture of ‘uniformity and smoothness’ like the sustained notes in the examples above or the tremolo strings at the opening of the finale of Mahler’s Second Symphony. Timbral contrast is also reinforced by the signification of sonic distance through specific instrumentation or through sounds that are literally distant, like the offstage horn fanfares at the aforementioned moment in *Tristan*. Lichtenfeld also notes a lack of motivic development and ‘thematic work’ in *Klangflächen*. This becomes the main focus of Dahlhaus’s discussion. He claims that these passages work in opposition to the ‘locus classicus’ of motivic-manipulation found in Beethoven’s development sections.\textsuperscript{24} Considering the posthorn ‘suspensions’ that replace the trios in the scherzo of Mahler’s Symphony No. 3, Sheinbaum recounts almost all the same musical features that Lichtenfeld observes to be characteristic of *Klangflächen*, including its timbral, topical, tonal, spatial, and programmatic contrast...

\textsuperscript{20} ‘die Suspension musikalischen Fortschreitens’ in Lichtenfeld, ‘Zur Klangflächentechnik bei Mahler’, 124.
\textsuperscript{24} Dahlhaus, Nineteenth-Century Music, 307.
with the main body of the movement. At least formally, these analytical concepts are almost identical.

Extra-musical meaning is attached to passages of Klangflächen due to the specific relationship of its characteristics to the nineteenth-century ideals of musical form. Quoting Adorno, Licthenfeld argues that the combination of these features and the absence of forward-directed processes that they imply, imbues Klangflächen (though Adorno does not use this term) with a sense that ‘through sonority time becomes transfixed in space’. They are also able to summon ‘the idea of a picture of nature’ because they are ‘based on a conception of lawfulness that necessarily associates the inarticulate context of nature, non-conceptual and dispassionate primal phenomena with developmentless, self-contained harmonies and the pure expansion of coloured sound’. She concludes that ‘this is why Klangflächen appear in Mahler’s symphonies as negatives of the artistic’, a statement that Dahlhaus reprised in Nineteenth-Century Music when he wrote, ‘musical landscapes arise less from direct tone-painting than from [a Hegelian] “definite negation” of the character of musical form as a process’. It is clear that underlying this concept is a dichotomy between what is considered to constitute form – thematic-motivic development and harmonic progression – and what is formless – a lack of these parameters. Mapped onto these are totalizing notions of human agency on the one hand, and on the other, a homeostatic, subordinate nature: something to go outside into, to hunt in, farm, or frack.

In Dahlhaus’s later definition of Klangfläche, he notes that this musical opposition was ‘driven to extremes in modern art music, even serving as the basis for entire works’, which as Hepokoski argues, often applies to Sibelius’s tone poems. To Lichtenfeld’s
definitions, Dahlhaus also adds that Klangfläche are ‘inwardly moving and outwardly static’, thus associating their musical ‘insides’ with rhythm and ‘outsides’ with harmony and motivic-development. These ‘outwardly’ moving parts become yet more apparent in relation to Sibelius’s music, which contains especially complex passages of overlapping string ostinati as opposed to the simple sheets of tremolo that underpin Mahler’s Klangfläche. It is for this reason that Sibelius’s music has been considered ‘proto-minimalist’ by both Hepokoski and Grimley.\(^\text{30}\) Building on Dahlhaus’s version of the concept, Hepokoski theorises that this rhythmical momentum is contrasted with a suspension of diatonic progressions and movement towards cadential goals and instead there is ‘harmonic stasis’ or ‘near immovability’ with pedals and ‘slow-motion chords’.\(^\text{31}\)

As one of the ‘compositional principles’ ‘reassessed’ by Sibelius in the years 1912-15, Hepokoski adds the word ‘meditation’ to the term, Klang, to reflect Sibelius’s biographical ‘turning inwards’ just before his late ‘nature-mysticism’ phase. Hepokoski argues that it was in these years that Sibelius’s ruminative approach to developing his musical materials became yet more concentrated. Hepokoski relates the musical principle of ‘Klang meditation’ to Sibelius’s sense of resignation when he realized that he was no longer part of the radical advances in European art music and the resulting sense of loneliness (Alleingefühl), which he reported with ever greater frequency in his diary. Hepokoski hears this introspective impulse in Sibelius’s music as ‘a solitary interior journey of phenomenological concentration that seems to have had as its aim the uncovering of the hidden core or “being”, of Klang (musical “sound”) itself’.\(^\text{32}\) The meditative aspect can be productively developed in relation to Adorno’s suspension, as well as with the implied programme of The Swan of Tuonela (Section 2.4).

Despite this biographical narrative of loss – perhaps even ‘negation’ from the central European canon – Hepokoski does not emphasise the ‘negated’ position of sound-sheets from the symphonic tradition as Dahlhaus does. Instead, he focuses on the

\(^{30}\) Hepokoski, Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 28, 58; Grimley, ‘The tone poems’, 101.

\(^{31}\) James Hepokoski, Sibelius Symphony No. 5, 28.

\(^{32}\) Hepokoski, Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 10.
‘generative’ properties of Klang that are particular to Sibelius’s music.\(^{33}\) While recognizing that there are precedents for the principle in nineteenth-century music, Hepokoski emphasises that ‘when coupled with the high focus associated content-based forms […], ever-deepening rotations or meditations, and teleological genesis, Klang emerges as an especially prominent musical factor’ in Sibelius’s music.\(^{34}\) Klang meditation has subsequently been understood as a structural device that can generate a form at its beginning ex nihilio – as J. P. E. Harper-Scott observes in Walton’s Sibelius-influenced Symphony No. 1 (1934), and Grimley in Nielsen’s Helios Overture. Warren Darcy has observed Klang to act as teloi in many of Bruckner’s Symphonies, particularly at the end of a movement where the musical material comes to fruition.\(^{35}\) Klangfläche – deemed to be devoid of process – had previously been considered antithetical to the ‘scholarly’ Beethovenian or Brahmsian kind of musical development. Such a dichotomy is potentially dissolved by Hepokoski’s fusion of Klang with the concepts of content-based form and teleological genesis. Yet these generative processes – the growth of themes from motivic ‘kernels’ – are not present in The Swan of Tuonela, which was written around twenty years before Sibelius’s so-called ‘nature-mysticism’ phase. When Hepokoski’s definition of Klangfläche is fed back into its earlier conceptions by Licthenfeld and Dahlhaus, The Swan of Tuonela’s sound-sheet is still understood to be the antithesis of musical form itself. Glenda Dawn Goss’s understanding of The Swan of Tuonela is particularly revealing of this attitude to Sibelius’s music. Though she does not use the same technical terminology as Licthenfeld, Dahlhaus, or Hepokoski, Goss describes the tone poem’s ‘exquisite moment of stasis’ as

\(^{33}\) Licthenfeld notes that Klangflächen in Mahler’s music often functions as an introduction in that they seem ‘like the model of a musical process of creation’, even when they are not at the opening of a movement. Lichtenfeld, ‘Zur Klangflächentechnik bei Mahler’, 130.

\(^{34}\) Hepokoski, Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 27-28. Hepokoski even suggests that gendered metaphors of a sort of musical womb might productively be used to understand this combination of musical processes. He argues that the metaphor is especially apt when applied to the circular, ‘maternal’ rotations in Sibelius’s Luonnotar, considering the gestational theme of its creation-mythology inspired text.

the opposite of the reigning Germanic idea of music, with its scurrying, developing, improving, advancing, progressing, apotheosing. It was the opposite of modern life and its clattering technology, frenetic activity, and scientific-minded positivism. Instead, a Zenlike quieting, a time-space entity of deep serenity and mystery opens up, and the star – the swan – makes an entry as dramatic as any opera prima donna, unforgettable in its very stillness.36

There is a danger that such apparently antithetical works might be flung from the repertory against which they are juxtaposed – the teleologically driven music of fin de siècle symphonicism – back into an exoticized notion of ‘North’ where a Sibelius-stereotype resides in isolation as a swan-lover and ‘man of nature’. The latter is a vision that recent scholarship has actually made significant efforts to complicate and nuance.37

It is at this point that we might turn to Adorno’s material category of suspension to establish how it differs from the concept of Klangflächen and how it might be productively used in relation to Sibelius’s music and The Swan of Tuonela. Like Klangfläche, Adorno’s conception of ‘suspension’ rests on its negation from the ‘logical’ processes of form. Yet Adorno argued that Mahler’s music was able to critique the notion that motivic-thematic development and harmonic progression are the ‘true substance’ of music – its ‘deep’ form – and timbre, on the other hand, is only ‘surface’ and ‘extraneous’.38 Although the material category of breakthrough is a particular kind of suspension, suspensions in the main are ‘more subtle’. Paraphrasing Adorno’s understanding of suspension in Mahler’s music, Sheinbaum writes, ‘whereas the breakthrough gives the lie to a completely insular formal structure through the decisive entry of outsider materialism […] the suspension itself is not necessarily marked, or not only marked, as coming from the outside’, because it ‘largely consists of aspects derived from within the movement itself’.39 Although suspensions are ‘timbral outsiders’ they

37 Recent publications and talks that aim to complicate and nuance the nationalist figure of Sibelius whose music is associated with depiction of Finnish landscape include Tomi Mäkelä, Jean Sibelius, trans. Steven Lindberg (Woodridge: Boydell & Brewer Ltd., 2011); Tomi Mäkelä, ‘Jean Sibelius and the “Forest of Fear”’, Research Colloquia, Faculty of Music, University of Oxford, 1 December 2015; Daniel M. Grimley, ‘Vers un cosmopolitisme nordique: Space, Place, and the Case of Sibelius’s “Nordic Orientalism”, The Musical Quarterly, Vol. 99, No. 2 (1 June 2016), 230-53.
39 Ibid., 60.
therefore do not ‘positively assert the presence of the Other’ as Adorno theorises breakthroughs do. They contemplate or ‘meditate’ on – to bring in Hepokoski’s terminology – the very concept of the ‘self-contained’. In other words, they are able to critique their own nature as ‘sedimented’ episodes as well as the ‘immanence’ of form, by occupying a liminal position that presents what is ‘inside’ (thematic or motivic material) as ‘outside’, allowing timbre and other musical features that are traditionally considered to be extraneous to come to the fore. Unlike Klangfläche, suspensions therefore ‘exhibit the dialectic’ of inside and outside. They are not simply ‘negated’. Though Adorno did not formulate it as such, suspension can be understood as a kind of musical doppelgänger, an uncanny presentation of the familiar in a different, even strange context, in such a way that insight, in the form of self-critique, can arise.

Adorno’s particular interest is in the relationship of suspension episodes to the rest of the work, an aspect of its theorisation that also sets it apart from that of Klangfläche. The material category relies on its effect on subsequent passages and thus the understanding of the musical work as a whole. Analysing the suspensions in the scherzo of Mahler’s Third Symphony, Sheinbaum observes that after the first posthorn suspension (bb. 256-84), it continues to intrude and making the following music ‘turbulent’. This is particularly pronounced after the second horn call (bb. 485-529), where the suspension seemingly disrupts the harmonic ‘logic’ that leads back to the tonic, C minor, so much so, that it can only be reached through the ‘sheer’ force of an ‘illogical’ progression of horizontally descending chords (b. 541, 553, 557). By dislodging the ‘music’s seemingly natural progress’, the suspensions in this movement have ‘profound effects on the “inner form” of the whole’ and ‘question[s] the very sense of convention, closure and even coherent tonal motion’ as the ‘natural’ order. It is this disruptive function that leads Adorno to argue that suspension episodes are ‘retrospectively [...] caught up by the form from whose elements they are composed’.

---

40 Adorno, Mahler: A Musical Physiognomy, 43.
42 Ibid., 63, 64-5.
43 Adorno, Mahler: A Musical Physiognomy, 43.
Adorno’s material category of ‘suspension’ opens up the possibility of a more nuanced and dialectical approach to understanding Sibelius’s sound-sheets that does not rely on their meaning arising from a singular opposition to nineteenth-century ideals of form. Rather than accept the ideological conceptions of formlessness, and therefore also accept The Swan as vacuous without ever reaching its sounding surface, I aim to examine the work closely to reveal its processes. Through the small slashes in the Klang-sheet of The Swan of Tuonela its own ‘timbral outsiders’ emerge, to disrupt, and in the Adornian sense, suspend the sequential progressions of the work, presenting a kind of nature that has agency, and that in turn critiques the presentation of a static and subordinate kind of nature. The chapter will conclude by arguing that despite Sibelius’s position as a ‘timbral outsider’ in accepted understandings of music theory and history, even his music has its own ‘timbral outsiders’.

Frustrated by the restrictiveness of existing treatments of the swan imagery, discussed below (Section 2.2.2), Timothy Howell eschews programmatic readings of The Swan of Tuonela entirely in order to restore the balance of scholarly approaches. While this is an honourable approach, the stifling nature of these images should be explored critically rather than straightforwardly abandoned in order to understand why they have been so restrictive. Furthermore, extra-musical meaning, particularly depictions of landscape and nature, are not separable from concepts of Klang and ‘suspension’, and are therefore required to understand how the tone poem can be understood in light of these, and vice versa. As Vande Moortele observes, Adorno’s material formal categories are ‘both formal procedures and vehicles for extramusical meaning’. Rather than dispense with nature-associations in Sibelius’s music entirely then – which is by now, a thankless task – Sibelius scholarship should be invested in redefining how nature and the natural are understood in Sibelius’s music.

Reading music programmatically requires the listener and analyst to play the ‘game of reading,’ as Hepokoski puts it. He proposes this ‘game’ as an interpretative approach that uses early sonata-theory style analysis to create narrative readings of many symphonic poems and other works including Strauss’s Don Juan, Macbeth, and Till Eulenspiegel; Sibelius’s Luonnotar and Finlandia; and Elgar’s Introduction and Allegro. Drawing on Gérard Genette’s concept of ‘paratextual apparatus’, Hepokoski argues that the paratexts of a symphonic poem act as the ‘framing conditions’ of a work’s reception and include any titles, images, and implied narratives associated with a piece of music, in other words, the programme. The game involves ‘calling forth some sort of “meaning” from a text’ on the basis of these conditions, which act as an invitation to do so. It is the ‘listener’s act of connecting text and paratext’ that is the defining feature of the symphonic poem. The Swan of Tuonela has been framed by three paratexts in its reception history and it is to the last that we will now turn.

2.2 The 1901 Publisher’s Programme

Tuonelan Joutsen or The Swan of Tuonela (1893) is often thought of as one of Sibelius’s ‘earliest masterpieces’ and a ‘high point’ in his career before the First Symphony. It is one of four symphonic poems that together form the movements of Sibelius’s Lemminkäinen, op. 22, which is structured as follows: no. 1, Lemminkäinen ja saaren neidot (Lemminkäinen and the Maidens of the Island); no. 2, Tuonelan joutsen (The


49 Ibid., 136.

Swan of Tuonela); no. 3, Lemminkäinen Tuonelassa (Lemminkäinen in Tuonela); and no. 4, Lemminkäinen palaa kotitienoille (Lemminkäinen’s Return). At early performances, Lemminkäinen was accompanied by printed texts corresponding to its movements, which were selected by Sibelius from the Finnish national epic, The Kalevala (1849). Sibelius’s extracts for Lemminkäinen, otherwise known as Four Legends from The Kalevala, are extra-musical descriptions of the adventures of the young Kalevala hero of the same name, Lemminkäinen, in an overarching quest narrative. The Swan of Tuonela is the only one of the four movements that did not have an associated Kalevala extract. The reason for this remains unknown.51 Nevertheless, Lemminkäinen’s presence as the protagonist of an extra-musical narrative in which he descends to the underworld island of Tuonela to shoot its swan, is strongly implied by the tone poem’s title as well as the titles and programme texts of its companion tone poems in the suite. This narrative is the subject of Section 2.4.

It is, however, the third and, chronologically speaking, final paratext, that has conditioned the critical reception of The Swan of Tuonela as a static musical ‘atmosphere’. This last paratext – the short prose programme of 1901 – was associated with the work as a circumstantial consequence of the complex compositional and publication history of the tone poem, as well as an attempt to make the work’s esoteric mythological overtones more accessible to non-Finnish audiences. It has little to do with the journey of The Kalevala hero, Lemminkäinen, to the underworld.

2.2.1 Lemminkäinen’s Estrangement from The Swan of Tuonela

The fraught and protracted compositional history of Lemminkäinen is typical of Sibelius’s unceasing critical reappraisal of his music, which continued even after he had recycled material from an abandoned opera, discussed below (Section 2.4.2). Although the suite was completed by early spring of 1896, Sibelius reversed the order of the inner

51 Confirmed in personal correspondence with Tuija Wicklund (6 June 2017). Wicklund is the editor of the critical editions of scores for the early and final versions of Lemminkäinen: Four Symphonic Poems, Op. 22, Jean Sibelius Works, Orchestral and Symphonic Works, Vols. 1/12a (early version) and 1/12b (revised version), ed. Tuija Wicklund (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 2013).
movements and revised the whole suite after its first premiere. Among other revisions, he shortened The Swan of Tuonela by a fourth of its length. Yet Sibelius was still unhappy with the suite after its second premiere in 1897 and withdrew the first and third symphonic poems, Lemminkäinen and the Maidens of the Island and Lemminkäinen in Tuonela, for further revisions. They were not performed again until 1935, and only published in 1954 after years of correcting editor’s errors and a lengthy interruption caused by World War II. The remaining second and fourth symphonic poems – The Swan of Tuonela and Lemminkäinen’s Return – continued to be performed as stand-alone concert pieces, having been published and performed in their final versions fifty-three years earlier in 1901. Although Sibelius wrote to the publisher to declare that ‘the legends make up a whole, wherefore it would please [him] most if they were always performed as a suite’, the long absence of the withdrawn legends has meant that those published earlier in 1901 entered the concert repertoire as isolated tone poems.

As the tone poem became distant from the suite, so too did its associated programme. Without its own Kalevala-extract or the companion tone poems to imply a programmatic plot, The Swan of Tuonela became entirely severed from Sibelius’s overarching Lemminkäinen plot. It was therefore as an inadvertent consequence of Sibelius’s scrutiny, that Lemminkäinen and his heroic narrative became estranged from The Swan of Tuonela. The hero’s implied descent to the underworld was suppressed in favour of the more apparent image of the title’s swan, which was supplemented by the short prose programme printed in the aforementioned 1901 scores in French and German, and likely written by the publisher (Fig. 2.2).

Figure 2.2
Prose Programme in German and in English, 1901

Tuonela, das Reich des Todes, - die Hölle der finnländischen Mythologie, - ist von einem breiten Flusse mit schwartzem Wasser und reissendem Laufe, umgeben, auf dem der Schwan von Tuonela majestätsich und singend dahinzieht.

Tuonela, the realm of Death – the Hell of Finnish mythology – is surrounded by a wide river with black, raging waters upon which the Swan of Tuonela glides majestically, singing.
Analysis of a typescript held at the National Library of Finland shows that Lemminkäinen’s presence was quite literally replaced in the textual transformation of lines of Kalevala verse into German prose (see Appendix: ‘HUL 1786: The Textural Transformation of Lemminkäinen into a Swan’). The publisher’s programme was also disseminated at some concerts outside Finland in the year of publication, including at a concert in Berlin on 1 December 1901. It was as a single tone poem in this context that The Swan of Tuonela contributed to Sibelius’s fame in Europe and the US in the early twentieth century and it remains one of Sibelius’s most performed works. In comparison, Sibelius’s Luonnotar, op. 70 (1913) for soprano and orchestra, has had few performances outside Finland, which according to Hepokoski is at least partially due to its especially esoteric Kalevala programme and Finnish language song text, neither of which were altered for non-Finnish audiences.

The Swan of Tuonela’s 1901 programme was therefore most likely written in an attempt to make the extra-musical associations of the tone poem’s title accessible for bourgeois concert audiences outside Finland, where familiarity with The Kalevala and Finnish cultural history could not be assumed, and the title alone would not mean much. The 1901 programme therefore provides an explanation of the bare minimum necessary to understand the title’s ‘Tuonela’. The result is a description of a narrative-less setting and

51 In its original order, Lemminkäinen in Tuonela was the second, and The Swan of Tuonela, the third movements of the Suite.
52 Wicklund, ‘Introduction’ in Wicklund (ed.), Lemminkäinen, Op. 22 (revised version), Vol. 1/12b, IX; Wicklund, ‘Introduction’ in Lemminkäinen, Op. 22, Vol. 1/12a, X. It is unclear if the revisions were made for the 1897 premiere or for the publication in 1901. Manuscripts for the early version were lost when Breitkopf und Härtel was bombed in Leipzig in 1943, so Sibelius’s changes are largely impossible to discern.
54 Jean Sibelius, Der Schwan von Tuonela, Op. 22, no. 2 (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1901). No. 2 and No. 4 were published in their final versions in spring 1901, and performed for the first time in Heidelberg, 3 June 1901. Wicklund, ‘Introduction’, Vol. 1/12b, IX.
56 Wicklund, ‘Introduction’, Vol. 1/12b, XII. A short prose programme was also printed in the first edition (1901) of No. 4 Lemminkäinen’s Return.
57 German programme text from the first edition of The Swan of Tuonela, quoted in Wicklund, ‘Appendix’, Vol 1/12b, 261.
60 Wicklund, ‘Introduction’, Vol. 1/12b, XII, XIV n. 66.
a desolate, human-less landscape that does not require any knowledge of The Kalevala to understand, unlike the extracts provided at the work’s premieres. Yet the work’s commodification as an exotic ‘concert filler’, as it appeared to Adorno, has meant that both its implied heroic programme and musical form have become obscured in public and scholarly spheres. The preoccupation with the static atmosphere depicted in this 1901 programme has reinforced the acceptance of The Swan of Tuonela as a formless and static sound-sheet, in such a way that has obscured any other musical features that do not conform to this reading. It is to this reception that we will now turn.

2.2.2 ‘Leave your blasted swans!’
A Static Critical Reception

Relative to the popularity of The Swan of Tuonela, analytical attention to this tone poem is scarce, especially in comparison to the first movement of the suite. There are very few dedicated studies of the suite as a whole or of the individual tone poems, with The Swan of Tuonela mentioned little more than in passing in Sibelius’s many biographies. Like many other under studied slow movements, it is possible that The Swan of Tuonela has not been considered to have the ‘weight’ or ‘seriousness’ of the first-movement sonata forms that have traditionally attracted most scholarly investigation. At a mere 104 bars (c. 10 minutes), it is not a sonata form or, in fact, any other classifiable form, but has most often been filed under the miscellaneous category of ‘expressive rhapsody’. The genre of symphonic poem or tone poem in Sibelius’s output is also still relatively unexplored and is a legitimate area of analytical neglect. Other than Howell’s analyses of all of Sibelius’s symphonies and tone poems, Grimley’s overview of the

---

latter, and Hepokoski’s analyses of *Finlandia* and *Luonnotar*, there have been few attempts to understand the musical processes of Sibelius’s tone poems.\(^66\)

Erik Tawaststjerna’s descriptive analysis of *The Swan of Tuonela* in his biography of the composer is a rare example of analytical focus on the piece, as is Timothy Howell’s later harmonic analysis. These stand out as the only English-language analyses, and indeed, the only extended engagements from the late twentieth-century at all, though Cecil Gray’s paragraphs on the piece from 1931 have been particularly influential.\(^67\) His description of the work’s form echoes through later scholarship:

> The slow, gently swaying, hypnotic nine-four rhythm, the strange, poignant harmonies of the strings at the beginning and close, and the long winding, dream-like melody for the cor anglais which persists throughout almost without a break – a masterly piece of organic construction, by the way, consisting of some sixty bars [sic.].\(^68\)

The solo cor anglais’s melody consists of an improvisatory treatment of ‘one haunting, perpetually recurring phrase’, in Gray’s words.\(^69\) Much later in the twentieth century, Tawaststjerna and Hepokoski also describe the ‘gently flowing’ character of the cor anglais’s melodic line, the way it remains ‘unbroken’, and ‘one phrase merges into the next’.\(^70\) Like Gray, both also emphasise the overall ‘impression’ of an ‘organic entity’ or ‘“inexplicable” organic cohesiveness’ left by the melody.\(^71\) Yet Tawaststjerna also argues that to ‘analyse “The Swan” formally and contrive some textbook formula […] would not do it justice’.\(^72\) Likewise, Hepokoski emphasises that the piece does not reply on ‘any standard formal plan’, instead attributing the piece’s cohesiveness to ‘the varied resurfacing of interrelated themes, colours and motifs treated as independent sound

---


\(^{69}\) Ibid.


objects’, but does not investigate further.73 Other than its presumed organicism, The Swan of Tuonela has long been received as the opposite of goal-directed music, as demonstrated by Goss’s remarks in Section 2.1 and Hepokoski and Grimley’s interpretation of it as a Klang-meditation or sound-sheet. Eero Tarasti even claims that as a result it is ‘subjectless’, and therefore ‘genderless’.74 Taken as a static atmosphere, it is unsurprising that aspects of the programme have been thought of as ‘impossible’ to relate to the formal structure of the work, which was consequently deemed to be formless.75

Howell observes that the central scholarly approach to The Swan of Tuonela has been to understand it as ‘a musical realization of pictorial imagery’.76 The predominant question that has arisen in the critical reception of The Swan of Tuonela has been, ‘What does the swan mean?’, and in further efforts to contextualize the piece within the Scandinavian and Finnish 1890s symbolist movement the question becomes, ‘What does the swan symbolise?’.77 At the end of the nineteenth century, the symbol of the swan was, as Goss observes, ‘something of an obsession’.78 While this cannot be disputed, the swan has also become an obsession in Sibelius’s popular and scholarly reception, fed by the image’s recurrence in his music and cemented by his famous diary entries describing the swans flying over his forest home as ‘one of his greatest experiences’.79 Studies, including Goss’s, often break down into lists of swans found in fin de siècle Finnish and European artworks and even Greek mythology. In the process, they become distant from the piece itself, with little consensus as to what the swan symbolises.80 In the absence of an adequate analytical approach to the piece’s allusive

73 Hepokoski, ‘Sibelius’, Grove Music Online.
76 Howell, Jean Sibelius, 219.
77 Symbolism was an artistic movement of the 1890s that aimed to evoke the human experience of ‘things’ through art, rather than depicting or describing the ‘thing’ itself. Sibelius’s music is understood be an evocation of his subjective experience of the Finnish landscapes rather than a mimetic representation in this context.
78 Goss, Sibelius, 215.
79 Examples include Sibelius’s incidental music for Swanwhite; three of his songs (op. 36 no. 2, op. 90, no. 1, op. 35 no. 1); and the famous Swan hymn of the Fifth Symphony. For translations of Sibelius’s diary entries (April 1915) describing swans see Hepokoski, Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 36. Bengt De Torne also recounts Sibelius’s wistful description of a swan landing on a lake in Sibelius: A Close-Up (London: Faber & Faber, 1937), 101.
structure, the images evoked in the 1901 programme have instead been attached to the work’s various timbres and instrument groups. The swan’s majestic ‘gliding’ and singing described in the 1901 programme is most frequently aligned with the solo cor anglais’s melody, which extends ‘perpetually’ through the piece ‘almost without a break’, according to Cecil Gray.81 Tawaststjerna describes this melody as ‘the Swan’s lament’ and George C. Schoolfield argues that the swan is ‘given voice’ by the soloist.82 Tawaststjerna also claims that the sonority of the cor anglais itself ‘underlines an association with death’ and Eero Tarasti believes that the instrument alone has ‘mythical connotations’.83

Specific orchestral sonorities in The Swan of Tuonela have also been attributed to the underworld setting of the 1901 programme, which has inspired descriptions of the ‘evil beauty’ and ‘otherworldly’, or ‘haunting timbres’.84 More specifically, the ‘black’ river and general darkness of Tuonela are traditionally associated with Sibelius’s unusual choice of instrumentation and murky orchestration. To Gray, ‘an exceptionally dark and mysterious’ tone-quality is created by replacing some of the standard orchestral high-ranged instruments with those that have lower registers.85 The flutes, clarinets and trumpets are omitted from the tone poem’s instrumentation and bass clarinets, bass drum, and cor anglais, of course, are included instead. Tawaststjerna and Barnett repeat Gray’s interpretation by claiming that Sibelius ‘darkens his palette’, and Hepokoski comments on the tone poem’s ‘gloom’.86 The work’s timbres are also associated with the far Northern climate. Layton’s descriptions of The Swan of Tuonela are particularly tinged with his rather exoticised perception of Finnish landscapes.87 To him, the piece ‘evokes with icy intensity the lines inscribed on the score’ and its ‘melody floats on an

81 Gray, Sibelius, 80.
82 Tawaststjerna, Sibelius, Vol. 1, 172; George C. Schoolfield, A History of Finland’s Literature (University of Nebraska, 1998), 100.
85 Gray, Sibelius, 79.
87 The exoticisation of a magical, dangerous, and frozen Northern Finland (Pohjola) where Tuonela is located – Lapland and its surrounding regions – is actually a trope in The Kalevala, but outside Finland it collapses into a signifier of Finnish culture in general.
arctic sheen of strings’, and Tawaststjerna also describes the harmonic movement in The Swan of Tuonela as ‘cold, icy, frigid’. 88

Certain aspects of this reception have become fixed ‘statically’ in a position that faces away from the music, is at times unfounded, and moreover reinforces an exoticist understanding of Sibelius’s music as a representation of an idealized, ancient, cold and human-less Northern landscape. It is arguably because of the extra-musical framing of the 1901 prose programme, quoted in Robert Layton’s monograph and evidently of influence to many others, that The Swan of Tuonela has not been explored in closer analytical detail. 89 The distance of the piece from the suite’s programmatic narrative has seemingly distanced scholars from the musical form and structure, and has tended to ‘flatten’ any features that do not conform to its idealized hearing as a static otherworldly landscape, including the fact that there are breaks in the cor anglais’s melody.

---

89 Layton, Sibelius, 99.
2.3 Klängflache and ‘Timbral Outsiders’ in The Swan of Tuonela

The Swan of Tuonela is neither rotational nor a sonata. Indeed, the tone poem does not involve the ‘symphonic principle of a clear-cut sectional structure defined by key-establishment, conflict and resolution’, as Howell observes.\(^9\) In this sense, it is ‘outside’ of the ideals of Austro-Germanic form. Nevertheless, a formal plan can be discerned. Several clearly audible breaks in the cor anglais’s melodic line occur at important structural moments – the aforementioned tears or slashes in the piece’s fabric – and serve to segment The Swan of Tuonela into five varied treatments of the same thematic material, framed by an introduction and a related epilogue (Table 2.1).\(^9\) The melodic line itself is a recurring and ever transforming phrase, and its sectional treatment is not unlike a theme and variation form, where contrast arises from melodic variation rather than from secondary themes or key areas. Unlike a theme and variation form, however, it is precisely the proportions and harmonic progressions in both foreground and middleground levels that are varied in each section, while the thematic material remains largely recognizable. Before proceeding with an overview of the harmonic processes in the work, it is first necessary to introduce the concepts and new terminology that will be used to clarify its complex voice leading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1</th>
<th>Sectional Form of The Swan of Tuonela</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bar</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73/84</td>
<td>Va / Vb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Epilogue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^9\) Howell, Jean Sibelius, 220.
\(^9\) Howell’s analysis of the piece splits it into six ‘stages’ and thus bares some similarities to mine. See Howell, Jean Sibelius, 221-228.
The tone poem’s instrument groups are consistently associated with particular counterpoint voices, an association that will be referred to as ‘sonorous voice-leading’. The cor anglais and the *divisi* strings are often concurrent as outer voices only, and horns, lower woodwind, and lower strings together form the third group. These voices occasionally cease to relate to one another but remain horizontally ‘logical’ and reach conclusions that are vertically dissonant. This kind of voice-leading will be referred to as ‘multivalent voice leading’. In the large-scale rotational sonata forms discussed in later chapters, ‘multivalent voice leading’ will be expanded into the related concept of ‘rotational projection’: a sonata-deformational Sibelian trait. ‘Sonorous uncovering’ is another voice-leading feature of the piece. When the upper voice sounds below a descant note (an inner voice), that descant is commonly referred to as a ‘cover tone’ in voice-leading terms. When a covering note drops out in pieces that contain sonorous voices, like *The Swan of Tuonela*, the sonorous voice below is ‘timbrally uncovered’ and comes to the aural foreground of the musical texture. This happens particularly prominently when the ‘timbral outsiders’ seemingly emerge from the texture at the ends of the tone poem’s sections.

Certain sonorities in Sibelius’s *Swan of Tuonela* are further associated with the key areas, A minor and C major, which are non-functional and functional. On the one hand, the dominant of A is almost totally suppressed. The key acts as more of a multi-modal centre than a diatonic key. On the other, the fleeting moments of C major are prepared by its active dominant as well as by cadential rhetoric. These two keys create what Robert Bailey has termed a ‘double-tonic complex’ with a shared ‘static’ Kopfton, Ṣ (E). In a double-tonic complex, two triads serve as equal representatives of the complex and at any moment, ‘one of these takes up a primary position while the other remains subordinate to it’. Bailey develops the theory in relation to the Prelude of Wagner’s *Tristan und Isolde*, which establishes a duality between the same keys as in *The Swan of Tuonela*. The Prelude of Wagner’s *Tristan und Isolde*, which establishes a duality between the same keys as in *The Swan of Tuonela*.

---

of Tuonela, and as in the tone poem, A minor becomes the complex’s primary member. In Sibelius’s tone poem, however, neither key is confirmed with a functional cadence.

The impression of The Swan of Tuonela’s opening is of one stoic wall of sound that swells from the distance into the foreground (Ex. 2.1). Sibelius’s tone poem opens with a muted A-minor chord that resonates up and across a total of 17 string parts: through the double basses and other string sections to the first violins in a huge four-octave crescendo. The divisi violins are almost consistently present throughout the piece as a ‘bleak musical backdrop’ in Grimley’s words or an ‘uncommonly rich background texture’ in Hepokoski’s.94 It is almost exclusively the upper strings that form the soundsheet, which both scholars have identified. After this introduction unfurls its A minor pedals, the cor anglais begins Section I (Phrase 1.1: P1.1 in Ex. 2.1). When read in conjunction with the work’s 1901 programme, the swan begins to sing and glide across the ‘murky’ waters of the strings.

The cor anglais’s phrases systematically and chromatically ascend, each harmonized around tonal nodes. Section II’s phrases move through a complexly evaded cycle of fifths that never quite start to cycle consistently, and Section III sequentially ascends by minor thirds in something like a late nineteenth-century linear intervallic progression. The multivalent nature of the sonorous voices tugs them in dissonant directions, so much so, that the material becomes bitonal in Section IV. The cor anglais’s melodic line and its string texture accompaniment sound in different keys simultaneously. Sections Va and Vb – a repeated funeral march – finally settle over a static A minor pedal without the cor anglais the first time around. The Epilogue reprises the material of the introduction and closes the tone poem in A minor.

Example 2.1  Sibelius, The Swan of Tuonela, bb. 1-8 (non-transposing score)

On first appearance, the tone poem seems to straightforwardly fulfil the criteria of a *Klang* meditation or *Klangfläche* outlined at the opening of this chapter. The tone poem seems almost entirely static with A minor pedals at the beginning and end, and the key also reappearing in most of the sections in between. Its harmonic processes, particularly those that are ‘non-functional’, also lie outside the norms of diatonicism and goal-directed harmony – A minor is not tonicized in any conventional sense – and the subtle thematic transformations of the phrase are far from the frenetic motivic working of Brahmsian developing variation or Beethoven’s development sections. The close association of voices and sonority elevates the parameter of timbre above these ideals.
What is more, the strict division of the melodic content from its accompaniment is also reminiscent of the examples of Mahlerian Klangfläche that Lichtenfeld discusses. The cor anglais wanders through the gently evolving homophony of the divisi strings whose textures are varied in each section, like their harmonic processes. The strings, predominantly the violins, sustain legato chords that sweep across the orchestra (Section I), as well as tremolo (II and III), interlocking pizzicati (IV), and finally, barely audible col legno within yet more sustained notes (Vb). All these features conform to a reading of the work as an unmoving ‘sound-sheet’, negated from the musical progress going on elsewhere in Europe, and a total retreat from humanity into an unchanging nature, as Hepokoski argues was the fate of Sibelius’s life and music later in the 1910s.

Yet at the end of Sections II, III, and IV, the cor anglais’s sequential progressions are answered by ‘timbral outsiders’, that serve to harmonically disrupt the direction of the melody’s linear sequential ascents, motivically transform it, and provide timbral, topical, and harmonic contrast, despite actually echoing the soloist’s material. The extent of this contrast increases with each subsequent answer. The first of these outsiders is a single horn call (timbral outsider 1, see Table 2.1 above), the second transforms the cor anglais’s phrase into a chorale in the woodwind and lower strings (timbral outsider 2), the third is a forte tutti passage of horn calls that echo each other in response to the cor anglais’s preceeding Rigi Ranz-like phrase ending (timbral outsider 3), reminiscent of the Alpine shepherd topic heard in the finale of Beethoven’s Pastoral Symphony and Wagner’s ‘alte Weise’ in Tristan, Act III, Scene 1. What is more, these topical gestures of calling – discussed in greater depth below – become associated with the only functional diatonic key and the desired, but ultimately unreachable outcome in the work’s double-tonic complex, C major. Conceptually coming from the ‘outside’, these small interruptions serve to suspend the tone poem’s meandering sequences and otherwise static processes in the Adornian sense of the material formal category. Nevertheless, these do not suspend the musical processes associated with human rationality and progress, as the suspensions do in Mahler’s music. They suspend the tone poem’s presentation of a subordinate kind of nature, to suggest that there might be something outside humanity’s experience of what is ‘outside’ – the flora and fauna,
and anything or anyone conflated with that category – that might have some agency, a capacity to interact, and change the course of human action.

This reading does not resonate well with the 1901 programme, which has not encouraged scholars to hear tears in the fabric of the work, but instead find processes to reflect a smooth unbroken gliding. Turning the score publisher’s program inside-out, however, we might come to a new interpretative reading that is closer to The Kalevala’s tragic hunting narrative implied by the title and Sibelius’s Kalevala extracts provided at the work’s premieres. In this reading, it is Lemminkäinen’s movement and motion in the underworld that is represented by the cor anglais’s melody and the sacred swan that responds. In the section that follows, a programme will be (re)constructed from these extracts that allows us to reconsider the role of Finnish mythology, landscape, and form in The Swan of Tuonela at a closer proximity so that a programmatic reading can proceed in Section 2.4. The following reading takes into account the significance of the timbral outsiders to give ‘them voice’, and builds on their various topoi including the funeral march at the work’s end (Va/Vb).

2.4 Sibelius’s Lemminkäinen Legends

In the context of Nordic ‘national romanticism’ in the 1890s, The Kalevala was drawn upon by artists who sought to create a distinctly Finnish style. It was approached as a seemingly ancient source of Finnish folk song and poetry, known as runo singing (runolaulu). In reality, Elias Lönnrot wove it together into a whole in the mid-nineteenth century from variants and fragments, mostly collected in Karelia, along with his own creative insertions. It is an example of what Eric Hobsbawn has called the ‘modern impulse for the “invention of tradition” for self-consciously political, ethnic, or sociocultural purposes’. The Kalevala presents a nostalgic and largely imagined vision of a Finnish pagan world and animistic beliefs.

---

95 Elias Lönnrot, Kalevala (Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran kirjapainossa, 1849).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Kevät laulu” orkesterille.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sinfonia runoelma (Aihe Lemminkäisen tarustta).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Lemminkäinen ja saaren neidot. Lemminkäinen lieto poika, Lasti laivan saaren päähän, Savon niemen merenlait.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Lemminkäinen Tuonenlaassa. Sano eti kyydätti, Kroonuita kiipepeari.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Tuonenlaan joutuen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Lemminkäinen palaa kotiinnoille. Sittä lieto Lemminkäinen, Ilta kunnii Erämaa, Lehto kunnia kauha, Marchesa uutat runaan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The programme is preserved in the Faltin Collection at the National Library of Finland. The order of the inner movements was reversed in 1935.\(^7\)

\(^7\) Wicklund, ‘Introduction’, Vol. 1/12a, XI.
Sibelius extracted passages from Lemminkäinen’s first and second cycles in *The Kalevala* to construct a composite plot for his suite of tone poems. Leaflets with these extracts were printed and distributed to audience members at the premieres of the first and second versions of the *Lemminkäinen* suite on 13 April 1896 and 1 November 1897 in Helsinki (Fig. 2.3). The programmatic plot of the suite begins with No. 1, *Lemminkäinen and the Maidens of the Island* (Fig. 2.4). The Don Juan-like Lemminkäinen, a shaman, demigod, and flawed hero, lands his boat on an island’s headland and visits its maidens. Once his desire for them is sated, he declares that it is time for him to leave. In response, the maidens of the island weep and groan, asking why he must leave them. This episode is one of several in *The Kalevala* that give Lemminkäinen his epithet of ‘wanton’.

**Figure 2.4** English translation of Sibelius’s printed programme for *Lemminkäinen*, Op. 22/1

I. *Lemminkäinen and the maidens of the Island* (Runo 29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lemminkäinen, wanton boy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran the ship to the isle’s end</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tip of the isle’s headland.</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then wanton Lemminkäinen</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went out visiting</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making merry with the isle’s lasses</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amid braided heads’ beauty.</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanton Lemminkäinen spoke</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Tis time for a boy to go</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On his way from these abodes</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From making merry with these lasses</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capering with these fair ones’</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now the island lasses wept</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The headland maids groaned:</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Why, Lemminkäinen, have you</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left, departed best of men?</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

98 The lines in English are from Elias Lönnrot, *The Kalevala* trans., Keith Bosley (Oxford University Press, 1989 and 2008). Punctuation and formatting have been amended to match Sibelius’s printed programme.
The order of the inner tone poems shown on Fig. 2.3 was reversed in 1935, many years after the premieres. Proceeding with the revised order of movements, The Swan of Tuonela is the next tone poem of the suite (Movement III. in Fig. 2.3). As the printed programme above shows, no Kalevala lines were provided as programmatic explanations for this. That Sibelius did not provide a text extract to compliment this movement is a striking narrative omission in comparison with the presence of extracts for the other three movements. We can assume from the title however, that Lemminkäinen has travelled to Tuonela, the land of the dead, otherwise known as Manala (‘the Dead Land’), where he sees the swan of death (Tuonelan joutsen) floating, and dies before the next tone poem. 99 With knowledge of the Kalevala, a narrative can be creatively extrapolated from the implications of the title, but this kind of knowledge cannot be assumed of audiences globally.

In the programme for No. 3, Lemminkäinen in Tuonela, Lemminkäinen’s mother senses that her son has ‘gone astray’ and begins to look for him (Fig. 2.5). She asks the sun if it has seen him and it replies that he has been killed in the ‘black river’ of Tuonela. She goes to the river and uses a rake to sift the ‘clear water’ for his body and pull it out. The mother then lulls Lemminkäinen back to ‘shape’ and ‘health’ by singing magical incantations. When he has been healed, the hero declares that he still lacks many things, namely his ‘heart’s desire’: the maids of the North.

Figure 2.5 English translation of Sibelius’s printed programme for Lemminkäinen, Op. 22/3 (Movement II in Fig. 2.2)

III. Lemminkäinen in Tuonela (Runo 15)

The mother sought the one gone, 115
Astray, for the lost she longs. 116
And she comes upon the sun. 179
To the sun she bows: 180
‘O sun, creature of God, 181
Have you not seen my son’ 182
The daylight reckoned: 186
‘Your son, luckless you 187
Has been lost, been killed 188
Down in Tuoni’s black river 189

99 ‘The Dead Land’ is Bosley’s translation of Manala throughout his translation of The Kalevala.
The programme extract for the fourth and last tone poem, *Lemminkäinen’s Return*, is the shortest (Fig. 2.6). After his miraculous resurrection, Lemminkäinen conjures horses from his cares and sorrows using magic. He rides home to the landscapes he once knew and presumably the place he departed at the beginning of the suite’s narrative: the shores, islands, straits, and moorings of his home.

**Figure 2.6** English translation of Sibelius’s printed programme for *Lemminkäinen*, Op. 22/4

IV. Lemminkäinen’s return (Runo 30)

Then wanton Lemminkäinen 481
He, the fair Farmind 482
Made his cares into horses 483
Sorrows into black geldings 484

When he arrived home 454
Knew the lands and knew the shores 455
Both the islands and the straits 456
Knew his old moorings 457
Places where he used to live 458
### Figure 2.7  Sibelius’s Plot Composite Lemminkäinen Narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Lemminkäinen’s Cycle 1</strong></th>
<th><strong>Lemminkäinen’s Cycle 2</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Runo 11</td>
<td><strong>Runo 29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey to a village (named Saari)</td>
<td>Journey to the island (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Making merry with lasses’</td>
<td>‘Making merry with the island lasses’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runo 12</td>
<td>Return Home (IVb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidnap of Kyllikki from Saari</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection of Kyllikki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runo 13</td>
<td>Runo 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey to the North</td>
<td>Journey to the North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting Tasks:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The Demon’s Elk</td>
<td>Return Home (IVa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runo 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Hiisi Gelding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Swan of Tuonela (II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemminkäinen’s Death</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runo 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemminkäinen’s Resurrection (III)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Return Home)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.7 shows the way in which Sibelius threaded together his narrative from the hero’s cycles via the conflation of similar events and through temporal collapse. The recurrence of the hero’s ‘making merry’ in *The Kalevala* can be understood as a kind of narrative portal that Sibelius’s plot passes through from Cycle 2 to Cycle 1 to compress Lemminkäinen’s quests. This initiates a kind of instantaneous collapse backwards through the cycles as they appear chronologically in *The Kalevala* that creates a direct alignment of temporally disjunct moments, much like the linearization of an unfolding in the process of reducing a Schenkerian foreground analysis. The plot folds back from the maidens of the island (Runo 29) to the maidens of Saari (Runo 11). If the narrative is unfolded in dialogue with *the Kalevala’s* cycles, an implied trajectory unravels and projects onward through Cycle 1’s seemingly impossible tasks to hunt three supernatural animals in order to win a bride, the maid of the North (Runos 13-14). These are conflated into one task in Sibelius’s quest narrative: to shoot the Swan of the underworld with a single arrow, which he fails to do. When the hero returns home with his mother at the end of Runo 15, the narrative is flung once more to the end of Cycle 30.
2 to conflate his return home from the island maidens with his return from a failed attempt at revenge in the North in Runo 30. The way that Sibelius’s construction jumps from one moment to another through its seams to give the appearance of seamlessness is characteristic of his treatment of rotational material in his music, as will be demonstrated in the next chapter with a theory of rotational projection.

2.4.1 Lemminkäinen’s Death

The short passage of *The Kalevala* that describes Lemminkäinen’s hunt for the swan can be used as a surrogate programme, by implication of the extracts for the tone poems that surround it and its title. During the vogue for *Kalevala* inspired artworks, which included Eino Leino’s play (1878-1926), which bore the same title and was based on the same swan passage of the epic (*Tuonelan Joutsen*, 1898), and *Lemminkäinen’s Mother* (1897), one of the many *Kalevala*-based paintings by Sibelius’s friend Akseli Gallen-Kallela (1865-1931), it is possible that Sibelius expected his audiences to know the swan narrative well enough for it to be implied by the title alone.

Lemminkäinen’s underworld episode begins with Louhi, the sorceress of the Northlands, instructing him to shoot the swan of Tuonela with a single arrow. Only then will he be worthy of her daughter as a wife (Fig. 2.8). In the pagan world of *The Kalevala*, the afterlife is depicted as an island surrounded by a rapid, dark river (the river of Tuonela) at its threshold. The Maiden or Daughter of Tuoni (*Tuonen Tyttö*) ferries the dead across the river to the island. Its depiction bares some similarities to the Greco-Roman mythological depiction of the underworld. Tuonela is not an evil hell but an afterlife for all the dead where they continue to need food and clothing as they did in the realm of the living. The first encounter with the Maiden of Tuonela in *The Kalevala*...

---

100 It should be noted that the events of Cycle 2 also parallel those in Cycle 1. Lemminkäinen travels to the Northlands, despite his mother’s warnings. On his journey there (Runo 26), he encounters supernatural ‘dooms’ that parallel Ilmarinen’s hunting tasks closely: 1) An eagle on the peak of a crag above river rapids; 2) A fiery ravine; 3) A wolf and a bear; and finally a huge serpent and counterpart to Märkähattu’s spear, which he enchants using the spell learnt from his mother at the end of Runo 15.

101 Eino Leino, *Tuonelan Joutsen; Sota Valosta* (Helsingissä: Kustannusosakeyhtiö Otava,1898).

is indeed also fairly prosaic: she is simply doing her washing. It therefore has a fairly uncanny position in the Kalevalaic world, as suspension does within a piece of music.

Figure 2.8 The Swan of Tuonela in The Kalevala, Runo 14: 373-94

| Louhi, mistress of the Northland | Then wanton Lemminkäinen |
| well, she put this into words: | he, the fair Farmind |
| 'I’ll only give my daughter | went to the swan’s whooping, to |
| and the young bride when you have | look for the long-neck |
| shot the swan from the river | out of Tuoni’s black river |
| from the stream the splendid fowl | from the dale of the Dead Land |
| out of Tuoni’s black river | and he swings along |
| from the holy stream’s whirlpool | warbles on his way |
| at a single try | towards Tuonela’s river |
| raising a single arrow? | to the holy stream’s whirlpool |
| | shouldering his great crossbow |
| | a quiverful on his back. |

After Lemminkäinen’s movement towards the swan, the remaining lines of Runo 14 contain the most striking event to be suppressed in Sibelius’s Lemminkäinen Suite programme (lines 395-460). As Lemminkäinen ‘warbles’ towards the ‘whooping’ swan, ‘Dripcap the herdsman’, also known as Märkähattu or Pohjolan Paiman (The Shepherd of the Northland), has sneakily followed him to the underworld. In vengeance for Lemminkäinen’s earlier actions in The Kalevala, he conjures a serpent with the river’s water and hurls it through the hero’s heart, liver, and ‘left armpit into his right shoulderblade.’ As he dies, Lemminkäinen apostrophizes his mother, reprimanding himself for disregarding her warnings, and wishes he had asked her for the magic words to heal ‘the hurts of water snakes, the bites of serpents’. After the hero’s soliloquy, the herdsman pushes Lemminkäinen’s body into the water and it swirls through the rapids towards the island of Tuonela. The ‘bloody son of Tuoni’ cuts him into eight pieces and tosses him back into the river though Sibelius only leaves a subtle trace of Lemminkäinen’s violent death and visceral resurrection from ‘a mass of entrails’.  

103 Lönnrot, The Kalevala, Runo 16, lines 167-70.
104 Ibid., Runo 14, lines 375-396.
105 Ibid., Runo 14, lines 409-12.
106 Ibid., Runo 14, lines 423-44.
107 Ibid., Runo 14, lines 446-52 and Runo 15, line 267.
Considering the Suite’s implied plot contains such a prominent event – Lemminkäinen’s death – it is remarkable that Sibelius did not include any of the lines from this passage in his printed programmes. It throws new light on the significance of the funeral march at the end of the tone poem.

Two shamanic themes emerge from the legend that might be used productively in conjunction with a programmatic analysis of *The Swan of Tuonela*. These themes are not immediately obvious from the lines in Figure 2.8: communication across great distances with animals as well as people from different lands, and entering into a trance state, a kind of meditation, to do so. These will now be explicated in conjunction with this paratextual framework for the tone poem, as well as with the first paratext attached to its musical material: the planned libretto for Sibelius’s unfinished opera, *The Building of The Boat* (c.1893). A narrative reading will then proceed in which the cor anglais is aligned with the hero Lemminkäinen rather than the swan – his own ‘warbling’ runo singing and ‘swaying’ movement through the land of the dead – and the timbral outsiders, with the sound of the swan in the distance.

### 2.4.2 The Building of the Boat and Yoiking

At its core, Lönnrot’s epic is about the negotiation between the inhabitants of the geographical north and south of an imagined ancient Finland. The cold northern landscape of *Pohjola* or *Sariola* (the Northland) is portrayed as the domain of Louhi, and her daughter, the Maid of the North. The Southern Kalevala of the epic’s title (‘the abode of Kaleva’) is the homeland of the male heroes, Väinämöinen, Ilmarinen, Lemminkäinen, and Kullervo. In this gendered and dualistic landscape, it is clear that the mystical North and its inhabitants are presented as a kind of ‘otherworld’, as Tarkka has observed. It is exoticized in a manner that is similar to the early British writers’ perception of Finland as a whole, discussed in Chapter 1.108 Tarkka argues that in Karelian folk poetry, the women are largely presented as ‘objects or means of exchange,

---

brides, representatives of the supranormal, [and] associated with death or bestiality'.

While Lemminkäinen’s shaman-like mother is an exception, Tarkka’s observation applies to The Kalevala’s presentation of women too, especially the Maiden of the North: Lemminkäinen’s promised bride.

All the Kalevala heroes, excluding Kullervo, must travel to this ‘other world’ of Tuonela to complete their quests in exchange for the Maid of the North. Väinämöinen’s underworld adventure (Runo 16), which follows directly after Lemminkäinen’s in The Kalevala (Runos 14-5), was in fact the core of Sibelius’s abandoned opera, The Building of the Boat (Veneen Luominen), and the first paratext associated with the musical material of The Swan of Tuonela. In the summer of 1893, Sibelius was planning an opera with a libretto by the Finnish poet, J. H. Erkko.

Little is known about how Sibelius recycled his incomplete opera or the early composition of the Lemminkäinen suite, but it is widely recognized that The Swan of Tuonela was revised from the opera’s overture. With the opera’s sketches lost, is not possible to investigate the implications of the specific changes to the musical material when it was moved from the opera to the new context of the suite. Yet the remarkable similarities between the programmatic plots – especially in the Tuonela episodes (Figure 2.9) – invite The Building of the Boat to be used as a second-level paratext to frame an analytical reading of The Swan of Tuonela.

Tarkka argues that not only is The Kalevala structured as a kind of geographic dialogue between North and South, and the realms of living and dead, but that the ‘thematic level of the poetry is likewise determined by dialogism: dia logos means literally “speaking across,” communication across existential or social borders’.

---

109 Ibid, 250.
110 The mother’s journey to retrieve and heal her son with expert shamanistic knowledge is a counterpart to the male heroes’ quests. She is also a Virgin Mary-like figure.
111 Wicklund, ‘Introduction’, Vol. 1/12a, VIII.
112 Ibid. An English translation of Sibelius’s letter to J. H. Erkko, dated 8 July 1893, outlines their agreed plot for The Building of the Boat. The letter is quoted in Tawaststjerna, Sibelius, Vol. 1, 141-42. Barnett suggests that it is highly likely that material was also recycled in Sibelius’s symphonic poem, Skogsrådet (The Wood Nymph), Op. 15 (1894-95). See Barnett, Sibelius, 95.
113 Tarkka, ‘Other Worlds’, 251.
Tuoni who is in the distance on the island. He calls across the river to the Maid, establishing a kind of spatially detached dialogue. While the sonic exchange between Lemminkäinen and the swan does not have a specific linguistic structure in The Kalevala, the verbal exchange between Väinämöinen and the Maid of Tuoni is a repetitive and strictly structured call and response that recurs several times in The Kalevala.

Figure 2.9 Comparison of Lemminkäinen’s and Väinämöinen’s Tuonela plots in The Kalevala

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lemminkäinen (Runos 14-15)</th>
<th>Väinämöinen (Runo 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lemminkäinen ‘warbles’ towards the ‘whooping’ Swan that floats on the river of Tuonela.</td>
<td>Väinämöinen asks the Maid of Tuoni to send a boat across the river so he can get to the island. He lies to her three times before revealing why he is there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemminkäinen is impaled by a water serpent conjured by the vengeful herdsman, Märkähattu.</td>
<td>Once on the island, Väinämöinen is sent to sleep by poisoned beer full of worms and tadpoles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Son of Tuoni cuts Lemminkäinen’s body to pieces and throws it into the river.</td>
<td>The Son of Tuoni weaves a seine to stop Väinämöinen from escaping Tuonela.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemminkäinen’s mother rakes the river of Tuonela and resurrects her son using magic.</td>
<td>Väinämöinen wakes up and magically transforms into an animal to escape through the river’s net.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They both leave Tuonela and go home.</td>
<td>Väinämöinen flees Tuonela.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The syntax of this dialogue can be productively aligned with the calls and responses between the cor anglais and timbral outsiders in The Swan of Tuonela. The verbal dialogue in between Väinämöinen and the Maid in Tuonela has a three-part structure: question, answer, and response (Fig. 2.10). After Väinämöinen asks the Maid to send him a boat to cross the river, she replies by asking what has brought him to Tuonela as a living being (the question). He lies about the cause of his death four times (the answer) before finally telling her the truth. After each excuse, the Maid calls him a fraud and reframes his answer as a conditional clause to point out the flaws in his claims (the response) before asking again what brought him to Tuonela (the question). The cyclic question-answer-response process then re-begins. These have a musical parallel in the moments surrounding each emergence of a ‘timbral outsider’: these outsiders echo the thematic-motivic content of the cor anglais line (the answer), but ‘dispute’ its content by...

114 The question is sometimes expressed as a command to answer the original question truthfully.
transforming it topically and harmonically (the response and question), as well as causing a thematic shift that affects the soloist in the following section. In Leino’s play, *Tuonela Joutsen*, he actually conflates both Tuonela episodes - Lemminkäinen rather than Väinämöinen encounters the Maid of Tuoni and enters into a dialogue with her across the river before a failed and ultimately fatal attempt to shoot the swan of Death. This further emphasises the flexible approach that artists took to the runo material in *The Kalevala* and suggests the appropriateness of overlaying one paratext over the other in a reading of Sibelius’s *Swan of Tuonela*.

**Figure 2.10**  
*The Kalevala*, Runo 16: 209-14 in English

---

**Tuonen Tyttö**  
**Question 2**  
‘Say truly, Väinämöinen: say truly the second time!’

**Väinämöinen**  
**Answer 2**  
‘Steady old Väinämöinen uttered and spoke thus:

'The stunted girl of Tuoni the squat maid of the Dead Land uttered a word and spoke thus:

*I can see a liar! If water got you to Death the billow to Tuonela your clothes would pour water, your hems would be dripping.*

**Tuonen Tyttö**  
**Response 2**  
'I can see a liar! If water got you to Death the billow to Tuonela your clothes would pour water, your hems would be dripping.'

---

Moreover, in the context of *The Kalevala* it is plausible that Lemminkäinen might have a meaningful exchange with an animal such as a swan, especially a sacred and supernatural one. Shamans could transform into animals in their trance states, as stated above, and there are many conversations with animals in the epic. For instance, there is a repetitive back and forth between Lemminkäinen’s mother and a bee when she

---

attempts to heal her son in the following Runo and hallooing across hills by other figures in other runos, which structurally resemble the conversation between Väinämöinen and the Maid of Tuoni, although Sibelius does not include these in his extracts for No. 3.

David Haas believes it fitting that the swan’s song take the form of conjunct mid-range phrases in the English horn because ‘the legendary creature sings in a language comprehensible to humans’, which is presumably a reference to the circumpolar symbolism of the migratory water bird in Finnish folk mythology, which has the ability to pass between realms and communicate with the living.116 According to Antti Lahelma, the seasonal arrival of the birds from ‘the south signalled spring and life, and their departure was a sign of autumn and death’.117 Yet when the work is framed by the paratext of Lemminkäinen’s hunting task the soloist’s melodic line can be understood quite literally as a representation of a human vocal range. Interpreted alongside the narrative of Runo 14, the melody is realigned with Lemminkäinen’s sound and motion, his ‘warbling’ and ‘swinging’ through the realm of the dead towards the swan. Sibelius’s writing for the soloist only utilizes the mellow-toned equivalent range of the countertenor or contralto vocal range on the cor anglais. What is more, an alternative translation of the swan-passage in The Kalevala reveals an even greater sonic interaction than Keith Bosley’s translation, or any other English translation, implies. Bosely translates the line, ‘Läksi joutsenen joruhun’ as ‘went to the swan’s whooping […]’ in order to retain some semblance of the Kalevalaic trochaic tetrameter.118 His translation also communicates the Finnish ‘whooper’ swan’s distinctive call (laulujoutsen literally translates as ‘song-swan’), which Sibelius himself claimed was ‘obviously a sarrusophone sound’.119 Other translations of this particular line have omitted it entirely: John Martin Crawford replaces it with Lemminkäinen’s ‘twangling crossbow’, as does W. F. Kirby.

117 Antti Lahelma, ‘Strange swans and odd ducks: interpreting the ambiguous waterfowl imagery of Lake Onega’, 22; V. Napoltsikh, ‘Proto-Uralic world picture: a reconstruction’ in M. Hoppál and J. Pentikäinen (eds), Northern Religions and Shamanism, (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1992), 3-20 at 23.
119 Jean Sibelius, Diary entry dated 21 April 1915 quoted in Hepokoski, Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 36. It is this diary entry that has led many to associate the finale theme of the Fifth Symphony with the flight of swans over Sibelius’s forest home, Ainola.
whilst Eino Friberg simply translates it as ‘singing’. Yet if the compact meaning of the obscure word ‘joruhun’ – the cause of this translational confusion – is unpacked, it expresses a ‘repetitious, monotonous, squawking or chirping, yoiking sound’. The ‘yoiking’ of the translation also implies a transformation and sonic exchange. It is a kind of Sami folk song that is not just an imitation of another person or animal, but was traditionally at least, intended to magically transform the singer into that person or animal. As Lemminkäinen moves towards the swan he imitates its calls and it imitates him. When framed by the paratexts of Väinämöinen’s and Lemminkäinen’s Tuonela interactions, the moments of suspension can be read as questioning and animistic responses. What is more, its illative case ending of ‘Joruhun’ – one of the Finnish language’s locative cases – suggests that Lemminkäinen is actually walking or meditating ‘into’ that complex sound.

Though Tuonela is a spiritual realm, there are several descriptions of the heroes’ physical journeys to Tuonela. For instance, we are told that Väinämöinen ‘trips along’ for three weeks through different lands defined by their plant life – brush, cherry, and juniper each for a week – until ‘the Dead Land’s isle appeared [and] Tuoni’s hillock gleams’. According to Tarkka these descriptions are to be taken as metaphorical depictions of entering a trance state induced by chanting incantations that allowed shamans to travel to other spiritual realms like Tuonela or the heavens. The process of inducing a trance and the journey of the soul was likened to a physical journey though one landscape to arrive at another when the trance state was attained. Other examples in the folk sources and Kalevala include ‘diving in the form of an animal, drifting in the sea, falling into a hole on a path, sinking, or flying’ and often involve crossing the threshold of a body of water like the river of Tuonela. The Finnish words for falling

121 ‘yksitoikkoinen, uikuttava, joikuva ääni’ in Aimo Turunen, Kalevalan sanat ja niiden taustat (Karjalaisen kulttuurin edistämissäätiö, 1979, second ed. 1981). The fact that the ‘h’ in Joruhun is not elided in the word indicates that it is from the Finnish Pojhanmaa (Ostrobothnia) dialect. The obscurity of the word, which would have very likely been esoteric even to Sibelius’s audiences at the premiere of Lemminkäinen, is one possible reason for the omission of a text extract for The Swan of Tuonela in the 1896 and 1897 printed concert programmes.
122 Ibid., Runo 16, lines 151-8.
123 Tarkka, ‘Other Worlds’, 266.
124 Ibid., 267.
‘into a trance’, *langeta loveen*, translate literally as going ‘into a chasm’: an etymological remnant of the shamanistic belief that inaccessible gaps in rocks contained magic.\(^{125}\)

The textual void or chasm created paratextually by the absence of a programme for *The Swan of Tuonela* therefore invites an audience to read absence symbolically as signifying Lemminkäinen trance-induced descent to Tuonela. In light of this metaphor, Lemminkäinen’s encounter with the swan at the end of Runo 14 in *The Kalevala* can be read metaphorically as a trance state in which the hero walks towards the sound but not necessarily the sight of the swan, which is described in quasi-musical terms.

At the opening of Sibelius’s *Swan of Tuonela*, the hero’s spirit reaches the threshold of Tuonela, rather than simply the surroundings themselves: the rising steam from the ‘raging rapids’ of the black river surge into the foreground of his senses, as they do in the audience’s experience in the orchestral illusion of a sound object moving towards them. The opening surge and shifting string textures of each section’s backdrop can also be read as a musical representation of entering and sustaining the trance state induced by the shaman’s rhythmic singing or chanting. As the physical journey to Tuonela is a metaphor for entering a trance in *The Kalevala*, so might the musical sound sheet be taken as a representation of the trance state in which Lemminkäinen or Väinämöinen travels through Tuonela. It is in this way that the trance state fits neatly with the concept of *Klang*-meditation. The sound-sheet is doubly symbolic of the water of the underworld and the trance-state of the shaman. His physical body is in one place – externally static – but his mind or soul is elsewhere and moving through a landscape – internally moving. Such a reading is further reinforced by the lack of sound-sheet in the following movement (No. 3, *Lemminkäinen in Tuonela*), which is also set in the underworld landscape but involves his mother’s journey to resurrect him. The contrast in musical processes between these movements suggests that the sheet is not merely a musical representation of a landscape, but it is particular to Lemminkäinen’s trance.

\(^{125}\) Bosley, ‘Notes’ in *The Kalevala*, 671-72. In Runo 17, Väinämöinen enters the mouth/grave of the ancient, buried, giant, Anteron Vipunen, to retrieve some magical words. As the hero tortures the giant from the inside, Väinämöinen likens him to a chasm where the words are hidden (Runo 17, line 524).
2.5 Dialogic Voices in The Swan of Tuonela

2.5.1 Section I: Skeuomorphic Cadences and Diatonic Souls

The first phrase, P^{1.1} (Ex. 2.1, bb. 5-8), is in some ways, an archetype for the following phrases, although it is subtly and irreversibly transformed in each section.\textsuperscript{126} The phrase consists of the aforementioned appoggiatura, which resolves down to $\mathsf{5}$ of the phrase’s implied key centre, in this case B$_{b}$ minor, and then drops a fifth before wandering up through the key’s triad back to $\mathsf{5}$, F, thereby prolonging this pitch (Ex. 2.2). B$_{b}$ acts both as a diatonic key centre, and a common tone: a centre around which the third-related triads rearrange themselves to create the phrase’s harmonic progression (G$_{7}$, B$_{7}$, G$_{7}+$, E$_{7}$, B$_{7}$).

P^{1.1}’s B$_{b}$-minor centre is not confirmed by a standard diatonic cadence and neither are any of the other phrases in Section I. Nevertheless, the phrases do end with a peculiar cadential $\frac{4}{4}$-like figure that winds its way up from the lower end of the strings – specifically the solo cello and solo viola – to strengthen the implied key centres (Ex. 2.3: bb. 7-9; and Ex. 2.3: 10-12; 14-16) and gather enough momentum to push through into the next chromatic transposition of the phrase. Heard within the predominantly diatonic context of Western art music, these gestures are one example of the ‘tonal debris’ heard by Adorno in Sibelius’s music (see Chapter 1.1.2). Though the rhetoric at these moments is strong enough to be identified as cadential, various elements of a cadential $\frac{4}{4}$ are missing. The broken chords in the lower strings outline something ambiguously between a V-i and a V$_{7}$$\frac{4}{3}$ motion, while the harmonizing violins are resistant to the cadential rhetoric and do not resolve their suspended chords at any point to a V$_{3}$.

Example 2.2 Voice-leading Graph: Section I, Phrase 1, bars 5-8

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{Example2.2.png}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{126} The acronym ‘P’ will be used for ‘Phrase’ in the analysis of The Swan of Tuonela, not to be confused with Hepokoski and Darcy’s acronym for ‘Primary Theme’. 
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The diatonic debris might also be understood as skeuomorphic: ‘an ornament or ornamental design on an artefact resulting from the nature of the material used or the method of working it’ and the replication of this ornamental design on a derivative object made from a different material, that makes the ornamental design obsolete from a functional perspective. Common skeuomorphs include digital imitations of analogue hardware. For instance, the sound of a SLR shutter click made by a mobile phone or digital camera or the optical illusion of three-dimensional buttons on digital audio interfaces that mimic physical soundboards and synthesizers are both examples. These design residues no longer have the same practical function as the original object that they were an inherent part of, and from this perspective, they are obsolete. Nevertheless, they do have a function beyond mere ornament. The skeuomorph imbues a sense of familiarity that allows the derivative object to be understood and used easily by transferring the concrete experiences of the original artefact to the new one, in spite of its unfamiliar material. In late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century music, the bits and pieces of ‘tonal rubble’ that are severed from their functional context can be heard as diatonic symbols of cadential resolution and tonal stability, thereby retaining a memory of their diatonic function within that system, even when they no longer actually functioning in that manner in their new context. They feel familiar and unfamiliar at once.

In the early reception of the tone poem, Rosa Newmarch reads the lower strings’ figure programmatically as ‘the farewell signal of some soul passing to Tuonela’. On the one hand, the musical figure retains some of the function of a half cadence within the diatonic system, albeit as a faded memory. Resolution from the dominant to a local root-position tonic is deferred as the gesture persistently pushes through the threshold of each phrase into the next, perhaps as other souls surrounding the hero move further across the river of Tuonela towards their final resting place on the island. On the other

hand, the figure is a synecdoche of the whole tonal system in which a simple resolution of dissonance is a possibility. The figure becomes a symbol of that resolution in juxtaposition to its cadence-less musical surroundings and in the absence of any more clearly established keys. By refining Newmarch’s reading, the figure can be equated to a remnant or an idealized vision of all the possibilities of fulfilment and wholeness associated with a soul’s or various souls’ former lives and with diatonicism itself as a superseded and now archaic musical system. Within the setting of the underworld – associated with the upper-string textures – a return to a past life is now totally unobtainable, but there is a flicker of resistance against its backdrop in the ‘dead land’. This flickering is perhaps only possible at the liminal boundary of the river: the souls have not yet reached the island of the dead – functionless tonality – but have left the now idealized, realm of the living – functional diatonicism.

On a small-scale then, tonic-dominant relationships are implied within each version of the cor anglais’s phrase by its triadic contour, aspects of its harmonization, and the cadential $\ddagger$-like figure that accompanies it. On a large-scale, however, The Swan of Tuonela lacks a diatonic structure, as it will become clear as this analysis unfolds. While the phrases are internally prolongational, they move to one another sequentially via chromatic transposition, as in Section I, or by transformation in other sections. There is no rest on any local tonic for more than a few bars at a time and this can be likened as successfully to Lemminkäinen’s or Väinämöinen’s wandering towards the swan, as it is to the souls’ journeys across the river. Section I ascends chromatically from A minor in the opening string chords to B♭ minor in P$^{1.1}$, and continues to search for a suitable key through B minor, C minor, an implied C♯ minor centre in P$^{1.2}$ to P$^{1.4}$, and returning to A minor by the end of Phrase 5, which breaks the rising sequence (Ex. 2.4). Like P$^{1.1}$, these phrases all end with the same cadential $\ddagger$-like figure in the lower strings, excluding P$^{1.4}$ and P$^{1.5}$. P$^{1.1}$ to P$^{1.4}$ all prolong $\ddagger$ of their key centres to create an ascending chromatic upper-voice line of F, F♯, G, momentarily G♯, and finally A at the end of P$^{1.5}$. These prolonged pitches are all the chromatic variants of A minor’s upper trichord, as Howell observes. 129

129 Howell, Jean Sibelius, 222.
Example 2.4

The Swan of Tuonela,
Section I, Phrases 2-3,
bars 9-15.
Example 2.4 continued

The Swan of Tuonela, Section I, Phrases 4-5, bars 16-22.


2.5.2 Section I: Sonorous Voice Leading

The presence of diatonic gestures including the cadential-§ figures and evaded cadence at the end of Section I, along with the importance of parsimonious voice-leading in the work – which, at times, even surpasses vertical consonance – invite a Schenkerian reading. This methodology is not without its drawbacks in its application to Sibelius’s post-tonal harmony, though it is productive in highlighting the aforementioned diatonic moments and how they relate to one another on a structural scale. Taken as a whole and viewed in retrospect from the end of Section I, as Schenkerian analysis tends to, it is tempting to interpret A minor as a certain harmonic goal with 5 of the key, E, as the Kopfton. In this reading, there is an ascent from 5 (b. 1) to 1 (b. 21) and the prolonged pitches of P\textsuperscript{1.2} and P\textsuperscript{1.4} fall away as chromatic passing notes in the tonal hierarchy of the passage.

Example 2.5 Voice-leading Graph: Section I, bars 1-22

This kind of reading does not account for the importance of sonority to the tone poem’s voice-leading structure or the moment-to-moment experience of the motion between keys, however. In The Swan of Tuonela, various combinations of individual instrument timbres arising from Sibelius’s orchestration become associated with different voices.\(^{130}\) The homophonic string choir that otherwise shrouds the cor anglais from above and below with densely orchestrated chords, responds to each of the soloist’s phrases (P\textsuperscript{1.1} and P\textsuperscript{1.3}: bb. 5-8; 12-15), with a compressed variation of the same phrase two octaves

---

\(^{130}\) Howell, Sibelius the Progressive, 222.
higher (P^{1.2} and P^{1.4}: bb. 9-11; 16-18). The division of the chromatic line between the soloist and orchestra in Section I creates a kind of double and timbral voice-leading. As a result of this division, the soloist prolongs the pitches F♯ and G♯ and the violins' sharp-side responses prolong the pitches F♯ and G♯. The ascents are graphically differentiated with separate beams in the voice-leading graph, Ex. 2.6. The strings' G♯ is not neutralized or to be interpreted as a chromatic passing note as it is in the first voice-leading graph above (Ex. 2.5). When the cor anglais finally reaches A in Phrase 5, it is at the pinnacle of the ascent through the A natural-minor scale, while the strings have climbed the ascending A melodic-minor scale. From the perspective of sonorous voice-leading, A is approached by G♯ and G♮ (Ex. 2.6). This passage presents a special kind of modal mixture, not of major and minor, but of different conceptions of the minor scale. The chromatic line that arises from a straightforwardly linear reading, as Ex. 2.5 shows, does not do justice to the speci

![Example 2.6](image)

The concept of sonorous voice-leading prolonged through, against, and layered over dissonances in a way that stretches Schenkerian analysis almost to a breaking point. Such a reading also resists further reduction to a certain extent. In order to represent The Swan of Tuonela’s almost consistent division of simultaneous voices into instrument groups, a flexible use of voice-

---

131 The natural minor scale utilizes the same collection as the descending melodic minor.
leading notation is required that communicates the smooth lines even when they are non-congruent with each other. The graphs in chapter and elsewhere in the thesis are thus referred to as ‘voice-leading graphs’ in recognition that they apply Schenkerian principles flexibly and in an unorthodox fashion as a reflection of the music’s treatment of tonality, and because these graphs place most importance on representing voice-leading patterns in Sibelius’s music, rather than long-range diatonic progressions.

As established, the soloist and orchestral backdrop can be associated with aspects of the programme: Lemminkäinen and his experience of Tuonela’s river and landscape. These same aspects therefore also become associated with the distinct voices and collections that they ‘voice’. Despite the attempts of the hero to blend in by singing in the only musical style available in Tuonela, the lament, his associated collection conflicts with that of Tuonela – in other words, the strings – much like the rising cadential figures or passing souls resist the harmonizing backdrop. Section I, and its partial reprise in the Epilogue, are the only passages where the violins have such an obvious responsorial role. They otherwise recede into a sonorous backdrop and harmonizing shroud. The string responses in Section I therefore might be heard as Tuonela’s echoes of the hero’s singing across the river that at once conflict with him as a living presence, and also draw him further into its landscape as the Section ascends sequentially.

2.5.3 Section I: The Double-Tonic Complex

In The Swan of Tuonela, Howell sees ‘the gradual establishment of one diatonic key as the outcome of the whole work’. A minor continually resurfaces in The Swan of Tuonela until it is omnipresent as a pedal in Section V’s funeral march. Though the key is gradually established as a key centre by its consistent reappearance at the beginnings of sections, it is neither tonicized by its dominant, which is almost totally absent in the piece, nor confirmed through cadential means at all. Thus A minor cannot be understood to be a diatonic key as straightforwardly as Howell suggests. It is only a key

132 Howell, Sibelius the Progressive, 220.
133 Triads built from a root of E only appear as passing Dorian inflected minor chords.
centre due to its sheer presence. This inescapable centre presumably makes the overarching harmonic structure of the piece static, as Hepokoski and Grimley argue. Yet to claim that its tonal structure is static implies that A minor is a stable centre from the outset, which it is not, and denies the sense of gradual ‘coming into being’ of the key, revealed by Howell’s analysis. It would require ignoring, too, the changing experience of the tonal processes through time, in favour of a fixed retrospective view of the piece that collates all the A minor appearances as definitively established tonics. Furthermore, there are also other subtle tonal processes at work in The Swan of Tuonela that work through and against the A minor backdrop and disrupt Howell’s reading of forward directedness towards the A minor pedal in Section V.

A minor is certainly a global tonic of stifling gravity but it is not a certain outcome from the outset or the only tonal goal suggested. Glimpses of C major also stand out against an endless progression of minor triads in The Swan of Tuonela. This is not a secondary key. Though A minor’s presence dominates the piece, it is as uncertain as a key centre. Instead, C major is presented as a viable and hopeful diatonic alternative to its relative. Unlike A minor’s absent dominant, C major’s is present and active, even if it only appears in seemingly half-remembered cadential gestures in the second inversion. For a while at least, both A minor and C major are presented as tonal possibilities because neither are fully established with cadences. The two keys are in a state of flux until bar 73 where the A minor pedal extends to the end, finally quashing the relative major and any hope of establishing this key.

Bailey does not frame his ‘double-tonic complex theory as such, but it is easy to see how the concept of a double-tonic complex – a large-scale tonal system of equals – arose from an essentially Schoenbergian understanding of the history and ‘rightful’ progression of tonality in the nineteenth century whereby the hierarchical status of harmonic features was eventually flattened out to the point where these became equally and freely interchangeable: minor with major, IV with V, and V with I. When it comes to the equal presentation of third-related major and minor triads as a double-tonic complex, Bailey acknowledges that the A-C pairing may well have grown out of the
‘traditional close relationship between A minor and C major’ as relatives.\textsuperscript{134} Given the above argument, it seems appropriate that when the keys surface in \textit{The Swan of Tuonela}, they may also retain some of the hierarchical functional associations of earlier nineteenth-century music: that the minor ‘bears an additional burden’ and is ‘a sign of a troubled condition seeking transformation’ to the major mode as Hepokoski and Darcy put it.\textsuperscript{135} In Wagner’s \textit{Tristan}, however, the relative relationship of the keys is significantly complicated and surpassed by their presentation in a chromatic context where there is no tonally or thematically subordinate area for one key to permanently occupy like a secondary key area does in a sonata form, for example. Given that neither key is stated at the outset of Wagner’s Prelude and is only implied by dominants, the simple diatonic statement of A or C in any mode is the goal. Both are achieved at the end of Act I with the cadence in A minor that concludes \textit{Tristan}’s final speech, followed immediately by a cadence in C major at the end of the stage trumpet fanfare.\textsuperscript{136}

In \textit{The Swan of Tuonela}, quite a different approach is taken. In fact, almost the inverse occurs. Unlike \textit{Tristan}’s double-tonic complex, which is largely implied by the appearance of the dominants of A and C rather than the chords themselves, A minor is stated immediately without its dominant, which is almost totally absent for the piece, as established. The key’s dominant is conspicuous in its absence in juxtaposition to the flickering diatonicism of C major’s active dominant, which is loaded with the expressive potential of future escape from the gravity of the minor mode. \textit{The Swan of Tuonela} therefore does not involve a gradual establishment of A minor or the constant suppression of the relative C major by its oppressive presence, but a state of flux between the two as manifestations of different tonalities – fleeting, but nevertheless rupturing, functional diatonicism and a flat and functionless, a ‘dead’, non-functional diatonicism – in its double-tonic complex.

This key relationship is established at the end of Section I, when the third element in the relationship between the sound-sheet and cor anglais and their associated natural

\textsuperscript{134} Bailey, 121.
\textsuperscript{135} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, 306.
\textsuperscript{136} Bailey gives no bar numbers here.
and melodic A-minor collections emerges: the first appearance of C major tonality. Although Section I seemingly ascends through the key’s upper trichord, the key is not a viable tonic on a moment-to-moment basis any more than the other keys that the phrases fleetingly rest on. In fact, there is nothing to indicate that it will be a tonal centre of the whole tone poem other than its structural location and clear root-position voicing at the beginning and end of the section.

As the last phrase of Section I, \( P_{1.5} \), interrupts the upward chromatic sequence of phrases to prevent it from ascending any further and also suggests C major as a possible diatonic centre. Before the cellos and violas can reassert the C\(_\flat\) minor centre of the violin’s \( P_{1.4} \) (bb. 15-18) with their cadential \( \text{vi} \) soul-figure, the phrase is suddenly elided with the soloist’s \( P_{1.5} \) (bb. 19-22) and no such cadential figure is heard. In this final phrase, the cor anglais pulls the violins’ prolonged G\(_\flat\) back down to G\(_\flat\) and the local key centre is turned away from C\(_\flat\) back towards C\(_\sharp\) (b. 18:4), but this time C major: the first appearance of the other half of the double-tonic complex. The sudden glimpse of C major interrupts the echoing strings and breaks the upward sequence of minor keys, momentarily stopping the hero in his tracks. This flash of C major might be interpreted as the swan coming into Lemminkäinen’s gaze in the distance, but perhaps only in retrospect of the accrual of association between the key and the swan, cemented by the third emergence of the timbral other.

In a rare moment of diatonic clarity, and perhaps a forecast of later structural events, the phrase proceeds with a cadential \( \text{vi} \). The diatonic resolution to C major here is as fleeting as the diatonic glimpses provided by the soul figures in the solo viola and cellos, but here it is intensified due to the voicing of the cadential rhetoric at the forefront of the texture in the soloist’s melody. At the end of bar 19, there is a decorated closing descent from C major’s \( \hat{3} \) to \( \hat{1} \). The soloist has the final harmonic word of the section, and its associated natural minor collection prevails. The tones prolonged by the cor anglais prior to \( P_{1.5} - F\sharp \) and G\(_\sharp\) – are revealed not just to be those belonging to A natural minor, but also C major’s scale. In Section I, the soloist acts as a kind of pivot between these keys. Nevertheless, the harmonizing violins do not conform to the cor anglais’s
outline of a cadential $\frac{4}{4}-\frac{3}{4}$ progression, and simply hold the $\frac{4}{4}$ through the bar. The C+::PAC is thereby evaded and the glimpse of a warm diatonic-major vanishes as the progression over-shoots and descends by step to A minor. The swan is out of reach and cannot be shot yet, but the glimpse of its associated key nevertheless provides a moment of hope that the hunting task can be completed and that a stable diatonic key centre can be attained. Lemminkäinen’s desire to shoot the swan and win the Maiden of the North is not yet sated and the desire for resolution to the key of C major is deferred. Section I thus closes on a tonic, A minor, but not the tonic as there are two alternatives, neither of which are cadentially confirmed.

C major is revealed to be a possible global tonic sharing the same Kopfton (E) as A minor, but reinterpreted as $\frac{3}{4}$ and this is reaffirmed later in the piece. The Swan of Tuonela thus has a double-tonic Kopfton: two modal harmonizations of the same Kopfton, like two sides of the same coin. The complex is seductive and siren-like: one of its sides might be associated with the beautiful and alluring vision of the gliding swan/maid and the other with the bestial and deadly threat of the serpent spear wielded by Markhattu and death, but these sides are both part of the underworld, and represented by a single Kopfton, E.

2.5.4 Section II: Multivalent Voice Leading and Timbral Outsider 1

In Section II (bb. 23-35), the deflection of C major and all other major mode keys continues as the hero steps further into the underworld after the swan. The section meanders down sequential pathways that are uncovered by new elements arising from the phrase’s shifting contour. This perpetual embellishment leads the sonorous voices in more than one harmonic direction. It is in this respect that Section II takes the sonorously associated voice-leading of Section I a step further. While Section I’s voices oscillate between different instrument groups, taking it in turns to sound the notes of collections, Section II’s voices start to move independently of one another simultaneously to create complex multiply directed voice-leading.
The first phrase of Section II, P\textsuperscript{2.1} (bb. 23-24), moves sequentially through a cycle of fifths (10-10 LIP) from A- at the end of Section I, to D- and G\textsuperscript{++}, at which point the cycle becomes a ii-V cadential progression back towards the alternative tonic, C major (Ex. 2.7). Nevertheless, resolution and tonicization of the relative major, C, is denied yet again as the whole phrase slips down a semitone at the beginning of P\textsuperscript{2.2} (bb. 25-27) creating an effect of hushed wonderment at the new harmonic and timbral surroundings as the soaring first violins drop out. C\textsuperscript{+} major becomes the new harmonic goal of the transposed cadential progression (D\textsuperscript{+} and G\textsuperscript{++}), yet even this major key is deflected by a relative transformation: from G\textsuperscript{++} in bar 26 to E\textsuperscript{+} in bar 27 in the cor anglais and violins only. Although E\textsuperscript{+} is an evasion of the immediate harmonic context – the cadential progression – it is not entirely out of place here. If P\textsuperscript{2.2} is interpreted as a transposition of the phrase archetype a perfect fourth higher, albeit with an accumulation of melodic embellishments from previous phrases (Ex. 2.8), E\textsuperscript{+} is an expected harmonic conclusion.\textsuperscript{137} Furthermore, $\hat{5}$ of this local key is prolonged in the cor anglais’s melody and violins’ countermelody, as it is in the phrases of Section I.

\textsuperscript{137} The Phrase archetype, P\textsuperscript{1.1}, ends with a chord of B\textsuperscript{+}. It should be noted that the lamenting appoggiatura of Motive a becomes a consonant in Section II. P\textsuperscript{2.2}’s a therefore corresponds to P\textsuperscript{1.1}’s a, motivically only. P\textsuperscript{2.2} is a transposition of P\textsuperscript{1.1} up a perfect fourth from the triplet figure onwards (b. 5:7ff), with the rising contour of b-c substituted for an inverted and embellished b.
Example 2.7  Section II, Phrases 1-2, bars 23-27
Example 2.8  Paradigmatic Diagram of Section II, Phrases 1-2, bars 23-27
Not all of the tone poem’s sonorous voices agree upon the goal of $E_7$, however. The lower strings have other ideas and they drop a tritone from $G_7$ in the previous bar (b. 26) to $C$ in bar 27 underneath the $E_7$ triad, thereby creating a half diminished seventh chord ($C – E_7 – G_7 – B_7$). Tawaststjerna, and later Howell, both comment on the prominence and ‘striking effect’ of the tritone throughout *The Swan of Tuonela*.\(^\text{138}\) Howell locates specific appearances of tritones here at the end of $P^{2.2}$ and at the end of the following phrase, $P^{2.3}$. He identifies the resulting dissonances as non-diatonic chords (bb. 26-27 and bb. 31-32, repeated in 32-33).\(^\text{139}\) Yet neither analyst expands upon their ‘striking’ nature nor relates the tritones to the sequence that generates them. Like the move to $E_7$, the lower string’s descent to $C$ is also not totally unexpected. What begins as an evasion of the cadential progression underpinning $P^{2.1}$ and a chromatic slip in the phrase’s footing ($ii-V_7-\,i$), becomes a predictable part of a descending sequence where each harmonic unit (although not melodic) is one semitone lower than the last. The lower strings descend from $D$ (b. 23) to $D_7$ (b. 25) and finally $C$ (b. 27) to continue the downward sequence. The conclusion of $P^{2.2}$ therefore provides an outcome that can be expected through reference to extracted parameters of previous phrases that transcend the immediate harmonic context. What is ‘striking’ about this moment, is that several outcomes are reached simultaneously to fulfil different expectations: $E_7$ relating to the harmonization of the phrases in Section I rather than its current harmonization; and the note $C$, as a continuation of a chromatically descending sequence.

In *The Swan of Tuonela*, these non-diatonic chords are not just colouristic or randomly occurring dissonances; they are the direct result of voice-leading lines that retain their own diatonic logic to continue parsimoniously to the point that they fork in pursuit of different endings and become momentarily separated from one another. At these special moments the sonorous voices cease to relate to one another in vertical harmonic terms and become alienated from one another, moving entirely horizontally. Not only do they move horizontally, but for a split second they also provide a glimpse outside the diatonic realm. In other words, the voices move beyond polyphony, for example,

---
\(^\text{138}\) Tawaststjerna, Sibelius, Vol. 1, 172.
\(^\text{139}\) Howell, Jean Sibelius, 223.
the violins’ dissonant suspensions, to become multivalent.\footnote{The violins stubbornly hold onto several of their suspended notes against the triads in the rest of the orchestra at various moments in Section II: Violin II.2 holds its F against G$+$ in bar 25 and Violin II.1 hold B against C$+$ in bar 29.} Yet by presenting several possible resolutions, the outcomes are layered to create a non-diatonic chord and the voices do not fulfil any resolution at all. Too much consonance creates dissonance. In other words, having your parsimonious cake and eating it, makes you dissonant and sick (or dead). It is no coincidence that the non-diatonic chord created at the end of $P^{2.2}$ is the Tristan chord, the chord most historically associated with the persistent cadential evasion of diatonic resolution.

The third phrase of Section II ends with a non-diatonic chord that also arises from multivalent voice-leading. $P^{2.3}$ begins with an acceptance of the violin’s mode of E$_b$ minor. The lower strings’ sequence is broken and as a result, the cellos are diverted up an octave in this last phrase (Ex. 2.9, bb. 28-32). The cadential progression is retained in the first bar at least (b. 28, E$_b$- to A$_b$+$^7$), seemingly now reaching towards D$_b$+$, but it is not supported in the same way by the lower strings. A solo cello instead rhythmically stretches and echoes the previous cor anglais phrase, $P^{2.2}$ in bb. 28-29, timbrally recalling the solo rising figures associated with the flickering souls’ in Section I. Despite the progression in the violins, the lower strings do move to C$_b$ this time, the tonal goal of the previous phrase. Nevertheless, the violins and cor anglais restate an E$_b$- triad above, thus creating a hypermajor chord, a major triad with a major seventh (C$_b$ – E$_b$ – G$_b$ – B$_b$).

Initially, the cor anglais’s $P^{2.3}$ cycles through $P^{2.1}$ a semitone higher and creates the impression of a miniature ABA’ phrase structure, from a melodic perspective at least. Nevertheless, instead of simply concluding on E$_b$ minor again, as the melodic recollection of $P^{2.1}$ suggests it will, the $P^{2.2}$ ceases to refer to this phrase. The rising figure (Ex. 2.8, b) does not continue past the minor third (bb. 29:8-30:2) and is instead repeated down a tone to begin melodic sequence that redirects $P^{2.3}$ back to the phrase archetype itself, $P^{1.1}$. For a moment, the cor anglais derails and switches track to pass
through the opening phrase’s ending and bars 30:3-31 fleetingly rejoin P\textsuperscript{1.1} at the same pitch, harmonization, and rhythm (Ex. 2.8, c).\textsuperscript{141}

**Example 2.9** Section II, P\textsuperscript{2.3} and echo, bars 28-35

If P\textsuperscript{2.3} were to continue to refer to the first phrase of the tone poem at pitch, it should now conclude on B\textsubscript{♭} minor. Once again, the harmonic direction and the string textures shift. Instead of resolving to B\textsubscript{♭} and thus ending up where the piece began (P\textsuperscript{1.1}) – the musical equivalent of walking in circles – the soloist snaps back to the current structural moment and drops from F\textsubscript{♯} to B\textsubscript{♭} below the violins’ tremolo accompaniment of A\textsubscript{♯}-E\textsubscript{♭}, as its rising third sequence is liquidated beyond recognition (bb. 31-35). The hero sees

\textsuperscript{141}That the end of the P\textsuperscript{3.3} echoes P\textsuperscript{2.3}, suggests that the liquidation that extends the phrase (bb. 30-31) is actually an abridged and elided compression of what could have been a fourth phrase.
a way forward. These layered tritones create a whole-tone chord: another non-diatonic chord that arises from multivalent voice-leading much like that at the end of P\textsuperscript{2.2}.\textsuperscript{142} In the immediate context, the B\textsubscript{♭} sounds strange and dissonant but it occurs as a result of various long-range processes. Firstly, B\textsubscript{♭}, enharmonically C\textsubscript{♭}, is the next step down in a whole-tone descent in the cor anglais’s melodic sequence down from E\textsubscript{♭} (b. 29) to D\textsubscript{♭} (30). At the end of the section, P\textsuperscript{2.3} reprises melodic embellishments that had been superseded as well as retaining some of the embellishments that have accrued across the phrases. In particular, the characteristic perfect fifth drop (Ex. 2.8, circled) returns in its original position at the opening of the phrase between motifs a and b, as well as its new position at the end, as it was heard in P\textsuperscript{2.2}, but this time warped into the tritone to reflect its new context as part of the descending liquidating sequence.

The soloist’s tritone drop also picks up the lower strings’ chromatically descending sequence from the point where it was halted by the E\textsubscript{♭} deflection at the end of P\textsuperscript{2.2}. In P\textsuperscript{2.3} the harmonies magnetically cluster around the tones E\textsubscript{♭} and G\textsubscript{♭} to form almost all the possible triadic chords involving these notes. At the end of the phrase, the cor anglais finally breaks away from their orbit to continue the lower strings’ D–(G), D\textsubscript{♭}–G\textsubscript{♭}, C motion with its F to B\textsubscript{♭}.\textsuperscript{143} The next step in the sequence is, of course, E–A, a movement that circles back to A minor. While this next step in the chromatic progression is not stated directly, A– does return at the opening of Section III.

The cor anglais’s compound melody in Section II proves to be multi-voiced and encapsulates distinct voices sounded by other parts of the orchestra: the upper voice, which is elaborated in the violins; an inner voice, which prolongs the Kopfton, E, via its upper and lower neighbours; and a second inner voice, which continues the chromatic ascent begun in Section I.

\textsuperscript{142} Interpreted in strictly vertical terms, the fifth-less chords in bars 31 and 32 tug the harmony in different directions, although neither paths are certain: F\textsuperscript{+7} of bar 31 reaches back towards B\textsubscript{♭}, while B/C\textsubscript{♭}\textsuperscript{+7} of bar 21 pulls to E\textsuperscript{+}, V of A–, one of the global tonics.

\textsuperscript{143} The tritone sequence is evident in Section I too, where it appears reversed and embedded the lower strings’ rising cadential soul figures.
2.5.5 Section III: A Smooth Ascent

After hearing the swan’s call, Lemminkäinen sets off towards the source of the sound without any of the harmonic indecision of the previous section. After a sequential arc of seven cor anglais phrases all enveloped by gradually accruing tremolo strings in Section III, a second, more obvious timbral and harmonic intervention occurs. The section opens with two cor anglais phrases based in A minor (bb. 36-39; P\textsuperscript{3.1}, P\textsuperscript{3.2}). Every subsequent phrase, excluding the intervention, P\textsuperscript{3.7}, begins a minor third higher than the last and the section climbs in a single direction through key centres of a diminished seventh chord – B, D, F, and A\textsubscript{b} – rather than chromatically (Ex. 2.10). This sequence is represented visually on a Tonnetz below (Fig. 2.11) to show the uniformity of the ascent. Although the phrases are externally related via thirds, they are internally harmonized with minor tonic and dominant pairs in second inversions, much like in Section II. Despite the assertive singularity of the harmonic direction in Section III, the cor anglais becomes firmly locked into the chains of minor triads and is unable to reach any cadences or find C major – the swan – or any major key.

Figure 2.11  Section III, Tonnetz representation of P\textsuperscript{3.3} to P\textsuperscript{3.7} (bb. 41-60)
Example 2.10 continued  Section III, bars 50-7
2.5.6 Section III: Sonorously Uncovering Timbral Outsider 2

In P³.6, the section reaches a fortissimo climax, the tempo hastens (Poco a poco meno moderato), and the soloist reaches its highest pitches in the piece: an F⁵ appoggiatura resolving to E⁻⁵ (bb. 48:7-49). In voice-leading terms, this is the pinnacle of yet another chromatic line that ascends from the Kopfton, E (b. 36), in the cor anglais part (Ex. 2.11). P³.6 expands in bars 50 to 53, where the soloist emerges from what has become an overwhelming wall of string sound to meander back down to the opening register of the section. Although the stepwise descent is likely conditioned by the timbral capabilities of the instrument – it is a tactical avoidance of the solo instrument’s thin upper register – the falling phrase leaves an impression of energy-loss as the cor anglais wearily creeps to the bottom of an arc in register and dynamics to complete its last phrase in the section.

At this moment, ‘timbral outsiders’ suddenly interrupt the soloist and take advantage of its energy-loss to come to the fore in P³.7 (bb. 54-57, indicated in boxes in Ex. 2.10 and 2.11). The timbral outsiders – another suspension – create a threefold transformation of sonority, motivic material, harmonic direction, and like the end of Section II, it also pushes through the enharmonic seam.

In terms of sonority, the tremolo violins are suddenly dampened and with a cavernous drop in register, the phrase is transferred to the cellos, violas, and several instruments...
that have been excluded from the tone poem’s orchestral palette thus far. Those previously silent are the bass clarinet, bassoons, and horns, which join in a few bars later for the first time since their warped call in Section II. As instruments reserved for these moments of rupture, these instruments exist as timbral outsiders in the tone poem and beyond the inside-outside dichotomy of sonorities set up in the piece, the bass clarinet also lies outside the instrumentation of the other movements in the Lemminkäinen Suite. The other tone poems reinstate the normative woodwind and brass sections. What is more, the instruments are also beyond the realms of Sibelius’s orchestral instrumentation in general. These low register instruments replace the flutes, clarinets, and trumpets in The Swan of Tuonela, and this confines the highest registers to the timbre of the violins, cut short here at the outer reaches of their register (B♭₆ in Vln I.I).

With only the orchestra’s deepest timbres at this moment, the thematic content of P₃.7 appears at the very bottom of the new texture in the bass clarinet and lowest cello parts, and the phrase is rhythmically homogenised into a solemn chorale. The sighing appoggiatura of motive a is omitted (a’) and replaced with a consonant sustained note, and the meandering, improvisatory character associated with the cor anglais’s command of the theme is lost. This transformation of topic creates another distorted echo or even answer to the cor anglais (Ex. 2.12).

The last phrase of Section III also ruptures what had threatened to be a perpetual loop through the sequence of minor third related phrases. If Section III’s sequence were to continue its uniform zig-zag up the chains of diminished sevenths shown in Fig. 2.11 above, this last phrase would return to a B minor centre, close the loop, and perhaps even re-join a version of P₃.3. Lemminkäinen is prevented from walking in musical circles yet again and the harmonic progression is instead ruptured. The chain is torn by the intrusion of the timbral outsiders and the section drifts across the Tonnetz. There is an immediate move to the minor dominant of B minor in P₃.7 instead of the local tonic itself (F♯) in what initially appears to be a re-harmonization of P₃.3.
Example 2.12  Motivic Transformation in Section III
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The voice-leading is affected too. When the expansive layers of string sound are pealed back, the inner voice is exposed and becomes the outer voice. Throughout Section III, the violin’s chromatic ascent through an octave prolongs A via an incomplete register transfer and acts as a sort of covering tone over the cor anglais’s thematic material while also supporting it from below with the same pitches. After the Kopfton E’s extensive prolongation through the middle of this violin shroud, the timbral outsiders uncover the Kopfton’s lower neighbour, E₃, and enharmonically translate the note to D₃. The exposure of this tone is indicated on the voice-leading graph above with a S-shaped dotted slur (Ex. 2.11 above). This lower neighbour is temporarily prolonged by the timbral outsider’s upper voice in bars 51-57 at the end of Section III, while the lower voice prolongs G₃. A sense that this intervention comes from within rather than from the ‘outside’ is therefore a result of the prolongation of the Kopfton within the violins’ sound-sheet in terms of register and voice-leading.

To Peter Raabe, when the soloist drops out ‘it is as if, for a moment, the swan had disappeared from our sight, and the horrifying fear of loneliness is upon us.’ If his reading is realigned with the new Kalevala-based paratext, it is not the swan but Lemminkäinen that is quietened and stops in his tracks (bar 54). The timbral outsiders respond to his walking song with their otherworldly or underworldly answer, perhaps ‘horrifyingly’ uncanny in its transformation of the now familiar phrase. The answer guides Lemminkäinen onwards and redirects the harmonic direction back towards A minor, the key associated with Tuonela; his arrival there; and ultimately his death. On a large scale, G₃ acts as the leading note pulling towards A minor, and D₃ as leading note to its dominant.

After this interruption, the cor anglais is not absent for long, and as Raabe poetically observes, ‘but soon we hear the swan-song again’. Two extended phrases unfold in this section that can be split into smaller elided sub-phrases: P\textsuperscript{4.1} (bb. 58-60) and P\textsuperscript{4.2} (bb. 61-64) (Ex. 2.13). These retain aspects of the archetypal phrase’s contour – most prominently the lamenting appoggiatura – but they are irrevocably affected by the half-speed transformation of the trill figure (c’) in Section III’s timbral intervention. Little else remains to tie these phrases motivically to P\textsuperscript{1.1}. After the cor anglais’s meandering descent in P\textsuperscript{3.6} Section IV’s phrases remain languid. Unlike the continuous harmonic movement of the previous sections, the piano sub-phrases do not ascend chromatically or sequentially.

Yet again, the sheet of violins shrouds the cor anglais in Section IV with suspended notes and layers of pizzicato from above (bb. 58-63) as well as below (bb. 60-63). The cor anglais’s thematic material is strangely diatonic in C\textsubscript{#} major, but it is unharmonized by the violins, which extend triads of the relative key, G\textsubscript{#} minor, across the entire passage in continuation of the sonorous outsider’s conclusion to P\textsuperscript{3.7} (Ex. 2.13). The downward arpeggiation in bar 60, P\textsuperscript{4.12}, makes the cor anglais’s C\textsubscript{#}-major centre particularly apparent. The pitch content of the cor anglais’s compound melody is not just a passing dissonance over a pedal, but a separate, floating voice in a separate key. C\textsubscript{#} and G\textsubscript{#} are sonorously distinct and this is another example of the tone poem’s multivalent voice-leading. The cor anglais’s insistence on C\textsubscript{#} is perhaps an attempt to resist the pull of the leading note, G\textsubscript{#}, back towards A minor, by presenting a different leading note, C\textsubscript{#}/B, in an effort to reach the brighter, hopeful C major (bars 60 and 62). Unlike the multivalent voices in Section II, which come to separate, albeit simultaneous conclusions and create non-diatonic chords, the separate voices in Section IV converge. They eventually agree upon a pivot of F\textsubscript{#}/G\textsubscript{#} in P\textsuperscript{4.23} (b. 63). F\textsubscript{#} acts as the leading note of the violin’s G\textsubscript{#} while the dissonant F\textsubscript{#} in the cor anglais’s melody have also been pulling

\textsuperscript{146} Marked with a screamer (!) on the voice-leading graph (Ex. 2.14).
Example 2.13  Section IV, P^{4.1} to P^{4.2}, bars 58-6
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Example 2.14 Voice-Leading Graph of *The Swan of Tuonela* (Timbral Outsiders marked in boxes)
towards its enharmonic equivalent, $G_\sharp$ - which is the dominant of the cor anglais’s local key, $C_\sharp$+.\footnote{After the chromatic ascent to $A_/G_\sharp$ in Section III and the timbral uncovering of the Kopfton’s lower neighbour, $D_\sharp$ is transferred up an octave in Section IV and extends across the outer voices (the violins and lower voice of the cor anglais’s compound theme), until just prior to the suspension. When it resolves down to the Kopfton, $E$ becomes an inner voice again during the intervention and then upper afterwards.}

At the point of harmonic convergence, the cor anglais pushes upwards (b. 63:1). It swells into a clear and conventional horn call of a falling octave and rising perfect fifth (b. 63:2-3) while $F#/G_\sharp$ undergoes a relative transformation to the first tonic major chord in the piece, $A+$ (b. 64), leaving the centres of $C_\sharp$+ and $G_\sharp$- behind. With another upward push from the bass clarinet, there is a ‘magical modulation’, as Tawaststjerna puts it.\footnote{Tawaststjerna, Sibelius, Vol. 1, 172.} $A+$ is suddenly transformed (PR) into one of the tone poem’s global tonics, $C$ major, which is strikingly firm in root position and rings out for four bars over the interlocking pizzicatos (bb. 65-68, Ex. 2.15). Following the bass clarinet’s lead, timbral outsiders break through the texture in a jubilant forte passage of horn calls that echo and answer the cor anglais’s summons. This is the third and final intervention and it is a structural parallel in many ways to the warped horn call echo at the end of Section II.\footnote{Coincidentally, this breakthrough-suspension occurs around the point of the Golden ratio: bar 65 of 102.} Other timbral outsiders join forces with the horns to create a full texture approaching a tutti. The cellos and bassoons enter for the first time since Section III’s intervention, expanding and deepening the range by two octaves. Timpani rolls and broken chords in the harp also enrich the texture: instruments that have both been reserved solely for this moment. To Barnett, this passage has an ‘eerie sonority’.\footnote{Barnett, Sibelius, 104.} He is perhaps reacting to the proximity of the horn calls to its hexatonic pole in the violin’s prolonged $G_\sharp$- in the bars before, which creates an ‘uncanny’ or ‘magical’ effect in the way that Richard Cohn has observed in Wagner’s music, for instance.\footnote{See Richard Cohn, ‘Uncanny Resemblances: Tonal Signification in the Freudian Age’, Journal of the American Musicological Society (2004), 285-323 and Cohn, ‘Hexatonic Poles and the Uncanny in Parsifal’, Opera Quarterly 22 (2006), 230-48.} It is striking that Tawaststjerna and Barnett are the only scholars to even comment on such pivotal moment of the tone poem’s structure and it makes the tone poem’s evident neglect all the more apparent.
Example 2.15  Section IV, bars 65-8
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2.5.8 Section IV: Timbral Outsider 3

At the third interruption of the timbral outsiders, which is further along the spectrum from suspension towards breakthrough, the timbral association of the solo cor anglais with a shepherd’s pipe is motivically confirmed to be a topos and not just to be intertextually heard in relation to the ‘alte Weise’ in Wagner’s Tristan, Act III. The cor anglais and horns motivically recall the Swiss Ranz des Vaches, which translates literally as a ‘rank of cows’.\textsuperscript{152} Hyatt King defines the Ranz as ‘a melody which for centuries has been sung, or played on an Alphorn [by Swiss Alpine herdsmen], to summon the cows from the lofty pastures above the tree-line in the Alps’.\textsuperscript{153} Each district had its own version of the Ranz, but of particular relevance to the echoing calls in bars 65-68 in Sibelius’s Swan of Tuonela, is the Rigi Ranz (Ex. 2.16, a). King was the first to note this version’s direct quotation in No. 6b of Somm from Haydn’s oratorio, Die Jahreszeiten, \textsuperscript{(b)} and in the fifth movement of Beethoven’s Sixth Symphony, the ‘Pastoral’ \textsuperscript{(c)}.\textsuperscript{154} What is more, the solo in Wagner’s Tristan \textsuperscript{(d)}, which has invited so many comparisons with Sibelius’s Swan merely for the instrument choice, also quotes and distorts the Rigi Ranz.

\textbf{Example 2.16} The Rigi Ranz des Vaches as a symphonic topos

\begin{itemize}
  \item[a] King’s transcription of the Ranz des Vache from Rigi, Switzerland\textsuperscript{155}
  \item[b] Haydn, Sommer, Die Jahreszeiten Hob. XXI:3, No. 6b, ‘Der munt’re Hirt versammelt nun’, bars 1-9 (1799-1801)
  \item[c] Beethoven, Symphony No. 6 in F, Op. 68, V. Hirtengesang, bars 1-9 (1802-7)
  \item[d] Wagner, Tristan und Isolde, WWV90, Act 3, Scene 1, bars 78-82 (1857-9)
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{152} Kühreihen/Kühreigen in German, which literally translates as ‘cow dance’.
\textsuperscript{153} Hyatt King, ‘Mountains, Music, and Musicians’, The Musical Quarterly, Vol. XXXI, No. 4 (October, 1945), 397.
\textsuperscript{154} ibid., 403.
\textsuperscript{155} As transcribed by King in ‘Mountains, Music, and Musicians’, Ex. 7, 403.
Though the Ranz does not always signify Alpine heights in this context, it often retains other functional associations that connote space and a sense of landscape. The use of the topic in Haydn’s ‘Die munt’re Hirt’, Beethoven’s Hirtengesang, and The Swan of Tuonela all involve some sort of antiphonal exchange between dovetailed instrument entries that paratextually imply a dialogue between spatially distant shepherds that command or summon their animals or other shepherds using their alphorns. One crucial purpose of the call therefore, is to sonically announce the location of a shepherd when their plane of vision is obscured and they cannot see the entire landscape around them nor the other shepherds scattered across it. The topos suggests that a sense of space and landscape is constructed entirely sonically and dialogically through calls across that space, in this case the river of Tuonela, between Lemminkäinen and swan or Väinämöinen and the Maid of Tuoni. The calls force the music to widen out onto another axis. Although music is by its nature spatially defined, this physical dimension is made glaringly apparent at these moments of suspension or breakthrough. The spatial is brought to the foreground of the musical experience and the music becomes ‘about’ the location of sound.

Tawaststjerna hears this moment programmatically as the ‘only point in this desolate, deathlike landscape [that] we find any sign of human life’. Taking his 1901-programme reading a step further, the dovetailed and dying away calls (muted last two – Hn 2, 4) suggest that many shepherds respond to the swan - the cor anglais in this programme – from across an increasingly great distance as the horns die away and become muted. While Tawaststjerna’s reading of the calls as humankind’s confrontation with nature is compelling, the calls can also be interpreted as the inverse in relation to The Kalevala narrative: mimetic of the swan of Tuonela’s ‘whooping’ or even of a great flock of sousaphone-like swans. The bridges of communication, established between the cor anglais at the ends of the sections with the timbral intrusions, may be aligned with Lemminkäinen’s ‘warbling’ following in the direction of the swan’s whoops: a yoik-like dialogue between a shepherd and animal. This communication is not only reinforced by

154 Tawaststjerna, Sibelius, Vol. 1, 172.
157 Though Tawaststjerna also describes Lemminkäinen’s journey into the underworld to hunt the swan, he does not relate this to the tone poem’s musical narrative. See Tawaststjerna, Sibelius, Vol. 1, 168.
motivic connections, but by its association with a pivot mode: A natural minor, which shares tones with both A melodic minor, perhaps the dark river, and the energetic C major of the swan.

Without its dominant, C major can only be a temporary condition and momentary escape from A minor, which returns only a few bars later after another relative transformation. Directly following the suspension, the cor anglais re-enters to recall the last bars of Section I. These bars followed the first appearance of C major (bb. 20-21), and they do so in Section IV too (bb. 70-71). These few bars might be read as a sonic representation of Lemminkäinen’s last words and a final recollection of the object of his desire, the swan/bride, as he first heard it in Section I. These bars are recontextualized here as part of a descent from \( \hat{1} \) back down to the Kopfton, E, supported by A minor. Ultimately, the suspension sets in motion a progression that uncovers E once more. This static Kopfton is prolonged in the upper voice until the end of the piece. After the Swan-suspension, C major and its diatonic potential disappears from the piece, like the dissipation of a hopeful mirage. Once Lemminkäinen reaches the swan and the full glory of simple C major diatonicism he is suddenly killed along with his associated A-natural minor tones, but not by a member of the underworld, but by Markkhattu, because of the hero’s past transgressions. A funeral march (Section V) in the prevailing A melodic minor proceeds and the cor anglais (and Lemminkäinen) disappear until the funeral march repeats as a memorial to the Kalevala hero.

It is the suspensions in *The Swan of Tuonela* that might provide us with a more ethical reading of Sibelius’s supposedly ‘formless’ music – a reading that does not position Sibelius and his music in the exoticist vision of the far North that these timbral outsiders resist. This chapter has set out to show that programmatic readings have privileged a static image and a corresponding, but erroneous, reading of a totally static sound, which in fact reaffirms Adorno’s concerns about Sibelius’s music receding from humanity into an overwhelming sound of nature. If nature is totally overwhelming – as Lowenthal finds in Hamsun and Adorno in Sibelius (See Section 1.1.4) – we withdraw from humanity into nature to our own destruction (very much like Hepokoski’s characterization of Sibelius’s late phase), and therefore we are relinquished of any agency or responsibility for our
surroundings in our powerlessness. Music becomes pure Klang and is falsely presented as natural in unordered noise, which denies its own artificial nature as an artistic object. On the other hand, if human rationality and mechanism – technology – are revered above everything else, the solution to anything that nature might throw at us – natural disasters, climate change, and antibiotic resistance, or Tuonela’s swan in Lemminkäinen’s case – responsibility is also relinquished, because nature and anything conflated with it is seen as subordinate. Sibelius’s tone poem is able to establish a dialectical position between these by presenting a static ‘other world’ – a representation of the protagonist’s arrogant experience of the underworld – and then tearing it at various moments to show that what is assumed to be a helpless ‘other’ – the Maid of Tuonela or the Swan – have their own agency, something beyond the heroes’ experience up to that point.

Underneath the ideological layers that have conditioned these critical responses to the piece, a similarly layered musical surface – multi-voiced even – can be heard that has several tears in its sound-sheet fabric. Far from being ‘formless’ or even static, the tone poem’s technical surface speaks to the dialogical structure within the cautionary tale of The Kalevala’s tragic hunting narrative. Thus, in The Swan of Tuonela, the hero of the tone poem’s Op. 22 suite, Lemminkäinen (A minor/cor anglais), travels to the underworld to shoot the swan in return for a bride. The tone poem is what could be termed a tonal variation form that explores bitonality, chromaticism, and functional and non-functional tonality, along with neo-Riemannian transformations and sonorous or multivalent voice-leading. While moving through these varying tonal landscapes, Lemminkäinen enters into a dialogue with the distant and sacred animal, following its siren-like ‘whoops’ (C major/timbral outsiders) ever deeper towards the raging underworld river. Though the swan is represented as a timbral outsider, it is engaged dialectically with the hero’s song, to change it and be changed. Nevertheless, when the swan is suddenly revealed in all its glory at the C-major suspension, the hero is tragically killed, and his funeral march is sounded. Neither the hero nor the illusionary object of his desire last: only the functionless A minor sound-sheet of the underworld surroundings.
2.6 Double-Tonic Complexes and The Afterlife: Lullaby and Lament

Tonal distance between the poetic spaces and subject positions described in the lyrics of Sibelius’s song entitled Sydämeni Laulu (‘Song of My Heart’), Op. 18 no. 6, otherwise known as ‘The Vale of Tuoni’, are also established by a double-tonic complex and static Kopftons. The last section of this chapter will therefore provide a supplementary analysis of the song to explore how Sibelius signified musical space in a non-orchestral context and one that does not make use of Klang-meditations or Suspensions. This song nevertheless demonstrates an affinity between Sibelius’s structural treatment of large-scale orchestral forms and small-scale works for different instrument groups.

Composed only a few years later than The Swan of Tuonela, this short song for male chorus (1898, arranged for mixed choir in 1904) is also set in the afterlife of Finnish mythology, the island of Tuonela, and uses major and minor relatives in a tonal scheme akin to a double-tonic complex. Unlike The Swan of Tuonela, and the rest of the Op. 18 part-songs however, the ‘Vale of Tuoni’ is not inspired directly by the national epic, The Kalevala, or The Kanteletar.158 Instead, it is a setting of a poem by Finnish-writer Alexis Kivi from his novel, Seitsemän Veljestä (Seven Brothers).159 Kivi’s book is generally thought of as the first notable Finnish-language novel and was written in 1870 during the nationalist revitalization of a unified, albeit imagined, Finnish culture. The lullaby-like poem is sung at the end of Kivi’s novel by a mother to her baby son as he dies, to reassure him that the afterlife – Tuonela – will be peaceful. As is the case with the majority of Sibelius’s small-scale works, his setting of Kivi’s text remains in musicological obscurity and has received no scholarly consideration whatsoever other than by those who remark on its existence in passing. A voice-leading analysis of the song’s sections using a similarly adapted, non-orthodox Schenkerian approach will support a reading of the song’s text to consider how a particular falling figure provides poetic and tonal resolution. As it was argued in the main body of this chapter, adapted forms of

158 Metsämiehen Laulu (‘Hunter’s Song’/Forest incantation’), Op. 18 no. 5 is another exception. It is a setting of a poem by Aleksis Stenvall (1834 - 1872).
159 Aleksis Kivi trans. Alex Matson, Seitsemän Veljestä (London: Faber & Faber, 1929), 394.
Schenkerian analysis are valuable tools to illuminate the bits of diatonic harmony that can be heard in Sibelius’s music in contrast to the parts that operate in non-functional tonal realms, so we can better understand how these kinds of tonality coexist in Sibelius’s music. Finally, Sibelius’s syncretic dialogues with Finnish-Karelian and Central-European musical traditions will be explored to foreground his tonal depiction of space in *Sydämeni Laulu*.

**Figure 2.12** Form of Sibelius’s *Sydämeni Laulu / Vale of Tuoni*, Op. 18 no. 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Finnish Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Vale of Tuoni, vale of starlight! Golden sand, thy cradle waits thee, There I shall lead thee my darling.</td>
<td>Tuonen lehto, öinen lehto! Siell’ on hieno hietakehto, sinnepä lapseni saatan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>Love and joy shall each hour yield thee, Thou shalt tend the master’s cattle, In the pale valley of Tuoni.</td>
<td>Siell’ on lapsen lysti olla, Tuonen herran vainiolla kaitsia Tuonelan karjaa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>In the quiet of the evening, When the flocks are gently sleeping In the pale Tuonela moonlight.</td>
<td>Siell’ on lapsen lysti olla, illan tullen tuuditella helmassa Tuonelan immen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>There my loved one shall be happy Lying in thy golden cradle; Sleeping while night birds are singing.</td>
<td>Onpa kullan lysti olla, kultakehdoss’ kellahdella, kuullella kehräjälintuu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>Vale of Tuoni, vale of dreaming! There no worldly strife nor scheming; There are all sorrows forgotten!</td>
<td>Tuonen viita, rauhan viita! Kaukana on vaino, riita, kaukana kavalma maailma.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sibelius’s song is a miniature ternary form of five strophes in an ABABA form, as indicated in Figure 2.12 and Example 2.17 (below), and each line of Kivi’s poem is set to a two-bar phrase.\(^{161}\) The particular form of this musical setting draws attention to the

---


\(^{161}\) Score based on Jean Sibelius, *Sydämeni Laulu*, Op. 18, no. 6 (1898), in *Works for Male Choir* (a cappella) ed. Sakari Ylivuori, *Jean Sibelius Works*, Vol. II/2 (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 2015), 17-20. The only difference between B sections is B1’s dotted crotchet-quaver rhythm in bar 10:1-2, which is replaced by straight crotchets in bar 22:1-2 of B2 to accommodate the Finnish lyrics. There are also slight changes in dynamics, but other than that, the A sections are musically identical to another, as are the B sections.
alternating poetic content of the stanzas. The attributes of Tuonela’s peaceful landscape are described in each A section – its ‘starlight’, ‘golden sand’, ‘pale […] moonlight’ – whereas the B sections describe the imagined experiences of the child once it reaches Tuonela.\textsuperscript{162} As Example 2.17 demonstrates, the A and B strophes also end in different keys, C minor and E\textsuperscript{♭} major respectively, suggesting a simple association of Tuonela and its landscape with the minor mode, and the child’s peace there, with the relative major.

An analysis of the song’s voice-leading structure reveals that the two keys are both active as functional tonics, unlike the functionless A minor and functional C major of \textit{The Swan of Tuonela}. The keys do, however, have independent static Kopftons: upper voices that prolong these tones throughout the work and do not descend to \textsuperscript{1}. The coexistence of the song’s keys is shown using accordingly unorthodox graphic notation in Example 2.18. The song begins with a chord of E\textsuperscript{♭} major, establishing \textsuperscript{5} of the key as the first Kopfton in Section A but within the first phrase of the song, a simple chromatic line in the upper voice leads away from E\textsuperscript{♭} major to C minor in bar 3 and continues to rise through the second line to establish \textsuperscript{3} of C minor as a second Kopfton. This second Kopfton is attained at the beginning of the third line in bar 5, after a rhythmically displaced voice exchange.\textsuperscript{163} The descriptive Section As each end with a \textsuperscript{3} -\textsuperscript{2} -\textsuperscript{1} decent in the upper voice in bars 5 to 6, a crucial signifier of definitive closure at a perfect authentic cadence. However, the descent is not harmonically supported by C minor’s dominant so it is not an assertive establishment of the key as the global tonic. In summary, Section A establishes the Kopfton of E-flat major, but the key is not confirmed by a definitive cadence.

\textsuperscript{162} It should be noted that Kivi’s depiction of the afterlife contrasts sharply with that in Elias Lönrot’s \textit{Kalevala}, in which Tuonela is neither a valley nor ‘golden’ but instead an island in the middle of a raging, black river.

\textsuperscript{163} The voice exchange has not been indicated on the graph because it reduces the visual prominence of E\textsuperscript{♭} major, which would not reflect its aural prominence.
Example 2.17  Sydämeni Laulu, Op. 18 no. 6, Sections A1 and B2 (bb. 1-6; 19-24) for SATB and TTBB (B2 only)

A1  SATB

1.1

\[ p \]
Vale of Tuoni, vale of star-light!

1.2

\[ riten. \]

Gold-en sand, thy cra-dle waits thee,

1.3

There shall I lead thee my dar-ling.

\[ \]

B2  TTBB

2.1

\[ mp \]
There my loved one shall be hap-py

2.2

Ly-ing in thy gold-en cra-dle,

2.3

Sleep-ing while night birds are sing-ing.

\[ \]

2.1

\[ dim. \]

There my loved one shall be hap-py

2.2

Ly-ing in thy gold-en cra-dle;

2.3

Sleep-ing while night birds are sing-ing.

\[ \]
Example 2.18  Voice-leading graph of Sibelius’s *Sydämeni Laulu*, Op. 18 no. 6
By contrast, Section B sets the imagined experiences of the child to decorated arpeggiations of descending consecutive triads. These begin a descending linear progression, shown with the long beam at the top of the graph above. In the first phrase, C minor moves to its minor dominant seventh in bars 7-8, which is outlined in descending arpeggiations in the outer voices of the SATB arrangement and in the tenor parts only of the male choir version. There is some resolution to what seems to be C minor at the beginning of the second line in bar 9, creating a slightly expanded repetition of the upper voice’s 3-2-1 descent at the end of Section A. Despite the echo of C minor’s prior confirmation however, this second phrase is in unison and its harmony remains ambiguous, albeit probably aurally imagined as on C minor due to its preceding context. The ambiguity of C minor’s prolongation in this phrase is indicated with a dotted beam in the lower voice on my graph. By the end of bar 10, an F minor triad has been outlined and the whole of the second phrase revealed in retrospect to be a prolongation of this harmony rather than C minor, whose confirmation is evaded.164

The final phrase of Section B rises through the next consecutive chord, E♭ major, initially harmonized as its subdominant, A♭, and comes to rest on a hymn-like plagal cadence. The cadence confirms that E♭ major was not merely a passing instability at the opening of the song but a viable alternative tonic to C minor. This is the only cadential confirmation of a key and is a harmonic goal of the song. E flat is offered as an alternative key centre, however fleetingly. It is the other tonic in a Sibelian double-tonic complex. The partial ascent through an E♭ major triad at the cadence is completed by the next phrase that begins the final Section A (bar 13/25). The linear progression from C minor’s Kopfton comes to a halt with E♭ major’s Kopfton to create a 4-progression, again notated with the long beam. Section A rebegins as Strophe 3 and later Strophe 5. The Section thus reestablishes C minor and its Kopfton at the peak of an ascending line before concluding the song with another falling figure from 3 to 1 in C minor. In summary, although E♭ is the only key that reaches a cadence in the song in Section B,

---

164 The A♭ in b. 9:4 may initially be heard as an upper-neighbour to the following G (b. 10:1), but by the next note, F (b. 10:2) the A♭ is retrospectively reinterpreted as a consonant.
albeit a plagal one, it is undermined by the return to the alternative tonic, C minor, by the end in Section A.

Turning to Kivi’s text, the aspects of Tuonela described in the second lines of the A sections come to their literary and musical teloi in the second lines of the B sections where a foreground figure, G–F–E, in the upper-voice is reinterpreted to resolve its dissonances, clarify the texture, and move away from C minor towards the relative major. These pairs of lines do not necessarily occur in chronological order, but all find their own poetic and musical resolution. The child will lie and sleep (line 20) in the ‘golden cradle’ that waits for him (line 2); he will ‘tend the master’s cattle’ (line 5) that are ‘gently sleeping’ (line 8); and additionally in other lines, he will feel ‘love and joy’ in Tuonela (line 4) where there is ‘no strife nor scheming’ (line 26) and ‘all sorrows [are] forgotten’ (line 27).

Each of these Section-A statements occur at the pinnacle of the song’s pitch, dynamics, and expression. The end of the second line in each Section A strophe is set to a sighing figure that slows and dies away after the preceding hairpin swells. An unprepared appoggiatura G (b. 4:3), which is a neighbour of a neighbour note, falls to an F (b. 4:4, see Ex. 2.19). This note is harmonized by a typically ‘yearning’ Tristan chord. The F continues to descend to C minor’s Kopfton, E, where the dissonance resolves at the beginning of the next phrase (b. 5:1). This falling figure covers the upper voice ascent from the lower neighbour of the Kopfton, so that it is approached from above and below. As the ‘Cube Dance’ in Figure 2.13 shows, the Tristan chord, understood as an altered B-augmented chord, is in fact the pivot between the tonics of the song.

Example 2.19  Voice-Leading in Sydämeni Laulu, bars 3-5\textsuperscript{165}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{sydameni_laulu_voice_leading}
\caption{Voice-Leading in Sydämeni Laulu, bars 3-5}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{165} The slur in the upper voice from C (b. 3) should continue to D (b. 4) and end at Eb (b. 5) to show the smooth voice-leading ascent to the Kopfton as it does in Ex. 2.18 but there is not room on this graph.
The same melodic contour and pitches, G, F, and E?, are reinterpreted in the B sections at the bottom of unfoldings as an inner voice of a compound melody that is opened up by the section’s arpeggiations. The falling figure’s G is no longer dissonant in this section, but part of the aforementioned evaded dominant 7th of C minor (present in an inner voice from b. 7). It falls to the seventh (b. 8:4/20:4), which is reinterpreted as 1 of F minor in the unison second phrase (b. 10:2/22:2), and becomes a passing note to E? which begins the third phrase, (b. 11/23). This falling third figure, associated with the potentiality of Tuonela’s landscape in Section A, is thus melodically and harmonically resolved in Section B, where the child is imagined to rest peacefully in that landscape. The transformation and resolution of the inner-voice figure in the foreground, along with the linear progression, and plagal cadence in the middle-ground of the song, all supports a reading of E? major – poetically associated with peace in Tuonela – as a tonal telos. What is more, when the song’s harmonies are represented graphically on a Tonnetz, E? is revealed to be a common tone that all its harmonies cluster around (Fig. 2.14).167

---

166 ‘Cube Dance’ diagram adapted from Figure 9 in Jack Douthett and Peter Steinbach, ‘Parsimonious Graphs: A Study in Parsimony, Contextual Transformations, and Modes of Limited Transposition’, Journal of Music Theory 42.2 (1998), 241-63 at 254.

On the surface, the song is a metaphorical lullaby sung by a mother to reassure her baby that the afterlife in Tuonela – depicted by Kivi as a place to sleep in the ‘evening’, under ‘moonlight’ and stars, with the sounds of ‘night birds’, will be as peaceful and comfortable as sleeping in a cradle. The interpretation of the song that I have been building to is as follows: Sibelius’s setting associates the realms of Tuoni/sleep with C minor in Section A, and the telos of the baby’s arrival in Tuonela where he will sleep with E♭ major in Section B, asserted with a plagal cadence. Section A’s dissonant foreground features, the G-F-E♭ line in particular, are reinterpreted and resolved in Section B and the anguish of life, its ‘strife’, ‘scheming’, and ‘sorrows’, are left behind. Nevertheless, the ‘sorrows’ of the mother are not forgotten.

A second and more nuanced reading works alongside the song’s lullaby status to account for the song’s ending in the minor mode. Sibelius’s musical setting reflects the subject position of the singer-mother who attempts to come to terms with her own grief and the loss of her child by imagining a peaceful afterlife for him in the comforting key area of E♭ major. Yet the afterlife must remain (tonally) distant from her sorrowful position in the realm of the living in a tonal landscape of C minor. According to Peter H. Smith and Michael C. Tusa, the use of this particular key places the song within the widely noted tradition of the late eighteenth and nineteenth century Western art-music

---

168 The Tonnetz is a visual representation of possible major and minor triads as triangles with their tones as nodes at each point. It was first theorized by Leonard Euler in 1739.
works that are associated with tragedy and human despair. The end of the Sibelius’s song returns to the tragic C-minor in a kind of fated ‘tonal failure’ that finalizes the separation between the mother and child. Only her son can find peace in death and emancipation from the minor mode, in the mother’s imagination at least. She cannot go with him to Tuonela or E major, only lead him there with her song.

From this perspective, Sibelius’s song is a lament as well as a lullaby. This reading is supported by the last line of the first stanza, ‘There I shall lead thee’, which is a reference to the Karelian lament tradition. Into the nineteenth-century at least, orthodox Finnish-Karelian Women sang laments known as itkuvirsat at funeral rituals to lead the procession and coffin to the graveyard and simultaneously sonically guide the soul of the dead across the Tuonela river into the realm of the dead: to the ‘golden sand’ of the island. The middle-ground progression from C minor’s Kopfton through the plagal cadence in E major to that key’s Kopfton might perhaps be thought of as a lament procession across the thresholds of both the physical graveyard and spiritual Tuonela, from tragic life in Section A to peaceful death in Section B. The progression could even be read as an allusion to the falling melodic contour of the Karelian lament, which often also spans a fourth or fifth.

In the ‘Vale of Tuoni’, Sibelius syncretically draws upon the musical funeral traditions of Karelian and even Christian rituals (the ‘amen’ cadence, for example). Yet he foregrounds them in the tonal systems of central European symphonic music by referring to diatonic cadential progressions and other harmonic features such as the pathos-laden appoggiatura and the Tristan chord. This lends the work a cosmopolitan edge that reflects Sibelius’s recent Austro-German education in the early 1890s when

---

169 Peter H. Smith considers the C minor works by Haydn, Mozart, Schubert, Beethoven, and Brahms to be some of the ‘most darkly expressive essays’. The key likely took on ‘stormy’, ‘turbulent’, and ‘tragic’, connotations perhaps because it allows the lowest murky registers of the orchestra to be exploited, particularly the lowest open strings of violas, cellos, and double basses. Joseph Kerman also terms the key’s special significance to Beethoven, a ‘C minor “mood”’, while Michael C. Tusa has identified a recurring collection of compositional techniques in composer’s works in this key. See Peter H. Smith, Expressive Forms in Brahms’s Instrumental Music: Structure and Meaning in his Werther Quartet (Indiana University Press, 2005), 4; Joseph Kerman, The Beethoven Quartets (Norton, 1979), 70; Michael C. Tusa, “Beethoven’s C minor “mood””, in Lewis Lockwood and James Webster (eds.), Beethoven Forum 2 (Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), 1-27.

he had indeed seen a performance of Tristan und Isolde in Vienna in 1891, and again at Bayreuth in 1894. The collection of musical traditions drawn upon in this work adds nuance to the received image of Sibelius at the forefront of fin de siècle Finnish nationalism and its (re)invention of a cultural history.

With the resolving power of dominant triads suppressed, the song’s structural tension and musical narrative are created by the opposition between the alternative tonics, C minor and E# major, along with the zig-zagging ascents and descents to establish their individual static Kopftons. The relative major of the song’s double-tonic complex is associated with a desired, but ultimately unobtainable spatial position. The song therefore provides an example of an alternative kind of Sibelian landscape depiction that has little to do with orchestral textures or static sound-sheets, and more to do with his structural use of tonality and the extra-musical association of de-centred key areas with the subject positions and geographic or spiritual locations of the programmatic protagonists.

3 | Rotational Projections

The concepts of ‘rotation’ and ‘rotational form’ are integral to James Hepokoski’s influential formal definition of ‘early modernism,’ outlined in his 1993 monograph, *Sibelius, Symphony No. 5*. Examining the theorization of this sonata deformation reveals technical contradictions at the heart of Hepokoski’s formal definition of Sibelian modernism. From a post-Elements of Sonata Theory perspective, ‘rotational form’ can no longer be understood as a form in its own right or sonata deformation. Although the concept of rotation retains its ability to illuminate musical structures, it loses any deformative function as Hepokoski and Darcy extend its application from early modernist music back into the eighteenth-century and beyond. It can no longer be used as a formal justification of early modernism and therefore threatens the composer’s historical position as it is currently understood. In order to continue redrawing Hepokoski’s theorization of early modernism in the light of the theoretical model of reactive modernism, ‘rotational form’ must be rejected before working back towards an understanding of rotation that can be productively used as a tool for examining Sibelius’s modernism. To do this, an early nineteenth-century work from a list of ‘rotational forms’ will be analysed in detail – the first movement of Beethoven’s ‘Appassionata’ Sonata – to understand what might be deformational about its use of rotation. Once this has been established, analyses of two of Sibelius’s symphonic works will also be analysed to present a new theory of ‘rotational projection’.

3.1 Conflict in the Theorization of Rotation

Hepokoski defines this member of the ‘sonata deformational family’ as a kind of ‘strophic’-sonata hybrid or series of ‘varied multisectional strophes’ that became increasingly prominent in Sibelius’s post-1912 works. Conceiving of rotational form as an amplification of small-scale repetition schemes or strophes persisted in both Hepokoski and Darcy’s publications through the 1990’s and early 2000’s, both

---

2 Ibid., 7.
independently of, and in relation to Sibelius’s music. In this early stage of Sonata Theory’s development, rotation is described as ‘more of a process than an architectural formula’. According to Hepokoski, it begins with ‘a relatively straightforward “referential statement” of contrasting ideas’, which are often ‘in dialogue’ with the norms of sonata form expositions. What follows, however, is a rather less ‘straightforward’, and more amorphous working definition. The next rotation may either cadence or cycle back through a transition to a second broad rotation. Second and any subsequent rotations normally rework all or most of the referential statement’s material, which is now elastically treated. Portions may be omitted, merely alluded to, compressed, or, contrarily, expanded or even ‘stopped’ and reworked ‘developmentally’. New material may also be added or generated.

In a list of such hybrid forms, Hepokoski includes the first movement of Beethoven’s ‘Appassionata’ sonata as a ‘clear precedent’ to the rotational forms in ‘early modernist’ composition, written almost one hundred years prior to Sibelius’s late music. Other movements noted to be ‘rotational forms on their own’, include those by Mendelssohn, Berlioz, and Mahler as well as the ‘circular patterns’ in Bruckner and Schubert’s music, although no specific works are given for these composers (Table 3.1). These works are claimed to be less sonata-like and more rotational: even purely rotational.

Over a decade later in Elements of Sonata Theory, rotation is defined as an ‘architectural principle’ of large-scale recurrence that may guide any kind of form that emphasises return and rebeginning. What is more, rotation is now a ‘foundational axiom of interpretation’. This axiom is explicated in its own dedicated Appendix essay, which

---

4 Hepokoski, Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 25.
5 Ibid., 25.
6 Ibid., 7.
7 Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 613.
Table 3.1  Rotational form 'on its own'\(^8\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Opus</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Piano Sonata No. 23 in F minor, ‘Appassionata’</td>
<td>Op. 57</td>
<td>I. Allegro Assai (4)</td>
<td>1804-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symphony No. 5 in C minor</td>
<td>Op. 67</td>
<td>II. Andante con moto</td>
<td>1804-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendelssohn</td>
<td>Symphony No. 3 in A minor, ‘Scottish’</td>
<td>Op. 56</td>
<td>IV. Allegro Vivacissimo (4)</td>
<td>1829-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlioz</td>
<td>Symphony Fantastique ‘idiosyncratic’</td>
<td>Op. 14</td>
<td>I. Rêveries – Passions</td>
<td>1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Harold in Italy</em>, ‘second portion’</td>
<td>Op. 16</td>
<td>I. Harold aux montagnes</td>
<td>1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Benvenuto Cellini</em> Overture</td>
<td>Op. 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Le Carnaval Romain</em> Overture</td>
<td>Op. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Le Corsaire</em> Overture</td>
<td>Op. 21</td>
<td></td>
<td>1844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahler</td>
<td>Symphony No. 2 in C minor, ‘Resurrection’</td>
<td>V. Im Tempo des Scherzos (3)</td>
<td>1888–94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Das Lied von der Erde</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. ‘Das Trinklied’</td>
<td>1908-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. ‘Der Abschied’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibelius</td>
<td>Symphony No. 3 in C</td>
<td>Op. 52</td>
<td>II. Andantino con moto</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Nightride and Sunrise</em></td>
<td>Op. 55</td>
<td></td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Bard</em></td>
<td>Op. 64</td>
<td></td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Luonnotar</em></td>
<td>Op. 70</td>
<td></td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

expands on certain aspects of the concept and its terminology to clarify them, but despite this expanded discussion, the core of the definition remains relatively unchanged.\(^9\) The music that ‘rotation’ is applied to does change drastically, however, with striking repercussions for its supposed deformational or radical characterization in earlier literature. The concept of ‘rotation’ loses any deformational function as Hepokoski and Darcy extend its application back from fin de siècle symphonicism into the eighteenth-century. From 2006, rotation becomes the architectural principle for underpinning a huge diversity of musical forms that far exceeds those of Sibelius’s contemporaries and even nineteenth-century music.\(^10\) Rotation not only underpins strophic variations and sonata forms, but also theme and variation forms, rondos, ostinato-grounded works, and ritornello structures and as Harper-Scott has pointed out, there is ‘nothing very obviously “modern” about the rotational principle’.\(^11\) It is not just a norm but an ‘archetypal principle’ of Western art-music structures. In fact, Hepokoski

---

\(^8\) The specific ‘strophic-sonata hybrids’ are introduced as precedents to Sibelius’s ‘rotational forms’: works by Beethoven, Mendelssohn, Berlioz, Mahler in Hepokoski, *Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 7 and 23-26*. The same list appears again in *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 323, as the aforementioned examples of rotational form ‘on its own’ with the addition of Berlioz’s *Benvenuto Cellini* and *Le Corsaire* Overtures; the Andante from Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony (a double variation form) as an early example; and other slow movements by Berlioz, Bruckner, Mahler, and Sibelius.


\(^10\) Darcy does suggest the extensive applicability of ‘rotation’ in ‘Bruckner’s Sonata Deformations’, 52.

\(^11\) Harper-Scott, ‘“Our True North”’, 566.
and Darcy claim that ‘any form that emphasizes return and rebeginning is in dialogue with the rotational principle’. From the perspective of Elements of Sonata Theory, rotation cannot be considered deformational nor related only to sonatas. It is therefore, not a ‘sonata deformation’. It is also not a new feature pioneered by the ‘early modernist’ generation of composers - Sibelius, Mahler, Debussy, Elgar and so forth – nor was it new with Bruckner, or Berlioz, or even Beethoven. What is more, rotation does not just sometimes exist in dialogue with forms like sonatas, for without the impression of large-scale recurrence and return imbued by the recapitulation, a sonata would arguably not have a sonata-identity. In other words, the concept of rotation cannot be prized apart from the concept of sonata or the other aforementioned forms. To state that sonatas are rotational, is to assert a truism. Rotation also cannot exist on its own, because repetition cannot exist without something to repeat, and it is that very something that defines its formal identity and type.

So where does this leave the list of ‘rotational forms on their own’ specially selected in Hepokoski’s 1993 monograph? Despite, or perhaps because of, this unacknowledged contradiction, this discrete list of pieces is reprised in Elements of Sonata Theory with some additions, including more of Berlioz’s Overtures and the slow movement of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony. Accepting the possibility that this might be a remnant of earlier literature incorporated during the book’s long conception, we might also wonder if rotation functions in these pieces in a way that makes them formally distinct from thousands of other rotational movements. Or more cynically, if they are simply a group of ‘problem’ works that need a non-specific catch-all term or ‘wastebasket taxon’ that they can be tidied into. The forms are stripped back down to something they have in common: a process that is eliminative towards distinction but ends with miasma. Either way, there are no whole analyses of the pieces by either author in their outputs that might reveal what this rotational feature is.

Hepokoski and Darcy go some way to emphasise the lack of sonata conventions in the unique forms of these pieces and the difficulty this presents to the analyst. They veer

---

12 Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 612.
towards the latter of the options above at times. Taking the overture of Berlioz’s *Le Carnaval Romain* as an example, Hepokoski and Darcy note that its ‘overriding rotational structure [...] at best responds awkwardly to “sonata-form” analysis’.¹³ There is also little to no explanation of what ‘rotational form deployed on its own’ means for a musical structure in *Elements of Sonata Theory*, other than it does not significantly intersect ‘with other, pre-established formal patterns’.¹⁴ In other words, these rotational forms are non-sonatas. As emphasized above, identifying a sense of return and rebeginning is not an adequate explanation for why the Overture or any of the other pieces listed should respond awkwardly to a sonata-form analysis: a kind of analysis that should be sensitive to the very same cyclic processes according to their own theories.¹⁵

Nevertheless, a dialogue with sonata form remains difficult to deny altogether, and Hepokoski and Darcy fall back on an early Sonata Theory-style description of the intermixing of the ‘circular’ rotational principle and the ‘linear’ sonata deformational procedures.¹⁶ Furthermore, several of the earlier works in the list are treated to an *Elements of Sonata Theory*-style reading of their sonata features elsewhere in the book. For example, scattered references to the ‘Appassionata’ appears throughout *Elements of Sonata Theory*, where it is presented as an exemplar of various sonata deformations: clearly this is considered to be a sonata of some sort.¹⁷ These pieces are certainly thought of as sonatas, although as Option 1 suggests, not easily classifiable as one of the five Types of sonata.

After removing concepts of ‘sonata’, ‘deformation’, and ‘form’ from what a rotation can be, the important question is this: what is left to help us understand Sibelian formal structures? It should be clear by this point that this thesis does not reject rotation out right. It is an invaluable tool for understanding internal reference within a piece of music and for the exploration of dialogue between large-scale forms, so to reject the concept

---

¹³ Ibid., 323, n. 13.
¹⁴ Ibid., 323.
¹⁵ Rotational Form \ ~ Sonata Form is a false statement.
¹⁶ Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Form*, 323, n. 13.
¹⁷ These include non-repeated expositions (20-21); ‘tonally underdetermined’ P-zones (73-74); ‘discursive codas’ (284-85); S’-themes (191); ‘quadri-rotational’ sonatas (207); recapitulations beginning over V (276); and major-mode collapses in Part II of the exposition (312) in *Elements of Sonata Theory*.  
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of the ‘rotational principle’ entirely would be to reject a whole body of analytical scholarship. However, an analysis that concludes by declaring a piece to be ‘rotational’ or in ‘rotational form’ is usually a truism and tells us only that its structure emphasizes ‘return and rebeginning’. The resulting lack of specificity does not allow easy dialogic investigations of pieces. Other formal categories are therefore needed to replace the concept of rotational form in order to reconsider the positioning of Sibelius’s pre-1910 works as ‘early modernist’ or late Romantic.

From a less cynical point of view, it is very likely that what motivates Hepokoski to group these works is a shared formal feature that involves rotational processes and is concretely discernible, even though he does not directly identify or effectively theorize what this is. Identifying these common processes will be crucial to the formulation of a new analytical approach for Sibelius’s music, as well as encouraging a reappraisal of analytical approaches to both nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century orchestral music. If Sibelius’s pre-1910 orchestral works are to be understood as early modernist – a radical departure from romanticism and characterised by formal fractures – there needs to be a formal feature identified in his music, and the music of his contemporaries, that reforms the current fallacy of rotational form.

To formulate a theory of a specifically nineteenth-century and a deformational use of rotation, and to understand why these works have been grouped at least, a rigorous analysis of these ‘rotational forms on their own’ and the way that their materials recur is therefore required. Beethoven’s Andante is a double variation form and may be excluded from consideration, but the other earliest example of rotational form ‘on its own’ – the ‘Appassionata’ Sonata – is a good starting point to explore just what makes it ‘more’ rotational.\(^{18}\) This is not to position Sibelius as a direct musical descendant of Beethovenian form, as early Sibelius scholars attempted (See Chapter 1.3), but to understand Hepokoski and Darcy’s concept of ‘rotation’ using their own examples.

\(^{18}\) Theme and variation forms and their fusions with sonata forms are not considered in Elements of Sonata Theory and this perhaps is why the Andante is included in this miscellaneous group of pieces.
The following section will therefore present a post-Sonata Theory analysis of the Op. 57’s Allegro Assai – Hepokoski’s ‘clear precedent’ – using voice-leading analysis and Janet Schmalfeldt’s concept of becoming to demonstrate the presence of a process that I term ‘rotational projection’. The work has a significant body of scholarship dedicated to the analysis of its form, which includes Rudolf Réti’s analysis of motivic unity and transformation, Martha Frohlich’s sketch studies, Barbara Barry’s analysis of cyclic procedures, Adorno’s scattered thoughts on the piece published posthumously as Beethoven: The Philosophy of Music, and Schenker’s phrase and voice-leading analyses.\(^\text{19}\) In the following analysis, this body of scholarship will be drawn upon to reach new formal conclusions. In this movement, musical material is allowed to project beyond the formal expectations of its contextual function within the sonata by summoning other material that cannot be predicted by the referential rotational ordering of the exposition alone, but nevertheless does uphold aspects of that ordering.

3.2 Rotation in Beethoven’s ‘Appassionata’ Sonata

One of the most striking formal features of the opening movement of Beethoven’s ‘Appassionata’ is its unusually rotational development and the reprise of the development’s material following the end of the recapitulation. Although it is modulatory, the development (R2: bb. 66-133) contains few sequence blocks, motivic manipulation, or any of the other common developmental procedures normally found in the second section of a sonata form. Instead, almost all the exposition’s thematic materials are cycled through closely and in order. After the end of the recapitulation (R3: 134-203) these materials return in R4 (bb. 204-238), corresponding almost bar for bar with R2. As Hepokoski and Darcy observe, this is a quadri-rotational sonata ending with a fifth half-rotation that begins with S (R5: 239-262).\(^\text{20}\) In the ‘Appassionata’, the


\(^{20}\) Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 207, 285.
development and its restatement are rotational beyond the expectations of a Type 3 sonata: less freedom is taken with the ordering of material when it is reprised.\textsuperscript{21} This piece might therefore be considered to be ‘more’ rotational but not ‘less’ sonata, and certainly not rotational form ‘on its own’. Adorno summarizes the overarching form and at the same time explicates the dialectical nature of its engagement with sonata conventions: ‘through the articulation of the development in terms of the two thematic groups of the exposition, the expansion of the coda, also polarized between these two groups, and the addition of a second coda which integrates both thematic forms while, as it were, abolishing itself, an entirely new form emerges from the bi-thematic sonata while strictly preserving the schema’.\textsuperscript{22}

According to \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}’s rhetorical and rotational definition of codas – anything after the complete cycling through R1 in R3, including all C-modules\textsuperscript{23} – the development’s restatement, R4 is the first rotation of a double-rotational coda (R4 and R5) in the ‘Appassionata’ (Fig. 3.1). Hepokoski and Darcy include the ‘Appassionata’ with other movements by Beethoven that have fully-rotational and monumentalizing ‘discursive’ codas followed by a shorter ‘coda to the coda’.\textsuperscript{24} The authors are in agreement with Leonard G. Ratner that these kinds of codas – the Eroica’s first movement is discussed most frequently in this regard – review Part II of the respective sonata (the development and recapitulation) in ‘compressed form’.\textsuperscript{25} In such a light, therefore, Op. 57’s first movement is a triple-rotational sonata with a double-rotational coda. There are, as a result, more rotations than might be expected of a Type 3 sonata and its form might be considered ‘more rotational’ in this sense, but it is certainly not a ‘rotational form on its own’.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item A Type 3 sonata has three to four sections, including an exposition, development, recapitulation, and an optional coda. See Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, 16, 344.
\item Adorno, \textit{Beethoven: The Philosophy of Music}, 60.
\item Ibid., 281.
\item Ibid., 285-86. They provide other examples of fully rotational discursive codas: the first movements of Beethoven’s ‘Waldstein’ Sonata, Op. 53 (double rotational coda); the Eroica Symphony; Symphony No. 8 in F, Op. 93; and String Quartet in B\textsubscript{♭}, Op. 130, which contains an incomplete reference to its recapitulation in the coda.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Figure 3.1  
Elements of Sonata Theory’s Quadri-Rotational Type 3 Sonatas
(Codas based on telescoped development–recapitulation material)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sonata-Space</th>
<th>Not Sonata-Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1: Exposition</td>
<td>R4: Coda 1 (Development material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2: Development</td>
<td>R5: Coda 2 (Recapitulation material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3: Recapitulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevertheless, there is an unusual rotational process at work within the exposition itself that eventually results in the ordering of materials in the lengthy coda in a way that requires new analytical apparatus to understand: the reimagining of the primary theme and transition as the secondary and closing themes. The exposition thus comprises two subrotations through the same melodic material.

3.2.1  
Rotation 1: Antagonism in the Primary Theme (P)

The piano sonata announces itself and its primary theme (P) with an arpeggio-like phrase that introduces the pervasive ‘Appassionata rhythm’, as Rudolf Réti labels it, and the chromatic Neapolitan inflection that generates much of the movement’s structural tension. Observing the generative structural role of the Neapolitan in this manner is a long-standing tradition in literature on the ‘Appassionata’. Many existing analyses hone in on the first movement’s motivic content to understand how the almost omnipresent upper-neighbour motion to $D_\flat$ – Schenker’s ‘Urlinie motive’, Rudolf Réti’s ‘prime cell’ or Barbara Barry’s ‘prime mordent’ – unifies all structural levels of the movement and the sonata cycle as a whole. In Schenker’s words, the motive ‘fills up all parts of the movement’. The result is a grand narrative of cyclicism, coherence, and deferred resolution.

26 My diagram is based upon descriptions of this formal option in Elements of Sonata Theory.
29 Schenker, Tonwille 7, 41.
As a whole, the P-zone (1-23) is ‘conflicted’ by the need to instate its own key with a cadence – F minor – and the desire to resolve to the major mode. The intrusion of the Neapolitan in the restatement of P’s phrase (in G♭ major bb. 5-8) provides an easy and instant way to achieve the latter. The upper-neighbour motion from Neapolitan to tonic versions of the phrase is also condensed in bar 10 to a staccato gesture several octaves below, which is reminiscent of the Fifth Symphony’s ‘Fate’ motif (Ex. 3.1). The persistence of D♭ as an upper neighbour note complicates P’s trajectory to the extent that the theme remains tonally underdetermined and is never able to assert a i:PAC, or even a root position i:HC.

**Example 3.1** Beethoven’s ‘Appassionata’ Sonata, I, bars 1-15

The dominant is emancipated from its role of creating large-scale harmonic tension by sheer virtue of the fact that all energy is expended in resolving D♭ to the dominant itself (V). Stated in hushed dynamics and in first inversion, the dominant is robbed of its assertiveness at every turn and, besides at the movement’s prominent structural cadences, it is never stated firmly enough to resolve to the tonic major or minor. Tonic resolution is deferred to the recapitulation. Furthermore, it is the Neapolitan chord that is responsible for the demise of S’s tonality as it is subsumed into the key of D♭ major in

---

30 All musical examples from Beethoven’s ‘Appassionata’ are based on Ludwig van Beethoven, Sonata in F minor, Op. 57, I. Allegro Assai in Complete Pianoforte Sonatas, Vol. III, ed. Harold Craxton, ann. Donald Francis Tovey (The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music, 1932), 14-29.
the development – a parallelism of P’s foreground C – D♭ – C motion at a lower structural level. In summary, in the ‘Appassionata’ the antagonism between C and its upper neighbour D♭ largely displaces the diatonic antagonism between the tonic and dominant and this is heard, too, in the lack of thematic contrast between P and S.

While there can be no doubt that the C – D♭ – C motion is strikingly persistent, there are other processes at work, indeed rotational ones, that also generate the ‘Appassionata’s’ expansive structure. Yet little if any consideration has been given to the effect of the motivic-content upon the rotation of materials or the shifting functions of thematic material itself, nor what this could mean hermeneutically speaking. With an Elements of Sonata Theory-oriented methodology, the ‘Appassionata’ can be re-approached from this standpoint to investigate what else it can tell us about sonata form analysis and rotational processes.

3.2.2 Rotation 1: Subrotations through Parallel Universes

Composed late on in the movement’s conception and ‘suddenly interpolated’ into Beethoven’s final sketches, the A♭-major S theme is based on the same motivic material as P’s F-minor phrases. While S does provide a contrast in topic and key – a dolce melody and accompaniment opposed to the clear unison texture of P – the ‘Appassionata’ rhythm and arpeggio contour drive both themes. Furthermore, the opening anacrusis of S is transposed from the middle portion of P (P1.2), itself an inversion of P’s opening anacrusis (P1.1) (Ex. 3.2).

Réti even interprets the secondary theme as ‘a varied intensification of the first theme rather than as a contrasting theme’ and Adorno writes that ‘the antithetical themes are at the same time identical in themselves: identity in non-identity’. Such motivic parallels invite a reading of the exposition’s halves as varied treatments of the same

---

31 Frohlich, Beethoven’s ‘Appassionata’ Sonata, 4.
32 Réti, Thematic Patterns in the Sonatas of Beethoven, 133; Adorno, Beethoven: Philosophy of Music, Fragment 48, 21. Other interpretative options could involve rejecting P and S labels altogether or hearing the opening theme as an introduction. Yet the contrasting keys and presence of a medial caesura (MC, b. 33) to divide the themes into Part I and Part II of the rotation supports a reading of a monothematic exposition with intimately related P and S themes.
material, something that has often been commented upon. The structural implications of this reading are yet to be considered, however. Both halves of the rotation are led astray at parallel positions by the Neapolitan, which is followed by more related material, a feature of the work that not been hitherto observed. The exposition, and the rotations that follow, might therefore be understood as ‘subrotational’. They contain two subrotations through related thematic and motivic material, albeit in different keys and with different characters (Table 3.2).

Example 3.2

Parallel Themes in Beethoven’s ‘Appassionata’ Sonata, I

![Example 3.2](image)

Table 3.2 R1: Expositional Subrotations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBROTATION 1</th>
<th>P₁ (Fate)</th>
<th>pCadenza</th>
<th>P₂</th>
<th>↔</th>
<th>TR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Part I)</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>V₅/iii</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
<td>V₅/iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16:4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBROTATION 2</th>
<th>S₁</th>
<th>S₂</th>
<th>SCadenza</th>
<th>S₂ (Fate)</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Part II)</td>
<td>III→iii</td>
<td>V₅/iii</td>
<td>iii:PAC EEC1</td>
<td>iii:PAC EEC2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39:4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S initially presents a more hopeful outcome for the ‘Appassionata’ material than P and thus seems to contrast with the exposition’s Part I materials (Ex. 3.3). Its statement and response both end with III:IACs, as opposed to the weak i:HCs that end P’s first phrase. Furthermore, Part II of the exposition does attain cadential closure, but not without the return of the Neapolitan to complicate events (b. 42). It is at this moment that Part II begins to resemble Part I at a structural level. The cadenza-like outpouring at the end of P₁ has its parallel in the cadenza (b. 44) preceding the Essential Expositional Closure.
(EEC1). Whereas D♭ deflects the conclusion of P’s cadenza and keeps the P-zone open, the Neapolitan of the relative major emerges at the end of S to initiate an extended cadenza and dissolve back into the minor-mode (A♭). With this dissolve, the reimagining of P’s identity in the relative major (S) is revealed to be merely an escapist fantasy from the murkiness of the minor-mode. A♭ major is also not much more permanent than the Neapolitan version of P’s phrase, which was an uncanny and instantly gratifying resolution of the minor mode. At the end of the cadenza, EEC1 is attained (iii:PAC, b. 51) and S does not need to rebegin as P did following its own cadenza. The multi-modal closing zone begins but some aspects of S spill over to colour it, hence the label S♭ (b. 51ff, see S♭ in boxes in Ex. 3.3). Normatively, the end of S in a sonata exposition would continue on to a codetta-like C-zone, which might be P-based, but as it turns out, Part II of the exposition continues to cycle through Part I’s material to reimagine the TR as a C-zone.33

Example 3.3 Rotation 1: S to S♭ (bb. 35-52)

---

33 Even in nineteenth-century minor-mode movements that dissolve to the minor at the end of a relative major S, it is unusual to continue to transform S material (in this case a new motive, S♭, that arises from S’s development of P-material) after the EEC, though Beethoven’s Piano Trio in E-flat, op. 1 no. 1 (ca. 1793), is a precedent and also reuses S♭ material in the C-zone. See ‘the non-S-ness of C’ and ‘C as S-aftermath’ in Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 181-3.
The TR and S superficially seem to be at opposite extremes of mood, much like the contrast of surface sonorities of P and S. After the end of P’s second statement, the TR’s dominant pedal offers some calm stability after the brooding, unresolved P, whereas S presents an aggressive outpouring of forte semiquavers after the dolce S (Ex. 3.4). Nevertheless, the voice-leading structure and motivic content of the TR material is retained in Part II. Both themes are structured around two 4-bar loops that are broken when the themes fragment and drive towards their terminal cadences: the iii:HC MC (b. 33) and iii:PAC EEC2 (b. 61).

In terms of voice leading, the TR continues a progression started by P from G, C, through D♭ (now a seventh) to E♭ in b. 27. Before E♭ can be reached however, the loop circles around the Neapolitan (F♭ major, b. 26) of this new dominant. The Neapolitan generates a new mordent figure at the apex of the loop in the inner voice (B♭–C♭–B♭) and in the upper voice (E♭–F♭–E♭) via a reaching over that creates an accented sighing figure (bb. 29-31) (Ex. 3.5). Like the Neapolitan that disturbed P, it has a similar role here: deflecting resolution to A♭. When the loop is broken (b. 31:3), there is a descent back down to the Kopfton at the beginning of the S theme (b. 36), now recontextualized within the relative major.

Example 3.4 Rotation 1: TR (bb. 24-34)
Example 3.5  Voice-Leading Graph of Rotation 1: TR to S (bb. 29-51)

Example 3.6  Rotation 1: S−
The sighing contour of the TR loop of Part I is transferred to the S\textsuperscript{c} loop in Part II in the guise of a recurring cadential progression that attempts to reconfirm the iii:PAC EEC1 (Ex. 3.6). The appoggiatura is compressed and is stated directly at the conclusion of each loop in the left hand (b. 54:3-4 and b. 58:3-4). In voice-leading terms, the contour of the TR is also retained, as F\textsubscript{♭} is thrown up from the inner voice E\textsubscript{♭} at the EEC1, through the registers and back down at the sighing conclusion of the loop.\textsuperscript{34} In other words, at its core, S\textsuperscript{c} expresses the same E\textsubscript{♭} – F\textsubscript{♭} – E\textsubscript{♭} mordent as the TR. The second S\textsuperscript{c} loop is rhythmically expanded as it is motivically condensed to just the sighing figure, which is swapped between hands in chiasma-like oscillations until b. 60, where the B\textsubscript{♭} – C\textsubscript{♭} – B\textsubscript{♭} mordent resurfaces as an elaboration of the local key’s 2 before the final iii:PAC at bar 61 (EEC2). In the TR, this material tonicizes A\textsubscript{♭} minor, but in S\textsuperscript{c} it reconfirms the key following the EEC1. What is more, the TR reimagined the Kopfton as the flattened 3 of this key, but here in the S\textsuperscript{c} it descends to the key’s 1 (3 of Urlinie). In retrospect then, the TR’s tonicization of A\textsubscript{♭} minor instead of major actually pre-empts the move to the parallel minor in S\textsuperscript{c} and thereby creates an unusually chromatic Urlinie. In Part II of the exposition then, the TR is re-written and functionally transformed according to its new context. The TR is synthesized with S\textsuperscript{12} to become the agitated S\textsuperscript{c} theme.

A ‘P-based S’ has significant implications for its rotational understanding.\textsuperscript{35} That S begins a subrotation through P material, complicates the standing of P as signifier of rotational beginning and rebeginning at an interthematic level. Simultaneously, and perhaps paradoxically, S also upholds the large-scale functions of continuation: the pulsing TR pedal is taken on in S’s accompaniment, for instance, but also retains the functions of contrast and closure that are normative to Part II of a sonata exposition. These double functions are a result of the blurring of the boundaries between the themes’ contextual roles and the intrinsic qualities of their material, and it is this blurring that also creates opportunities later in the movement for congruous exchanges between the sides of the medial caesura. Monothematicism, also known as ‘contrasting

\textsuperscript{34} The chromatically inflected descent to V at the MC is also reversed to become an ascent from the iii:PAC EEC1 in S\textsuperscript{c}.

\textsuperscript{35} See ‘P-based S’ in Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 135.
3.3 The Process of Becoming at Rotational Borders

The exposition’s parallel subrotations are not the only feature of the movement that might be deemed ‘additionally’ rotational. Perhaps because they can be read as alternative approaches to the same content, both halves of the exposition are cycled through in every subsequent rotation, each time altered to comply with the formal needs of the sections in which they appear. In the second rotation, the development, the themes remain largely intact as the expected thematic-motivic developmental processes are replaced by an emphasis on the functional transformation of themes. The only developmental procedures are a P-based sequence block (b. 84:2-92) and some antiphonal textures. The exposition is not repeated and some of the function of a repeat is taken on by R2 in its almost direct restatement of material like a written-out repeat, albeit in new key areas. Unlike the kind of becoming from one subrotation to the other – the transformation of P into S, and TR into S’ – which was instantaneous, like viewing the same material in parallel universes, the kind of becoming between rotations in this work is ‘written’ into the music and it thus appears to be a gradual becoming. Its process is ‘laid bare’. The junctures between R1 and R2 (exposition and development) and the corresponding juncture later in the movement between R3 and R4 (recapitulation and first coda rotation), are elided and integrated using ‘linkage technique’ to blur any sense that there is a musical seam and create the illusion of continuation. In contrast, the Fate

36 Arnold Schmitz was the first to observe the principle of monothematicism using the term, ‘contrasting derivation’ in Beethoven’s music (his term) in Beethoven’s ’Zwei Prinzip’ (Berlin and Bonn: Ferdinand Dümmler, 1923). William E. Caplin gives the following examples of monothematicism in Haydn: the first movements of the ‘Military’ Symphony No. 100 in G; String Quartet in E♭, Op. 50/3, String Quartet in C, Op. 64/I, i. See Caplin, Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven (Oxford University Press, 2000), 169 and 277 n. 23.
motif emerges as a result of subrotational substitution at the junctures between R2 and R3, and R4 and R5.

### 3.3.1 R1-2 and R3-4: Rotational Elision and Knüpftechnik

The blurring of the borders between these rotations caused by Knüpftechnik, R1-2 and R3-4, creates a momentary sense of structural disorientation. Knüpftechnik, or ‘linkage technique’, is a Schenkerian term that describes the join from the end of a phrase to the next one’s beginning via a motif, the link. It is a specific type of elision that integrates disparate musical elements through a process of elimination. Though this linkage technique is most associated with Brahms, it can be found in Beethoven and Sibelius, as we will see at the end of the chapter. The technique takes on an architectural role at the end of the ‘Appassionata’s’ R1, which predicts and later initiates the second rotation through the development within the coda (R4).

After C’s codetta-like cadential loops (bb. 61-63) at the end of R1, A♭ minor is confirmed one last time with a descending arpeggiation down through the triad (bar 64-65:3) (Ex. 3.7). With a motion through the enharmonic seam, A♭ is converted to G♯ (b. 65:4–66:3). The falling arpeggiation is condensed to take on the ‘Appassionata rhythm’. It becomes P’s initial anacrusis (P¹.¹) and a link to its opening phrase. P¹.¹ is then subjected to a leading note transformation and repeated to outline E+, the new local tonic, as D♭ steps down to E (G♭ becomes 3). P¹ then proceeds (bb. 66:4–78:3) to initiate the development, R2, with some variation. Through rhythmic compression, Knüpftechnik, and the opening outwards of the local tonic triad, the first rotation is woven into the next.

The same process is intensified at the end of the recapitulation as it cycles through the referential ordering of materials laid out in the exposition, including these bars. The link is omitted this time, and the arpeggio confirming the ESC in the last bar of C stands in

---

38 For a discussion of Brahmsian Knüpftechnik see Walter Frisch, Brahms and the Principle of Developing Variation (University of California Press, 1990), 15.
directly for P\(^{1.1}\) (b. 203-4:3), continuing straight to P\(^{1.2}\) (b. 204:4) (Ex. 3.8 below). The leading-note transformation between rotations is retained here but deferred until later within the P theme itself (F- to D\(_\flat\)+). P itself is truncated – the cadential unit is omitted – and becomes sequential in its tonicization of D\(_\flat\) major, the Neapolitan.

To understand how and why this occurs, the end of the exposition must be reconsidered. The smooth and efficient transformation between the R1 C-zone and R2 P-zone is pre-empted by the appearance of P\(^{1.2}\), which is rhythmically compressed into C’s RH accompaniment semiquavers. Their basis on P only comes to the fore during the aforementioned process of becoming in the LH. By the last bar of C (b. 64) the figure is liquidated to become the same Alberti pattern that accompanied S\(^c\), retrospectively revealing this S\(^c\) pattern to be not just TR based, but a P\(^{1.2}\) variant as well. At the end of the recapitulation, the entire passage is transposed into the tonic minor, as is the beginning of the next rotation. The link that enacted the L transformation is no longer needed and clears the path for the quavers to run over from the last bar of C into P, which now continues straight into the P sequence block (b. 204:4) of the development to tonicize D\(_\flat\)+. The rotations overlap in an ouroboros-like manner, and as a result, R2 is projected forth from the end of the recapitulation as R4.

Such a simple slippage to E major (the hexatonic pole of the dominant) through the link from the exposition to development sounds unprepared and strange after the exposition’s extended and furious S\(^c\) and C zone’s A\(_\flat\) minor. Like the Neapolitan transformation of P’s sentence into the major mode, its lack of dominant preparation renders it a temporary and inadequate solution to the burden of the minor-mode. P’s cadential unit is reiterated and expanded to become a standard HC-cadential progression (I\(^3\)–ii–V\(^4\)–%3) and the responding Fate motif is transformed into its cadential %3 as a sighing piano appoggiatura. The cadential progression dies away each time and is eventually interrupted and rejected forcefully by E minor as P rebegins (P\(^0\)). A simple concealment of the chromatic antagonism inherent in P proves to be not enough to adequately transform it. The rejection of this version of P could be taken as a critique of the false promise of escape from the ‘violence’ of diatonicism that hexatonic relations
provide, a violence that Harper-Scott argues is made explicit in Beethoven’s music through forceful ‘gestural spotlighting’.\textsuperscript{39}

The voice-leading slippage between rotations continues well into the development but is confined to a sequence block that ends up where the exposition ended. P\textsuperscript{2} (b. 78:4) opens the block based upon the first part of P’s opening phrase (P\textsuperscript{1.1} to P\textsuperscript{1.2}). The block completes a descent from E major through the equal division of the octave and back through the enharmonic seam to A\textsubscript{♭}, which is prolonged as a pedal in the reprised TR. The dominant, C\textsuperscript{+}, is conspicuously absent from Subrotation 1’s systematic cycling around the Northern hexatonic cycle, perhaps reserved for the RT in its function as structural dominant (Fig. 3.2). Unlike the developmental treatment of P material, the TR in R2 (bb. 93–109:1) corresponds exactly to the TR in R1, with the same looping structure. The direction of the loop’s octave leaps is reversed, before the liquidation of the final Neapolitan sigh (bb. 101-2) and chromatic descent through diminished seventh chords to A\textsubscript{♭}. The TR ends with four new bars of imitation that expand the V-I bass motion onto S’s accompaniment figure so that D\textsubscript{♭} is approached by a chromatic stepwise motion (bb. 105-108:1). The TR fulfils the same tonicizing function in the development. It recontextualizes A\textsubscript{♭} as the dominant of D\textsubscript{♭} major, which is tonicized for the onset of S. Unlike Subrotation 1’s E major, Subrotation 2’s D\textsubscript{♭} major is tonicized by strong dominant preparation and gains a stronger foothold in the structure of the movement. Even the Neapolitan sighs at the pinnacle of each loop are initially transformed to the diatonic II.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{northern_hexatonic_cycle.png}
\caption{Northern Hexatonic Cycle Transformations
R1: Subrotation 2 to R2: Subrotation 1
(Numbers indicate bars)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{39} Harper-Scott, \textit{The Quilting Points of Musical Modernism}, 243.
In the development, S retains its descending arpeggio contour and is repeated three times in a descent through the Neapolitan chord: S₁ in D♭ major, S₂ in B♭ minor, and S₃ in G♭ minor. In Subrotation 2, the desired Neapolitan major alternative to the minor-mode world is opened out here in a sanctified major theme zone, but not without negative implications for the reprise of S at the movement’s end. Upon its third statement, S fragments before its response can be sounded. The resulting rising sequence initiates a move away from the Neapolitan’s flat side and through the enharmonic seam in an attempt to assert the dominant, which is reached by bar 122 via N and L transformations to the secondary dominant. The structural dominant and 2 are reached at bar 122. However, the Neapolitan’s D♭ proves inescapable, and remerges to transform the dominant to a diminished seventh (G-B♭-D♭-E) that cascades in broken chords in a new fortissimo cadenza-like section (b. 122-29). This cadenza replaces the retransition to the next rotation, the recapitulation. Instead of straightforwardly tonicizing F minor with a dominant lock, the cadenza instead prevents the retonicization of I with V, as it did in the P-zone, by displacing this resolution and using all energy up on its own resolution to V.
Example 3.7  Rotation 1: C ↔ R2: P (bb. 61 – 66)

Example 3.8  Rotation 3: C ↔ R4: P (bb. 200 – 207)
3.3.2 R2-3 and R4-5: Rotational Role of the Fate Motif

The borders between R2 and R3 – the development and recapitulation – and R4 and R5 – the coda rotations – demonstrate another kind of becoming, this time involving the changing contextual function of the Fate motif. This motif, which first functioned to disrupt the trajectory of P, emerges at several moments of structural importance where its HC fermata provides a juncture-like caesura between rotations. Taken out of its Subrotation 1 context, the motif becomes something new but does so merely because of its new structural position, not through a ‘written-in’ dissolution of some sort or through a smooth elision of one material into another at the aforementioned rotational seams. The end of the development is one such juncture where it takes on a new function through a kind of ‘definite negation’. In fact, Adorno reads this moment in a very similar way, remarking that this moment is a ‘supreme example’ of the ‘nullity of the particular; the fact that the whole means everything’. He argues that in ‘isolation [the opening of the recapitulation] is in no way striking [yet] in conjunction with the development it is one of the great moments in music’. This moment ‘retrospectively conjures up as accomplished facts details which were never actually there’.

There are no Sc or C-zone modules within Rotation 2. Their function of reaffirming closure is inappropriate for the end of a development, which is generically concerned with tonal preparation for the return of P in the tonic and re-establishment of the Kopfton. Nevertheless, the material following S does not entirely diverge from the referential rotation. The cadenza begins with the P1.2-based semiquavers that accompanied C, for example (b. 123). Furthermore, the conception of the first and second subrotations as variations of the same thing creates a greater fluidity between Part I and II of the exposition’s materials. Materials from either side of the MC are allowed to be substituted for another. In this instance, the Fate motif portion of P in

---

40 Adorno, Beethoven: The Philosophy of Music, Fragment 53, 22-3. For more discussion about this fragment, see Michael Spitzer, Music as Philosophy: Adorno and Beethoven’s Late Style (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 46.
41 Ibid., 23.
42 Ibid., 22.
Subrotation 1 replaces S of Subrotation 2, which did incorporate the motif in its closing function in any case (b. 130).

Following a passage of rhythmic liquidation, the cadenza concludes with reiterations of the motif criss-crossing either side of the RH’s semiquavers (bb. 130-33, Ex. 3.9). The Fate motif was suppressed in Subrotation 1 of the development, making its appearance at the end of the cadenza all the more prominent and aggressive. Initially the Fate motif forcefully asserts D♭ without falling to C on the crotchet downbeats. It is only in the last bars of R2 that it falls by step to C and the diminished seventh is converted back to V. The rotation finally comes to rest on a piano quaver C pedal in bar 132. The reprisal of the Fate motif in a new structural context alters its function and rotational connotations. It follows on from S as a subrotational alternative to S', as well as a tonal consequence and motivic representation of the development’s SR2 tonal structure, and a last attempt to establish D♭. The Fate motif therefore acts both as a continuation from the S-cadenza to P1 and, paradoxically, as an ending to the development by providing a clear caesura in its role dictated by the formal demands of the sonata.

**Example 3.9** Rotations 2 to 3: The Fate Motif to P (bb. 130-7)
Even removed from its original context as a mid-P gesture, the Fate Motif projects forth the rotational ordering of the exposition. P is reintroduced next and the recapitulation begins, thereby quite obviously fulfilling sonata norms. The new rotation, R3, provides another fresh start for P, but the recapitulation is not without its complications. All energy is expended resolving the Fate motif’s D♭ to C in the bass and the latter lingers on into the new rotation, almost as if the LH has thematically stalled. The quaver pedal C continues incessantly through R3, meaning that Subrotation 1 occurs over two extended cadential ¶ (TR is the second) (Ex. 3.9 and 3.10). There are two reasons for the dominant lock to continue under P. Firstly, the disruption caused by D♭ at the end of the development seriously compromised the dominant preparation. In the absence of a straightforward RT, the dominant spills over into the recapitulation, thereby dislocating the beginning of P¹ (b. 135: 4) and the Kopfton (b. 138) from its root position tonic support and the beginning of the Bass Arpeggiation (b. 152). Secondly, the Fate motif seemingly cannot stop reiterating the dominant until P² is sounded, and the rotational order of its first context is picked up. The sonata's formal demand to recapitulate R1’s material means that it is P¹ and not the explosive P² that follows the Fate motif at the end of the development. However, the original function of the Fate motif’s HC as a link to the first note of P² is retained, and C is prolonged as a pedal indefinitely until it can fulfil this duty at the fermata.

After such an extended pedal, the dominant gains some of its powers of resolution at the Fate motif’s HC in bar 151. The tonic is only asserted in root position after the cadenza’s expansion of the Fate motif, which is identical to the equivalent passage in R1, except that V at the cadenza’s HC is altered from first inversion (b. 16) to a more definitive root position (b. 150). At this point, the P – Fate motif segment may be reinterpreted as a loop at an interthematic level in retrospect. The motif at the end of the development is part of a loop already in process, and P² begins a new loop that goes elsewhere after the end of the extended bass oscillations between C and D♭ (Fig. 3.3). It acts not only as continuation, but as a kind of interthematic link.
Figure 3.3  Rotation 2 to Rotation 3: Development to Recapitulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROTATION 2</th>
<th>=&gt; ROTATION 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C =&gt; P</td>
<td>TR' S Cad. Fate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii i → vii – v – III V₆/VI vi-iv- iii O7 i:HC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P¹ Fate P² TR'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V₆/i i:HC i V₆/i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 3.10  Rotations 2 to 3: The Fate Motif to P (bb. 139-141)
As discussed above, the fourth rotation – the second cycle through developmental material – spins out of the end of the recapitulation as a result of the close cycling through the referential rotation (R1) that occurred in the recapitulation (R3), which included those bars that smoothly segued into the development (R2). R4 is half the length of R2, but it is not a half rotation because it contains material from both Subrotations 1 and 2. That R4 cycles through the development’s materials makes R2 a second referential rotation. Yet R4 does not ‘recapitulate’ the materials of the development because it does not involve a transposition of non-tonic materials into the tonic. Instead, the rotation compresses the thematic and tonal content of the development: the bass oscillation of $C - D_\flat - C$. The rotation’s formal role is unclear at this point in the movement. It is outside the realms of Type 3 sonata norms but occurs as direct result of the recapitulation of the R1-R2 Knüpfttechnik bars so it is not merely an addition to the structure, or definitively outside the sonata-space (‘parageneric’). It is in fact, a structurally inevitable or ‘fated’ continuation.
A shortened variation of the P-sequence block tonicizes D♭ almost immediately without the aid of the TR’s tonicizing dominant lock, which is omitted. P is allowed to cycle straight into S (b. 210) through a new rotational pathway without the dividing MC. The proximity of P and S draws direct attention to the shared motivic content of the themes and the alternative worlds of SR1 and SR2 begin to converge. Conversely, it is their shared thematic material that allows the themes to be elided. The S material fragments as it does in the development, this time moving back to the tonic minor. The cadenza also interrupts and ascends through the Neapolitan, replacing the diminished seventh harmony of the equivalent position in the development, and tries to reassert itself. The ascending semiquaver pattern becomes the P-cadenza as the beat-long pattern (bb. 218–226) acts as a large-scale link to bar 227. The P-cadenza ends this section with a chromatic rise from D♭, neutralized to D♭ and then fortissimo C (V), resolving the Neapolitan once more. R4 ends with the reprise of the Fate motif (bb. 235–238) in parallel with R2 (Ex. 3.11 above). Unlike the declamatory end of the development, Fate loses its energy as it dies away from piano to pianissimo and grinds to a halt. After the extended pedals of the recapitulation and the faltering character of the Fate motif here, the dominant finally summons the energy to resolve to the tonic. The Fate motif is transformed into a V-I cadence at the telos of the work. Its motivic and tonal resolution dispels the lasting effects of the Neapolitan’s uncanny major transformation of P’s phrase, the D♭.

Although the body of the sonata retains the expected rotational pathways through material, the double-rotational coda might be understood as a freer space, beyond the realms of strict sonata functions. In other words, there are no sonata formal-functional necessities for the material following a reprised development, which is unusual in itself. Simply being ‘outside’ sonata space is not an adequate explanation for the specific rotational treatment of musical materials. Much like the reprise of the development, the resolution of the Fate motif is a structurally inevitable continuation of the movement’s events. It is only here that it can be resolved because of the development’s order, and because R4 does not proceed to reprise the recapitulation, which it might, given the
previous joins between rotations in the movement. In some ways the material following the Fate motif’s thematic and tonal resolution is a new rotation, as the recapitulation is a new rotation following the development. The Fate motif retains some of its connotations of continuation as it did at the parallel juncture between R2 and R3. As the Fate motif is finally resolved, P does not need to restart as it does in the exposition or at the beginning of the development. F minor has also already been reached and forcefully asserted by the Fate motif, so TR’s tonicizing function is not needed, and S can therefore proceed immediately. The process of conflation and elision between rotations, initiated by the link’s slippage between R1 and R2, continues into R5 resulting in a contracting spiral-like rotational process (Fig. 3.4)

Figure 3.4  Rotation 4 to Rotation 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C ⇒</th>
<th>ROTATION 4</th>
<th>→ ROTATION 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>P-block S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cadenza</td>
<td>Fate’ P/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i → VI IV ,II − iv V₅</td>
<td>i:PAC i</td>
<td>i:IAC i:IAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What follows S and C materials in this rotation is not simply a statement of P, reversing the rotational ordering. Rather, the last segment of the piece is a distilled version of P and S that eventually dies away to the feeble ppp i:IAC that ends the movement. The material retains the Appassionata’s distinctive anacrusis rhythm and the rising and falling F minor arpeggations common to both P and S. The theme thereby represents the opposite process to that of organic growth: it is a special kind of thematic liquidation that eradicates differences between two elements until they are indistinguishable, revealing what is common to both. As Adorno observes in the above quotation, the second coda ‘integrates both thematic forms’ while ‘abolishing itself’.43 Though the movement’s sprawling expansiveness seems to fit comfortably into the narrative of ‘heroicism’ commonly attributed to Beethoven’s mid-career phase, P does not aim to conquer or subordinate S, but struggles against the dopamine rush of the Neapolitan that is closely associated with the Fate motif. Once it has been resisted, the MC-barrier

43 Adorno, Beethoven; Philosophy of Music, Fragment 142, 60.
between subrotations can be fully lifted and the rotational halves dissolve into each other.

In conclusion, the first movement of Beethoven’s ‘Appassionata’ Sonata does contain various processes that make it ‘more rotational’ than other works from the nineteenth-century, hypothetically at least. These include a greater number of rotations, and a strictly ordered development section that is reprised. The most strikingly rotational feature of the work, however, is its unusually rotational monothematic exposition, which is in fact two subrotations through the same material. It is this sharing of material across the normally strict divide of the medial caesura that creates the possibilities for subtle ‘rotational projections’ later on in the movement. In such instances, a material’s contextual ordering from a prior rotation is allowed to project forth beyond the formal expectations of its generic form in that moment, and it is at these moments that the rotational principle ‘on its own’ might be said to take over.
Table 3.3  Form of Beethoven’s ‘Appassionata’ Sonata in F minor, Op. 57, I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBROTATION 1</th>
<th>SUBROTATION 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1</strong></td>
<td><strong>R5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(^1) Fate → Cadenza</td>
<td>S(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>V(_A) i:HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 10 14 16 16:4</td>
<td>i:HC MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>S(^C) (Fate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 33</td>
<td>iii: PAC EEC1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S(^3)</td>
<td>Cadenza (C/P(^1)(^2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii – v – III</td>
<td>vii – v – III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66:4</td>
<td>66:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII HC</td>
<td>VII HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78:4</td>
<td>78:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R2</strong></td>
<td><strong>R4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⇒ P(^1)</td>
<td>P(^2) Sequence-block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(^2) Sequence-block</td>
<td>TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V(_A) vi</td>
<td>S(^1) ⇒ P-Cadenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii – v – III</td>
<td>i: HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>i: HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R3</strong></td>
<td><strong>R5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(^2) Sequence-block</td>
<td>S(^1) ⇒ P-Cadenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i → VI</td>
<td>S(^1) ⇒ P-Cadenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204:4</td>
<td>i: IAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R4</strong></td>
<td><strong>R6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(^1) Fate → Cadenza</td>
<td>S(^1) ⇒ P-Cadenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>V(_A) i:HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135:4 145 149 151 151:4</td>
<td>i: HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>S(^1) ⇒ P-Cadenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V(_A) i: HC MC</td>
<td>i: HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>i: HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R5</strong></td>
<td><strong>R6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(^2) Sequence-block</td>
<td>S(^1) ⇒ P-Cadenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i → VI</td>
<td>S(^1) ⇒ P-Cadenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204:4</td>
<td>i: IAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R6</strong></td>
<td><strong>R6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(^2) Sequence-block</td>
<td>S(^1) ⇒ P-Cadenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i → VI</td>
<td>S(^1) ⇒ P-Cadenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204:4</td>
<td>i: IAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **S\(^1\)**: Cadenza
- **S\(^2\)**: Cadenza
- **S\(^3\)**: Cadenza
- **S\(^C\)**: Cadenza
- **S\(^{1.1}\)**: Cadenza
- **S\(^{1.1}\)**: Cadenza
- **S\(^{1.1}\)**: Cadenza
- **S\(^{1.1}\)**: Cadenza
- **S\(^{1.1}\)**: Cadenza
- **S\(^{1.1}\)**: Cadenza
- **S\(^{1.1}\)**: Cadenza
- **S\(^{1.1}\)**: Cadenza
- **S\(^{1.1}\)**: Cadenza
Example 3.12  Voice Leading in Beethoven’s ‘Appassionata’ Sonata in F minor, Op. 57, I
3.4 A New Theory of Rotation: Sibelian Rotational Projection

To recapitulate, the rotational principle, as defined in Hepokoski and Darcy’s *Elements of Sonata Theory*, dictates that the order of musical materials in a rotational piece should refer back to the order of its first rotation, otherwise known as the ‘referential rotation’.\(^{44}\) In some of Sibelius’s music, Hepokoski discerns an accumulative effect of growth or rumination on material through successive rotations, implying that Sibelian rotations refer back not just to the first, but also to all previous rotations within a work freely, in order to expand, comment upon, or negate certain features.\(^{45}\) This process of internal reference intensifies the rotational form of a work. Yet like in Beethoven’s music and doubtless in other music that lies beyond the scope of this thesis, there also exist some moments in Sibelius’s music when reordered material ‘feels’ like it is rotational but does not seem to conform to the expectations of the section in which it appears. It is these moments that can be understood using the concept that I term ‘rotational projection’.

Like Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s rotational principle, the concept of rotational projection may be extended back into the eighteenth-century – the potential has always been there – but unlike the rotational principle, which governs a vast amount of music, the potential was not unlocked, so to speak, until the nineteenth-century. Occasionally, material is allowed to project forth beyond, against, or outside the formal expectations of the sonata or other generic form by calling forth other material that cycles away from it that makes rotational sense at the moment of this cross-roads. The order of this material cannot straightforwardly be predicted from the referential rotation. When the material of Part I and Part II is very similar – either monothematic, with a P-based S, or with some similar unit appearing in both parts – the forward projection of the rotational principle from certain modules can present multiple pathways to choose from at unusual points in the structure. The result is a rotational form, but not one that conforms to the

---

\(^{44}\) Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 23. The same rotation is referred to as a ‘referential statement’ in Hepokoski, *Sibelius, Symphony No. 5*, 26-7.

The linear layout of the referential rotation. The concept of rotational projections enables the analyst to understand why this deformation has occurred.

In a sonata form, for instance, an exposition’s closing zone that is based on the primary theme might short circuit straight into the primary theme itself without any kind of sectional division to separate the two theme zones (Fig. 3.6), as is the case in the first movements of Beethoven’s ‘Appassionata’ Sonata or Mendelssohn’s String Quartet, Op. 44 no. 2 in E minor. Or a retransition at the end of a development might borrow and functionally transform material from the exposition’s transition (Fig. 3.7). This borrowing could direct the form down a path to a Type 2 sonata by rotationally projecting into the secondary theme or complicating recapitulatory return in other unexpected ways. The ‘Appassionata’ sonata additionally contains subrotational projections caused by the close basis of S on P, which results in a projection to TR-based Cs.

**Figure 3.5**  Rotational projection in a sonata form from a P-based C (projection marked in blue)

**Figure 3.6**  Rotational projection in a sonata form from a TR-based (projection marked in blue)

---

46 The P-based C-zone in Mendelssohn’s String Quartet flows directly into a post-P modules at the beginning of the recapitulation rotation. The process of rotational elision and becoming in this work demonstrates the kind of rotational projection in Fig. 3.6 particularly clearly. The first movement of Mendelssohn’s “Scottish” Symphony No. 3 in A minor, also contains P-based S themes that result in unusual rotational ordering and possibly rotational projections.
Such treatment of formal junctures has also been understood as a kind of telescoping. Writing in the late 1940s, Gerald Abraham suggested that the development and recapitulation in several of Sibelius’s symphonic movements were telescoped. In the Fourth Symphony, he argues that this results in the truncation of the primary theme entirely.\(^47\) It is crucial however, to locate the specific formal processes that lead to such moments and I propose that the concept of ‘rotational projection’ might work in tandem with concepts like ‘telescoping’ or becoming to lend them further specificity and contextual meaning.

Non-congruence between rotations and formal boundaries can also be found in Sibelius’s early music. In the context of scholarship on the composer, reference to internal recurrence and the sense that his music is in some way more rotational than others, emerges as a response to the phenomena often created by his treatment of transitional material at rotational boundaries. The functional transformation of TR material; misalignment of thematic material from its associated accompaniment texture, and the elision of sections through layering, dovetailing, and metrical modulations are all processes that create a sense of disorientation within the form. Although a dialogue with the sonata tradition is maintained, endings of rotations become difficult to discern and it often seems that we are mid-rotation before realizing that it has even begun. The overwhelming impression is one of coming into focus, becoming, or even ‘coming into being’, in the Heideggerian sense, as Hepokoski has observed.\(^48\) It is crucial however, to locate the specific formal processes that leave this impression.

What defines him from his predecessors is that while his rotations overflow past the boundaries of formal sections, the boundaries of these formal sections are also sometimes simultaneously upheld, and two rotations are overlaid on top of one another as are the musical materials of both rotation in a large-scale version of the multivalent

---

\(^48\) Hepokoski, Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 27.
voice leading demonstrated in Chapter 2. It is this layering of different rotational pathways that distinguishes Sibelius from Beethoven and other earlier composers. His TR and RT materials are imbued with special structural significance and given double function. They enable the existing rotation to continue cycling while also preparing for a new rotation to begin. P and S therefore sometimes appear simultaneously, and rotations overlap.

In summary, rotational projections occur at musical moments when an individual form retrospectively refers to a previous rotational moment by projecting forth the ordering of that moment’s material, but by doing so against the logic of the historically mediated form’s generic schema. The endings of rotations become difficult to discern and it often seems that we are mid-rotation before realizing that it has even begun. This is not a process that is limited to sonata forms though their large-scale sectional form provides an opportunity for some of the most striking projections.

### 3.4.1 Sibelius, Symphony No. 3 in C major, Op. 52 (1907)

Like the first movement of Beethoven’s ‘Appassionata’, the finale movement of Sibelius’s Symphony No. 3 in C major, Op. 52 (1907), repeats the exposition’s materials with some variation and expansion. Unlike Beethoven’s movement however, it is Sibelius’s third rotation that receives a more typical developmental treatment. If this is to be understood as an exposition cycled through twice – a ‘double exposition’ – it is perhaps in a dialogue with the expositional repeat.

The first rotation, R1, presents musical material in two contrasting key areas, the tonic and submediant, before rotating through this material once more: returning to the tonic and presenting the secondary theme in the subdominant minor. However, the second rotation’s treatment of the material of the first is not simply a case of variation and expansion, as Hepokoski suggests. A striking feature of these opening rotations and a feature that has evaded analytical enquiry is the simultaneous cycling through P and S at the opening of the second rotation (Fig. 3.7). The retransitional material joining these rotations, is in fact, based upon the first rotation’s transitionary passage. The passage
reintroduces S as a rotational necessity of the transitional material itself and P as a result of its structural positioning as a retransition at the end of the exposition. This is a rotational projection. Further complicating the matter is the continuation of the TR’s staccato ostinato texture in the strings as a backdrop to the overlaid P and S themes.

![Figure 3.7](image)

Sibelius, Symphony No. 3, Op. 52 III, Rotations 1-2

The movement opens with a descending cadential gesture that re-establishes the Symphony’s bright tonic C major after a G-sharp minor second movement and provides firm closure before the movement has even begun. After a second PAC in the tonic, the bassoons answer with a codetta-like phrase (P2 Ex. 3.13), and an oboe response that provides an IAC. This is varied and passed to the second violins and violas whose *sforzando* entry is again answered by the oboe’s continuation. This time, the response rises to assert a PAC, but is instead interrupted by Piú Allegro chattering violins that outline a diminished seventh chord. This interruption allows the slow movement’s theme to be reintroduced, transposed up a semitone in the flutes. Initially, the episode-like interpolation may be read as a transition containing successive attempts to open a medial caesura with a tonic half cadence, each time thwarted by the returning string chatterings. However, upon its third repetition, the second movement’s melodic fragment is elided with P1’s cadential unit and the whole episode is subsumed into the P-zone retrospectively.

The closure of the tonic PAC here is obscured. The staccato quavers, which initially double the falling cadential gesture in the woodwind, overrun in the strings and initiate a series of falling diminished fourths from $\hat{1}$ at the cadence. These G-sharps act as the leading note of the submediant, A minor. Caesura-fill outlines the new key in a rising and falling passage of oscillating quavers before a searching secondary theme is introduced over interlocking string oscillations.
Example 3.13  Sibelius, Symphony No. 3 in C major, finale, bars 7-26
The second rotation begins with the chattering Piú Allegro strings that interrupted the cadential function of P2’s continuation, this time interrupting the attempted closure at the end of S by running down to flat five and creating an A diminished chord, which initiates a move away from A minor. The cellos and violas chatter up sequentially to be dovetailed with an oscillating staccato pattern in the upper strings from the CF passage of R1, re-establishing the Kopfton, G. The chattering is not answered by the flute’s recall of the second movement’s theme in this rotation, nor is it part of the P-zone. Strangely enough there is some trace of P buried in the Violin II part – the overrunning quavers that obscured P’s final PAC. Here they are barely audible and seemingly have no function, other than to project forward into the CF material, which has similarly lost its caesura-filling function. The falling diminished fourths, now minor thirds, that proceeded from P’s PAC are deferred and scattered across the orchestra at the end of this passage. The G-sharp is respelled as its enharmonic A-flat, in an extended antiphonal exchange between woodwind instruments, which ultimately outline an Italian 6th. In this new context, the A-flat serves no tonicizing function as it did in R1. It instead acts as a chromatic passing note in an ascent from G to A – a covering tone over 4 of the 5-prg. The A flat defers the continuing descent until the tempo settles into an allegro and the P-theme is cycled through once more, now compressed to begin with a falling arpeggiation. Strikingly, these abbreviated P-units are answered by S-theme material in the bassoons, which is now removed from its lilting timbral context, and placed over the extended staccato CF oscillations, which accompany this passage. S here has no structural function from a tonal perspective. The 5-prg. from G is carried out by P material alone, making the appearance of S purely a rotational necessitation of the appearance of TR-like and CF materials.

49 This rotation of the folk melody served as a last reminder of the incessant cycles of this theme, which, after being resolved through its elision with P, has served its purpose.

50 The augmented 6th does not resolve as might be expected to V and does not have a predominant role. According to Hepokoski and Darcy, in eighteenth-century expositions, V at an HC:MC is approached by chromatically altered harmony containing 4♯(3-♯4 or 4-♯5). In this movement, the 6 above 4 happens after the I:PAC. An alternative reading of this area in R1 might be that after the end of P (the I:PAC), a new key – V – is sought through a condensed TR involving the Italian 6th as a predominant. This does not resolve inwards to V (G), and there is no V:PAC, but it nevertheless acts as a chromatic passing note within the 5-prg. This reading maintains a dialogue with eighteenth to nineteenth-century norms. See Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 30.
After this layering of P and S themes, the second rotation then re-joins the referential order of materials, cycling through the Piú allegro chattering, CF-material, and the entirety of the S-theme. The chattering quavers undergo yet another functional transformation in this mid-rotational. In contrast to their first appearance where they interrupted P3.2’s continuation, in this rotation P3.1 becomes an altered version of the quaver passage through a process of liquidation, before P3.2 is even reached, in a kind of P-TR dissolve. The quavers rise sequentially through an A-flat scale (C to G) that arises as a direct result of the tonic minor inflection of P3.2. After a tonic PAC MC at the apex of this passage, the falling thirds commence, this time confirming the cadence before dropping from C to A-flat and moving through the enharmonic seam to the lilting backdrop of the S-theme in F minor. Yet the thematic material of S does not return immediately, and the chorale theme that will later emerge from the end of the development is sounded distantly in the horns and violas, seemingly growing out of the descending minor thirds in an instance of Knüpfttechnik, as discussed in Section 4.3. It is only after this theme comes to rest on an F minor chord, that the rotation continues in strict correspondence with Rotation 1 and S-proper is introduced.

Retrojecting back from this point, the falling minor thirds may be read as reaching down in each appearance for the ‘right’ tonal space to open. In this way, the double rotational exposition is reminiscent of nineteenth-century three-key expositions and trimodular blocks, where an S-zone is unable to secure an EEC and a second more successful S-theme in a new key is reached after a second transition and medial caesura. A reading of these rotations in a dialogue with these kinds of expositional structure goes someway to explaining the continuation of TR texture throughout the layered P and S section followed by S in a third key, although the analogy quickly becomes strained, considering the return to the tonic in this segment, and the double rotational implications of the return to P.

51 F♯-C augmented 6ths/tritone resolve to C-E.
In fact, both rotations take place upon the plane of an almost omnipresent C pedal, a tone around which the key areas of S are conceptually imagined (Fig. 3.8). The chattering quavers are next sounded at the end of S, in a calamitous push to A-flat major at the onset of the next rotation: the development. The rotations therefore present trajectories through alternative tonal worlds: trajectories guided by the functional transformation of the mid-rotational material, which has interruptive, transitional, and/or retransitional functions, and the ability to open up episodes that conceptually occupy a different spatial-timbral plane as well as multiple simultaneous pathways through the rotational ordering of material.

**Figure 3.8**  
Sibelius, Symphony No. 3 in C, III  
Key centres of Rotations 1-2 represented on the Tonnetz

---

52 This section’s sequence blocks and antiphonal textures strongly support a sonata-reading of this movement, even after the complex rotational introduction of material preceding it.
3.4.2 Simultaneous Rotation in Sibelius’s Second Symphony

The explosive brass chorale at the brink of the development in Sibelius’s Symphony No. 2, Op. 4 (1902), first movement, has received much scholarly attention as a ‘magnificent moment of synthesis’ of seemingly disparate motivic material. This last section of Chapter 3 will argue that the climactic chorale can in fact be aligned with Adorno’s material category of Durchbruch or breakthrough: a peripeteia-causing rupture, involving an intervention of conceptually external rather than internally generated, critically charged music and leads to a rotational projection of both P and S themes simultaneously after the end of the movement’s development. Mid-expositional material that pre-empts the chorale – an exact statement – takes a particularly uneasy position in existing analyses. Its appearance in this position in the sonata, I argue as caesura fill, has structural implications that are yet to be considered from a rotational or tonal standpoint in relation to its chorale transformation.

This analysis of the movement will support a theory that Sibelius and other contemporaneous symphonists were able to comment critically upon the symphonic tradition through structural fissures at the borders of sonata form: mid-expositional or end of rotational caesurae. This Sibelian approach to musical form either involves 1) a disorientating blurring of architectural markers, or 2) breaking apart the form at the seams by interpolating parageneric episodes, sometimes Durchbruch or Suspension, to signify spatial distance and suspend the teleological drive of the sonata. After drawing attention to aspects of the movement that have not been critically addressed and highlighting the inadequacies of the existing analytical traditions, this section will proceed present a new reading of the first movement’s exposition so as to reveal the function and position of the music foreshadowing the chorale, in addition to considering the breakthrough’s structural impact, particularly on the opening of the recapitulation, where another of Adorno’s categories of materiale Formenlehre comes into play.

A common aim motivates analyses of the first movement of the Second Symphony: to support its positioning as the first step of Sibelius’s ‘path’ towards the formation of a personal language. It is characterized as the moment when Sibelius turned away from nationalist romanticism, Russian influences, and the Austro-Germanic symphonic traditions. In narrative constructions of Sibelius’s career trajectory, perceived features of formal compression and synthesis inform an argument that this symphony initiated a teleological drive to the utmost pinnacle of unified, organic musical material: his single-movement Seventh Symphony.

Cecil Gray, writing in 1931, finds the ‘evolution from fragmentation’ in Sibelius’s Second Symphony ‘revolutionary’ and ‘entirely new’:

The internal organization of the movements reveals many important innovations, amounting at times, and particularly in the first movement, to a veritable revolution, and to the introduction of an entirely new principle into symphonic form. […] in the first movement of the Second Symphony […] Sibelius introduces thematic fragments in the exposition, building them up into an organic whole in the development section, then dispersing and dissolving the material back into its primary constituents in a brief recapitulation. Furthermore, the convention of first and second subjects or groups of subjects is abandoned; in this movement one can detect several distinct groups of thematic germs none of which can claim the right to be regarded as the most important.54

Gray’s claim that the process of ‘evolution from fragmentation’ is new in Sibelius is an absurd gesture of advocacy that denies the process in not only Brahms, but the Viennese Classicists before him. Gray distorts Sibelius’s music to fit the theory and does not provide sufficient analytical evidence to support his claims.

This approach has resulted in some profoundly distorted analyses of the movement that actively reject contrast as a category. As Timothy Howell states, ‘thematic synthesis, rather than contrast, articulates a cyclic, rather than polar, tonal scheme’ in the first movement of Sibelius’s Second Symphony.55 Robert Layton also focuses on integration,
claiming that the first movement of Sibelius’s Second is the ‘most concentrated’.\footnote{Layton, Sibelius, 70.} Bearing in mind the deep-rootedness of organicism in analyses of Sibelius’s music, it is unsurprising that the category of breakthrough – which by its very definition ruptures any sense of formal coherence with external and contrasting music – has not been considered in relation to the movement or its rotations. This is not to reject notions of coherence and organicism outright, but to address uncritically held and unsupported assumptions about Sibelius’s treatment of form. The following analysis is partially an attempt to redress the balance between analysis informed by internal generation and external generation: in other words, analysis informed by motivic analysis and Schenkerian theory, and dialogue concerned kinds of analysis like topic theory and Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s Sonata Theory.

Analyses of the Second Symphony’s first movement are quick to reject sonata form conventions in fear of tarring Sibelius with the brush of musical conservatism. There is no doubt that analytical difficulties arise when a straightforward textbook sonata structure is overlaid upon this movement. The brass chorale and caesural fill theme are two moments that pose particular problems for the analyst. Nevertheless, I argue that a sonata form dialogue is of utmost concern when understanding the movement and these particular moments are ruptures at the borders or seams of the form.

Overlaid onto a pulsing accompanimental texture in the strings (P\textsuperscript{1.0}) at the opening of the symphony, is a pastoral, dance-like theme in the upper woodwind. This primary theme is distinctly thematic and not as fragmentary as Gray would have us believe. Its rhythmically deferred 8-bar phrase structure can be split into two 2-bar and one 4-bar subsegments: P\textsuperscript{1.1} (b. 9:4 – 11:3), P\textsuperscript{1.2} (b. 11:4 – 14:1), and P\textsuperscript{1.3} (12/13-16) (Ex. 3.14). From P\textsuperscript{1.2}’s half cadence the horns swell with a half speed, altered echo. The constant reiteration of half cadences in the primary theme zone creates an interrupted 3-progression down from the Kopfton to 2, alternating between the obligatory register and the one below it.
Example 3.14 Sibelius’s Symphony No. 2, I R1: P1 and P2 (bb. 7-22)
The third presentation of P (bb. 25-32) is metrically normalized and the entire phrase is shifted onto the downbeat with the ‘echo’ no longer dovetailed into the texture of P^{3.2}. Instead, the last bar of P^{3.2} is repeated and spread down through the upper woodwind to the clarinets in a process of fragmentation (b. 28-32). The relationship of the echo to P_{1.1}^{1}/P_{2.11}^{1} and P_{1.2}^{1}/P_{2.2}^{1} is now made explicit. P^{3.2} is sounded over a dominant lock and cadential $\frac{4}{4}$, which sets up the expectation that there will finally be a PAC. This is not to be, and an almost inaudible slippage onto the submediant at the end of the phrase evades this expectation for resolution (b. 32) (Ex. 3.15)^{57}. The 3-line descent is left incomplete, and cadential affirmation of the tonic, D major, is yet again deferred. From this evaded or interrupted cadence emanates a huge gap in the texture.

Another attempt at a PAC is made by the flutes two bars later (bb. 32-4), but root support is again evaded, and they act only as a chromatically inflected link between the feeble evaded cadence and what follows. The second sounding of this new subsegment in the bassoons initiates a fanfare-like passage underpinned by a timpani roll on the dominant (b. 36-8, see Ex. 3.15). The bassoon’s broken chords outline an arpeggiation through the dominant triad, transferring 2 back up an octave to the obligatory register. The fanfare culminates with the dominant, albeit clouded by the flute trill that layers false relations and diminished seventh harmony over a straightforward A major chord in the timpani and bassoon. A unison violin theme then meanders down an octave from E ending with a Dorian-inflected half-cadence in A major and another fermata (bb. 41-52). The dominant is now tonicized as the new key and the half cadence is accepted by contrasting thematic material, although this is initially generated from its falling contour – another example of Knüpfttechnik. By this point it is clear that the primary theme is long gone, along with any hope of its tonal resolution. Nevertheless, the definitive arrival of A major is non-congruent with the beginning of S: it is not sounded in its root position until the end of the second subsegment of the zone: S^{1.2} (b. 60) Much like P, the secondary theme also lacks cadential confirmation and closing-zone material has to step in instead to attain essential expository closure. The question then remains: What is the function of the musical material connecting the primary and secondary themes?

---

^{57} Score extracts for Ex. 3.13 and Ex. 3.14 are from Jean Sibelius, Symphonies 1 and 2 (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1993), 1-46.
Example 3.15  Sibelius’s Symphony No. 2, I R1: P3 and ‘Chasm’ (bb. 25-36)

P3.1  P3.2  P3.3

V₄  ⁵/₃ I:HC⇒EVADED
Example 3.16  Sibelius's Symphony No. 2, I R1: Extraordinarily Expanded Medial Caesura Fill (bb. 35-52)
These passages have initiated the most disagreement among analysts who either see them as cause for rejection of a sonata form dialogue altogether, or call for looser labels to be applied, such as ABC for instance. Gerald Abraham, for instance, ignores these themes entirely and argues that S spans from the bassoon fanfare to the very end of the exposition. Nevertheless, most analysts, Simon Parmet and Tim Howell, for example, end up affixing the fanfare and descending violin theme to what has been described as S in this chapter. Robert Layton and David Haas provide an alternative, hearing this passage as the transition. But their label does not fit comfortably either. While this passage does tonicize the dominant as discussed, it has none of the necessary energy-driven rhetoric of a transition. In fact, this movement has no transition in the conventional sense, and instead may be understood to be in dialogue with what James Hepokoski and Darcy have termed a blocked medial caesura. The role of the MC in a conventional eighteenth-century and even nineteenth-century sonata is to ‘forcibly’ open up S space with a textural gap following a cadence. A blocked MC, however, involves a sudden drop of dynamics on a predominant or cadential 6-4, which shatters the drive to the MC and casts forth a ‘bridge-like arc’ connecting the blockage to S. In this movement, the drop occurs before any energy can be summoned, and P simply slips down into the chasm of a fermata. There is no acceptance of the textural gap by an S theme, and an exceptionally long medial caesura ensues. The fanfare and violin theme ‘fill’ the caesura providing transportation for the ear from one end of the silence – the I:HC – to the other – a V:HC.

The fanfare and the violin theme ‘transport the ear’ via the transformation of 2. The Ursatz of a prototypical sonata form involves a linear progression from the Kopfton down to 1, followed by the establishment of 2 at the beginning of the secondary theme.

---

60 Layton, Sibelius, 70. Haas, ‘Sibelius’s Second Symphony and the Legacy of Symphonic Lyricism’, 83
61 Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 34.
62 Ibid., 47.
63 Hepokoski and Darcy describe ‘expanded caesura fill’ as follows: ‘the expressive impact of the whole is similar to that of observing a projectile cast forth and sailing in the empty space of air in order to land gracefully at its destination’, ‘something else will have to be shot forth over the abyss, something that will land of the S-side of the chasm’ in Elements of Sonata Theory, 47. This expanded MC should not be confused with the middle of a ‘trimodular block’ (TMB) which also has two MCs but also two TRs.
zone. This second step of the Urlinie is typically prolonged by either a 5-line or 3-line descent to $\bar{1}$ of the new tonic. In Sibelius’s Second Symphony, the primary theme’s recurring half cadences mean that resolution from E to D in the upper line is avoided and E is prolonged into the secondary theme zone where it is reinterpreted as $\bar{5}$ of the new key and becomes $\bar{2}$ of the Ursatz. This complication creates a giant rupture between primary and secondary theme zones to allow space for E to be prolonged, its function ambiguuated, and finally clarified: all of which is achieved by an extraordinarily expanded caesura fill. The tone E thus undergoes functional transformation from E of an inner voice to $\bar{2}$ of the Ursatz. It becomes the second step of the Urlinie and the active dominant A major becomes the new tonic (Ex 3.17).

**Example 3.17** Voice leading in Symphony No. 2, Exposition (bb. 1-117)

This extraordinarily expanded caesura fill continues to have a special role in the movement when it resurfaces towards the end of the development. An altered version of the C theme swells suddenly in the trumpets (b. 226-9), initiating a movement through the enharmonic seam from G♭ to the third divider F♯ and triggering the breakthrough several bars later (bb. 243-59). The climax of the movement transforms the caesura fill’s violin theme into a fortissimo brass chorale, no longer in unison but fully harmonized, as D major returns at the close of the development. Announced by the fanfare now fulfilling its timbral potential in trumpets and horns, both caesura fill

---

64 The cadential gesture linking the end of P to the fanfare may be retrospectively reinterpreted as a Neapolitan inflected appoggiatura resolving onto the new tonic, A.
themes are still underpinned by the dominant, yet the shifting function of V in the exposition is now clarified and reversed.

The same themes at the same pitch are revealed to have the latent potential to enact dual harmonic functions. Whereas the themes tonicized the dominant as caesural fill in the exposition, the fanfare and chorale retonicize the tonic at the end of the development and this entire passage acts as the retransition. The G natural of the Dorian inflected half-cadence is omitted. The chorale’s harmonization also explicitly lays out third relationships that were only implied by the violin theme’s unison descent. F sharp minor and B minor, now oscillate as full triads enacting relative and leading note transformations (southern hexatonic pole) to the tonic which parallel the move to these keys at the opening of the pre-EEC, and pre-ESC closing themes, respectively.

The passage following the chorale has been hailed as a moment of great compression and an embryonic gesture that would lead to Sibelius’s fusion of movements in later symphonies – the Third, Fifth, and Seventh – and even between the scherzo and finale of the Second Symphony itself. P and S are layered on top of one another and sounded simultaneously but still distinguishable due to the instrument groupings: the P theme is in the woodwind as it was in the exposition, and S is now scored for strings and horns in the tonic. The themes are thus retrospectively revealed to have had the innate potential for compatibility and have become symbiotic.

Various readings have been proposed by analysts hoping to understand this unusual moment in the movement’s structure and its implications for the recapitulation. These include the reordering of themes, the truncation of material, or the telescoping of development and recapitulation sections. Harold Truscott and Abraham consider the first of these interpretive options to be the most convincing: a reversal of the normative P opening with the fanfare and chorale material at the opening of the recapitulation before cycling closely through the remainder of the exposition. In fact, Abrahams hears

---

65 Arpeggiation and falling third in both P and S, alternation of material in instrument groupings.
the beginning of the recapitulation prior even to the fanfare and chorale. He locates it at bar 232, where D major re-emerges and an altered version of the horn echo ascends to 2. The pitfalls of this reading are numerous. Although this ascending passage is in D major, it occurs over the third. The tonic is not sounded in root position until the conclusion of the chorale. Placing the recapitulation at this point, not only denies P’s signification of rotational beginning but is also does not account for the layering of P and S, nor the function of the chorale as a retransition. As Tawaststjerna notes, ‘when the first group’s pastoral wind […] starts up, one nods to oneself: the recapitulation’. What precedes it, the breakthrough chorale, is somehow outside sonata space and time. It is parageneric and deformational.

Truncation, meanwhile, is Layton’s structure of interpretative choice for this moment. He marks the onset of the recapitulation at Tempo I: P is followed immediately by the pizzicato episode heard directly after S in the exposition without a recapitulation of the fanfare, or violin theme – this is omitted. Layton explains this truncation as an avoidance of redundant repetition as these themes have only very recently been heard. Like Abraham’s suggestion of reordering, this reading does not account for the layering of S under P, which does follow the rotational ordering of the exposition, and thus directly leads to the pizzicato episode following the exposition’s rotational ordering.

The third proposed reading is one of telescoping and compression, outlined most comprehensively by Howell and later by David Haas. Rather than a three-part sonata structure, Howell sees the movement as two-part structure whereby the traditional functions of development and recapitulation are, ‘telescop ed into one organic structure’. Retransitionary and recapitulatory processes occur simultaneously as the material is recapitulated and also retonicizes the tonic. Again, the flaw in this reading lies in the lack of double return of P and the tonic during the passage, significantly

---

67 Tawaststjerna, Sibelius, 249.
68 Layton, Sibelius, 71.
69 Howell, Jean Sibelius, 17.
weakening an argument for the recapitulation at this point. In fact, there is not even a ‘single’ return here – a root position tonic – until the very end of the chorale.

A more fitting interpretation must shift the emphasis from compression and synthesis to one concerned with the breakthrough as a rupturing gesture that intervenes, like a suspension, from the outside of the form. As a retransition, the fanfare and chorale retroject back to the opening of the development to confirm that this rotation is over, and the recapitulation is to begin, resulting in a straightforward triple-rotational or Type 3 sonata structure. Following P, the CF themes are omitted, not just because they have been heard recently, as Layton suggests, but because the themes have been transformed to fulfill their tonal and timbral functions potential. However, as a mid-rotational gesture, the CF material projects forward rotationally to the end of the recapitulation and requires S to be cycled through next, as dictated, by the ordering of materials in the referential rotation. At this moment of rotational realization and conversion, the development is retrospectively reinterpreted to be the same rotation: Rotation 2 of a Type 2 sonata. This development becomes syntactically joined to the recapitulation, which accounts for the absence of P\textsuperscript{1.0} at its beginning, but it is not joined on the same terms suggested by Howell. The rotation does not just become birotational. Due to the layering of themes, the movement also remains triple rotational.

Table 3.4 Rotational form of Sibelius’s Symphony No. 2, I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotation</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>y</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>w</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Ep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I/V.</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V/iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>C\textsuperscript{A}</td>
<td>C\textsuperscript{B}</td>
<td>C\textsuperscript{A}</td>
<td>CF=RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(P\textsuperscript{3} + Ep.)</td>
<td>(P\textsuperscript{1.0}, P\textsuperscript{1.1/S\textsuperscript{1.2}, CF\textsuperscript{2.2})}</td>
<td>(P\textsuperscript{3})</td>
<td>Breakthrough!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I/iv</td>
<td>iv \rightarrow I (ESC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rotationally and harmonically, the breakthrough functions within the sonata trajectory as a CF (at least retrospectively), but timbrally and topically it is from outside. It is of note that the brass, so sparingly used through the entirety of the movement, is now
called upon almost solely for the purposes of the breakthrough trigger, fanfare, and chorale, and thus may be read as ‘timbral others’ like those in *The Swan of Tuonela*. The material itself evokes the hunting topic - ‘a gesture of calling’ signifying a physical distance between the summoner and the summoned.

An analysis of the first movement of Sibelius’s Second Symphony, supports a shift of focus in the analysis of his music from the organic generation of form from motives and fragments, to his treatment of the structural borders of form – music in the medial caesura and the music joining rotations – to create the illusion of seamless growth of material. Dovetailing, metrical ambiguity, and linkage technique of the kind linking the caesura fill to the themes either side, all contribute to a blurring of borders in the Second Symphony. These structural seams become indecipherable or pulled wide apart, and paradoxically, sometimes even both, in a kind of synthesis markedly different from the synthesis of fragments into a thematic whole. Cadential deferral, non-congruence, functional transformation of tones, and the layering of themes all create the illusion that the Second Symphony’s breakthrough – music from outside the movement’s trajectory and beyond the seams of the sonata – grows from within.
Paul Bekker is commonly attributed with coining the term ‘Durchburch’ or ‘breakthrough’ in his analysis of the first movement of Mahler’s First Symphony, but it is Adorno’s formulation of ‘breakthrough’ as a ‘material’ formal category in his ‘physiognomy’ of Mahler, that has led musicologists to look for the category in music by other composers such as Schumann, Brahms, Bruckner, Nielsen, Sibelius, Elgar, and Strauss.¹ Hepokoski has also had an impact on the recent musicological explorations of the concept by introducing the category to Strauss’s and Sibelius’s music as a ‘sonata deformation’ in two studies that were foundational to the development of Sonata Theory.² Following the critical engagement with this development in Chapter 1, and explication of tensions between the early taxonomy of sonata deformations and the refined theorization of sonata types in Elements of Sonata Theory that needed to be resolved in Chapter 3, ‘breakthrough’ in Sibelius’s music is the last category which needs to be assessed to locate it within the broader context of early modernism. In order to enrich readings of early modernist symphonic music, the development of Adorno’s material formal category of breakthrough and Hepokoski’s sonata deformation will be outlined and scrutinized in the first half of this chapter. After an examination of literature surrounding the concept, a new Sonata Theory-influenced theorization will be defined and applied. The combination of the breakthrough with other sonata deformations – ‘episodic substitution’ and the ‘fusion of movements’ – will also be explored within Strauss’s Don Juan and Sibelius’s Fifth Symphony.

² Hepokoski, Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 6; Hepokoski, ‘Fiery-Pulsed Libertine or Domestic Hero? Strauss’s Don Juan Revisited.’
4.1 **Durchbruch: Adorno’s Material Formal Category**

At the opening of his ‘physiognomy’ of Mahler, Adorno describes the breakthrough in the First Symphony as a ‘rupture [that] originates from beyond the music’s intrinsic movement, intervening from outside’.³ In this sense, breakthroughs are very much like suspensions because they are, in fact, a type of suspension. By forcing a given piece of music to ‘point beyond itself’ – a sonata, for instance – breakthroughs critique the ‘here and now’ of sonata form’s linearly directed temporality.⁴ Adorno claims that such musical intrusions thus reveal the inadequacies of such totalities as sonata form. Adorno argues that Mahler’s music ‘rebels against the illusion of the successful work’ and the ‘art-work’s claim to embody something merely added in thought, without being realized’ by paradoxically realizing this extra ‘something’ as a fleeting escape from the prevailing form: the breakthrough.⁵

This critiquing element in Mahler’s music has also led many other scholars to investigate the idea of a narrative voice. In *Mahler’s Voices: Expression and Irony in the Songs and Symphonies*, Julian Johnson explores what he perceives to be essential to an understanding of Mahler’s music: the processes of narrative and the dialectical relationship between authentic and ironic forms of expression in the composer’s music. Following Adorno, Johnson argues that the intrusions and interpolations in Mahler’s music take on a ‘metatextual aspect; […] they reflect on their own conditions as a kind of “writing”’.⁶ In other words, while Mahler’s music narrates through form, the idea of music as a narration is questioned by musical intrusions. ‘Since’, writes Johnson, ‘the idea of musical narration, with its roots in the classical discourse of musical themes and the linear process of tonality itself, implies a certain model of musical subjectivity, its critical self-questioning is also a questioning of that model of subjectivity’.⁷

---

⁴ Ibid., 5.
⁵ Ibid., 5.
⁷ Ibid.
This narrative and extra-musical level of breakthrough is expressed in Adorno’s writing in his elevation of the category to a celestial status. He refers to the breakthrough as an ‘apparition’, the ‘parousias of the supernatural’, the ‘Messiah’, and he contrasts its ‘transcendent’ nature with the ‘immanence’ of form. He constructs an antithesis between the form it ruptures and breakthrough itself: inner and outer, immanence and transcendence, self and Other. According to Adorno, Viennese Classicism could not express this antithesis due to its philosophical idealism. Sonata form was a stylized form, which valued rational balance and large-scale repetitions in its ‘grand’ architecture. It therefore celebrated the ‘Enlightenment’ culture, of which it was a product. Adorno claims that whereas the insufficiencies concealed by the ‘immanence of society’ cannot be revealed by an ‘imminence of form derived from it’, a breakthrough ‘penetrates’ both form and society to reveal these concealed inadequacies by acting as an imperfect mirror. It is through these ruptures in form that glimpses of Utopia can be found: ‘Utopia finds refuge in its no man’s land’. Nevertheless, the breakthrough cannot offer lasting transcendence. Adorno emphasizes the temporariness of the breakthrough:

the image of corresponding to breakthrough is damaged because the breakthrough has failed, like the Messiah, to come into the world. To realize it musically would be at the same time to attest to its failure in reality.

If a breakthrough were to become entirely synthesized with the form, it would negate its status as Other and therefore undermine its fleetingly transcendent qualities. As soon as it breaks through into the work, such external musical material is it is subsumed into the work’s form and becomes internal, it has come ‘into being’.

Before returning to Mahler’s First Symphony, it is worth exploring one of Adorno’s paradigms for the ‘material’ formal category of breakthrough – perhaps the earliest known breakthrough – in Act 2 of Beethoven’s opera, Fidelio, op. 72 (1804-5). In the
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second scene of Act 2, Leonore, disguised as Fidelio, enters the prison where Pizzaro is holding her husband, Florestan, captive for political reasons. In this scene, Rocco, the gaoler, and Fidelio (Leonore) prepare a grave for Florestan in his cell. When Pizarro enters with the intention of killing Florestan, Leonore draws her pistol. At that very moment, the trumpet stationed in a tower earlier in the opera (offstage), announces the arrival of the King’s minister, Don Fernando. This interruption from outside the scene and beyond the boundaries of the stage, signals the couple’s freedom from tyranny: the minister will punish and imprison Pizarro for his wrong-doing and corruption. Julian Johnson has described this gesture as ‘both literally a breaking through into the narrative space of the scene and a paradigmatic anticipation of its overcoming’.\(^{15}\) In Hepokoski’s words, the trumpet call is the ‘announcement of salvation from a different, outside world’.\(^{16}\)

At the ‘parallel moment’ in Leonore Overture no. 3 in C minor, the same off-stage fanfare call interrupts in B♭, here in the context of a sonata form developmental rotation.\(^{17}\) This overture was actually the second version in a series of revised overtures for the opera, and while it is beyond the scope of this chapter to consider all of its versions in full analytical detail, it is worth noting that the first, the Leonore Overture no. 2, also contains the same interruptive fanfare call (on stage), this time in E♭. After confirming the tonic C minor with a hammer blow cadence, the key is reaffirmed with quaver figuration. Without any preparation other than a passing note however, the harmonic progression is suddenly jolted from C minor to E♭ major for the ‘Un poco sostenuto’ call. After experimenting with the keys of this breakthrough, Beethoven revised the overture a third time before eventually abandoning it altogether to write a new overture, the official Fidelio Overture. Incidentally, Mahler is attributed with popularizing the nineteenth-century and twentieth-century practice of performing Overture No. 3 between the cell and parade-ground scenes of Act 2.\(^{18}\) In this position in the opera, the overture is likely to bridge an awkward scene change, but it also acts

\(^{15}\) Johnson, Mahler’s Voices, 219.
\(^{16}\) Hepokoski, ‘Fiery-Pulsed Libertine or Domestic Hero? Strauss’s Don Juan Revisited,’ 172, n. 54.
\(^{17}\) Johnson, Mahler’s Voices, 219.
as a musical summary or reprise of the events that have just happened on stage.\textsuperscript{19} Johnson understands the overture as ‘an operatic “way of telling” […] taken in to purely orchestral music, just as it is in Mahler – unprepared and unmediated, but not arbitrary because [it is] taken up in the subsequent unfolding of the piece’.\textsuperscript{20} It acts as a musical premonition or anticipation of the dramatic breakthrough.

To Adorno, Mahler’s music seeks to ‘rejoin musically and surpass’ the breakthrough in \textit{Fidelio}.\textsuperscript{21} The formal aspects of Adorno’s concept can be deduced from his brief analyses of Mahler’s symphonies. He considers there to be two breakthroughs: one in the first movement of Symphony No. 1 in D major and one in the second movement of Symphony No. 5. The First Symphony breakthrough itself is a fanfare scored for trumpet, which occupies a separate space from the orchestra in a literal sense: the trumpets are offshore much like the breakthrough in \textit{Fidelio}. A bar later the trumpet is joined by the horns and woodwind (bars 352-57). The fanfare is first heard in the ‘nature’ introduction played by the clarinets and trumpets marked \textit{In sehr weiter Entfernung aufgestellt} (‘Placed at a very far distance’). The breakthrough occurs at the end of the development, before the recapitulation, affecting the ‘entire form’. Adorno claims that ‘the recapitulation to which it leads cannot restore the balance demanded by sonata form’ and this ‘shrinks to a hasty epilogue’ or coda.\textsuperscript{22} It can be concluded from this description that for a section of music to be an Adornian breakthrough, it must be new or at least different to the inner-sonata material; and it must have a structural impact on the form that proceeds from it. Yet it seems as though Adorno may have overstated the structural impact of the breakthrough on the recapitulation.

Only seven bars of the previously tonic version of the theme have been elided and this rotation constitutes neither a Schenkerian coda nor a rhetorical coda. Adorno also recognizes that the exposition prepared for this abbreviation with its dispensation of ‘multiplicity of forms and the traditional thematic dualism’, in other words, rather than
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two contrasting themes (P and S), there is in fact just one, meaning that the exposition needs 'no complex restitution'. The exposition of this movement is monothematic and borrows its theme from the lieder entitled ‘Ging heut' Morgen übers Feld' from Mahler’s first song cycle, *Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen* ('Songs of a Wayfarer'). Despite its monothematicism, the exposition is structured around two key areas – tonic and dominant – as is typical of many sonatas, with the tonic half corresponding to the third verse of the song (Part 1) and the dominant half to the first verse (Part 2). These verses are very close in structure and thematic content, giving the exposition subrotational properties not unlike the Appassionata’s exposition. In the case of the overture, if both halves of the section were to be recapitulated in the tonic, the difference between the section’s halves would be minimal. It seems as though the partial omission of the first verse is more of a solution to the problem of redundant reiteration than an effect of the breakthrough. Nevertheless, the breakthrough does have a timbral impact on the recapitulation. Up until the point of the breakthrough Mahler uses the brass very sparingly, which heightens the shock of fortissimo trumpets and horns at the breakthrough. The exposition’s main theme at the onset of the recapitulation is orchestrated for four horns (bars 358-63) in the fanfare-like version generated in the development (bars 209-218) and this horn theme ‘writes over’ the beginning of the expositional cycle. From this point on (bar 363ff), the recapitulation begins to cycle through material corresponding to 15 bars into the exposition (bar 78ff). The remainder of Part 1 and Part 2 are richly reorchestrated and the brass feature prominently.

The fact that the breakthrough fanfare has been heard before, and as Adorno notes, and seems to evolve throughout the development from the falling fourths figure first in the cello (bar 167), somewhat negates the ‘newness’ that the category of breakthrough requires. This motivic evolution highlights one of several paradoxes in Adorno’s theory of breakthrough: that it is often the focal point of the movement – the telos – to which everything drives, but at the same time it is sudden, shocking, and new. Adorno claims that Mahler was aware of the crudity of the antithesis between the breakthrough and
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the perpetual motion of the world’s course (Weltlauf), and so ‘gradually concretizes’ and ‘mediates’ the breakthrough into the structure of the symphony.

It no less meets the obligation, enjoined by the fanfare, to be something new than it provides the secret source throughout the music’s protracted evolution, at once in the spirit of the sonata and against it, of the entire piece. For the sake of the breakthrough, of the Other, formal integration is increased blunting the absolute antithesis that the breakthrough demands.\footnote{Ibid., 13.}

It can be argued, however, that the fanfare retains its status as an outsider to the sonata form because it has not been heard in full since the introduction, a section that can be considered to be conceptually outside the sonata form. As already alluded to, the most prominent feature of the breakthrough in the first movement of Mahler’s First Symphony is its timbre, which creates a striking contrast with that of the preceding rotations.

\section*{4.2.1 The Contexts and Meanings of Breakthrough: Timbre and Topic}

As noted in Chapter 2, Sheinbaum has identified a subtext running through Adorno’s work that constructs timbre as a subordinate, surface parameter to the ‘true’ substance of the piece.\footnote{Sheinbaum, ‘Adorno’s Mahler and the Timbral Outsider’, 41.} Adorno claims that Mahler’s music exhibits the most ideal relationship between instrumental colour and this substance, whereby it is not constructed as a superficial display but as a structural device. In Adorno’s opinion, Mahler’s music does not entirely marginalize timbre by allowing it to ‘puff itself up around the music’, and making it into a spectacle (unlike Strauss, perhaps).\footnote{Adorno, \textit{Mahler, A Musical Physiognomy}, 117.} In Mahler’s music, Adorno perceives a balance between the ‘outsider’ status of timbre and its ability to function as an ‘insider’, creating music which functions as an ‘articulated diversity’ rather than a unified whole.\footnote{Scheinbaum, ‘Adorno’s Mahler and the Timbral Outsider’, 42.} This balance allows timbre to have a profound impact on the structure of the piece.
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Sheinbaum sees Adorno’s discussions of timbre and structure as barely disguised metaphors for social structures where a formally pure and unified society (a form that elevates unification of musical ideas) is threatened by intrusions of sinister cultural outsiders (breakthrough). Adorno regards the fragmentation and discontinuity created by compositional procedures such as breakthrough as critical of the fragmentary aspects of fin de siècle society. Breakthrough in Mahler’s First, Fifth and Eighth Symphonies may be taken as a metaphor for the composer as ‘outsider’, ‘foreigner’, and ‘Jew’. These metaphors can perhaps be adapted to understand breakthrough in Sibelius’s music as a metaphor for his position as an ‘outsider’ to the musical centres of Europe and the composers with whom he attempted to compete with, such as Strauss, Busoni, Pfitzner, Schillings, and Reger. It was his ‘exotic’ early works that first gained him an audience in this arena; ironically, however, the success of these early pieces banished Sibelius’s later works to the peripheral category of ‘nationalism’ and provided Sibelius with a reputation from which he hoped to escape. Whilst breakthroughs can arguably also be found in the tone poems of Strauss including Don Juan (the Heldenthema) and Death and Transfiguration, it is more difficult to consider Strauss an outsider given his position as a successful German composer. The existence of breakthroughs in the symphonies of Mendelssohn, Schumann, Brahms and further problematizes this reading. It is thus perhaps inappropriate to apply Sheinbaum’s metaphors of breakthrough to other composers.

A reconsideration of the instrumentation at Mahler’s breakthroughs is revealing. Sheinbaum observes that the breakthroughs in Mahler’s Symphonies – the First, Fifth and Eighth – are a ‘conflation of timbre and topos’, although he does not elucidate further. These moments are characterized by fanfare or chorale figures played by massed brass instruments, invoking the eighteenth-century hunting topic and therefore ‘nature’ or the pastoral. The evocation of this topic perhaps suggests nostalgia for a
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pre-modern Europe before the industrial revolution, and is an area that needs close
investigation. The association of ‘nature’ with the Other is demonstrated particularly
clearly in Mahler’s First Symphony. The fanfare breakthrough of the first movement
transports the ear back to the sonic landscape of the introduction, which is marked Wie
ein Naturlaut (‘Like a sound in nature’). This section – outside the sonata-proper – is
constructed of falling fourth figures mimetic of cuckoo calls, layers of sustained
harmonics, and another descending fourths pattern that is passed around the
woodwind. The fanfare is constructed from fourths, an interval associated commonly
with nature and the natural horn. Adorno observes that ‘nature’ of this kind is always
expressed through ‘positive negation’ and deviates from ‘high musical language’ in
Mahler’s music. In other words, the nature passages are contrasted with the linear
driven tonal and motivic processes of the form, and thus constitute music that is Other.
The breakthroughs of Sibelius, Strauss, and before them Beethoven, Schumann, and
Brahms, also evoke hunting topics and the idyll. The breakthrough of the first movement
of Sibelius’s Fifth Symphony, featuring horn calls, is no exception, and has been called
a ‘natural catastrophe’ by Veijo Murtomäki and a ‘nature-epiphany’ by Hepokoski. Ideas of ‘nature’ and landscape in Sibelius’s music are categories of interpretation that
are evoked repeatedly in Sibelius studies and therefore need careful, critical
consideration.

Johnson’s discussion of ‘gestures of calling’ in Mahler’s music gives another dimension
to this reading. He groups these gestures into three categories; each with their own
associated timbre. These categories may fluidly overlap with one another in his
symphonic music: 1) nature (birdsong), 2) humankind (horn calls and fanfares), and 3)
God (bells). Following Adorno, Johnson observes that the second kind of call is used
by Mahler to habitually mark recapitulations, some of which are also breakthroughs.
Horn calls function semantically to define a separate musical space from the prevailing
form. The fanfare is a ‘summing to muster and a call to arms, but also [an] announcement
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and the signaling of imminent arrival. By definition, the fanfare implies physical distance: it acts as a nonverbal communication that can be heard over a wider distance than could be achieved by the human voice'.\textsuperscript{35} According to Johnson, when horn calls are sounded in Mahler’s music they frequently have a shared function of breaking through into a different ‘spatial field’ – often literally when the brass are offstage – as well as a musical threshold, a suspension of linear motion, a new musical identity, and often mark a moment of arrival or fulfillment acting as the telos of the piece. Fanfares may act as a ‘crossing between two worlds, a liminal crossing of the musical threshold’.\textsuperscript{36} It follows that these thresholds may be conceptually constructed spatially acting as a ‘plateau’ at the top of a ‘musical ascent’.\textsuperscript{37}

The intrusion of ‘Other’ music may create a narrative voice, a critique of Formenlehre and sonata form, and a different spatial plane from the surrounding music. Yet these are also phenomenon associated with Adorno’s material category of ‘suspension’ and with episodic interpolation. Specific to the breakthrough, are representations of nature and humanity’s relation to it.

### 4.2.2 Developments of Breakthrough

Following the attention to the category of breakthrough as an identifier of early modernism in Mahler’s symphonies, other musicologists have sought out eruptive moments in the music of other composers such as Bruckner, Nielsen, Elgar, and Strauss. Julian Horton and Warren Darcy have explored the concept in Bruckner’s symphonies and J. P. E Harper-Scott in Elgar’s First Symphony and \textit{Falstaff}.\textsuperscript{38} Daniel M. Grimley has discussed breakthroughs extensively in the works of Nielsen. Grimley argues that like Mahler, Nielsen’s music is ‘fractured and energized by moments of \textit{gennembrud} or
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Durchbruch, a sense of radical destabilisation created through the incursion of music from seemingly beyond the boundaries of the individual musical work’. 39 But unlike Mahler and other early twentieth-century modernists whose breakthroughs ‘signal defeat, resignation, or alienation from world […] the emphasis in Nielsen is rather on the music’s dynamic instability, its creative energy or impulse towards transformation, regeneration, and change’. 40

These studies were prompted, at least in part, by Hepokoski’s introduction of the concept of breakthrough to Strauss’s Don Juan and Sibelius’s Fifth Symphony in a pair of studies that are foundational for Sonata Theory: ‘Fiery-Pulsed Libertine or Domestic Hero? Strauss’s Don Juan Revisited’ and Sibelius, Symphony No. 5. 41 He was the first to apply the concept to Sibelius’s symphonies, although he only identifies one Sibelian breakthrough: in the first movement of Symphony No. 5 in E♭ major. As Chapter 3 has shown, a breakthrough may be also be found in the opening movement of the Second Symphony, along with possible allusions to the procedure in the finale of the Third, and the first movements of the First and Fourth Symphonies. 42 Hepokoski gives several other examples of breakthroughs in early modernist works, which he claims to be generally ‘more eruptive’ than their earlier counterparts, including those commonly identified in Mahler’s symphonies and Strauss’s Death and Transfiguration. He locates the origins of early modernist breakthroughs in earlier symphonies such as the Finale of Schumann’s Fourth Symphony ‘whose developmental space, in effect, turns its back on the generically well-behaved exposition in ways that have profound consequences for the rest of the work’. 43 John Daverio has also explored early breakthroughs in Schumann’s symphonies with a particular interest tracing the influence of his breakthroughs on the structure and placement of breakthroughs in Brahms’s music. Daverio identifies breakthroughs in all four of Schumann’s symphonies, the last movement of his
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Ouvertüre, Scherzo und Finale, op. 52, as well as in the finales of Brahms’s First and Third Symphonies.\textsuperscript{44} Balakirev’s Symphony No. 1 in C major might also be added to this list of works that containing breakthroughs.

Hepokoski categorizes breakthrough as one of the ‘characteristic fin-de-siècle deformation families’.\textsuperscript{45} The category of breakthrough involves music entering a movement that is conceptually outside the form as well as the array of expectations that the form and genre provokes in the listener. It is on this basis that Hepokoski claims that the breakthrough is a sonata deformation. Rather than applying solely to sonata forms, as Hepokoski implies with his ‘sonata deformation’ label, Adorno’s breakthroughs may apply to various genres and formal types. Nevertheless, breakthroughs are most likely to occur in orchestral works of symphonic proportions – in other words, sonata form movements – in order to provide the necessary instrumentation and timbre characteristic of a breakthrough.

It is Hepokoski’s definition of breakthrough in relation to Don Juan that is perhaps the most formal application of the concept of breakthrough to a sonata structure in the literature on the category. He specifies that this must occur at a post-expositional point and have irreversible consequences on the structure and character of the movement.\textsuperscript{46}

The concept of breakthrough, closely related to the category peripeteia, or sudden reversal of fortune, involves abandoning or profoundly correcting the originally proposed sonata (the one proposed in the exposition) through the inbreaking of an emphatic, unforeseen idea at some post-expositional point, usually during the space customarily given over to development. The mid-piece inbreaking of the new from outside the proposed structure, sundering the piece’s immanent logic, is sufficiently powerful to render a default recapitulation inadequate. The breakthrough thus triggers a recomposed or totally reconsidered recapitulation, in which the breakthrough idea itself usually plays a prominent role. Although there are many ways of realizing the concept, it can be seen to have arisen historically as one solution to the problem of a potentially redundant recapitulation within an aesthetic system that increasingly validated only original ideas.\textsuperscript{47}
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Although this description is largely specific to the breakthrough in *Don Juan*, it is also applicable to breakthroughs found in the music other early modernists, including Mahler’s. It is the structural impact of a breakthrough that Hepokoski takes as his point of reference for defining a more formal kind of breakthrough. Like Adorno, Hepokoski sees the breakthrough as a critiquing force that rejects sonata form. Unlike Adorno, however, Hepokoski’s conception of breakthrough involves the complete abandonment of the form preceding the breakthrough. In Sibelius’s Fifth, a sonata form is abandoned for a scherzo, and in Strauss’s *Don Juan* the breakthrough rejects the preceding sonata rondo for a ‘pure’ sonata. The prominence of structural rejection in Hepokoski’s definition can be traced to Adorno’s declaration that the ‘idea of breakthrough […] dictates the entire structure of the movement, transcends the traditional form while fleetingly sketching its outline’ and that in Mahler’s First Symphony the breakthrough ‘affects the entire form’. On the other hand, Adorno’s discussion of the breakthrough’s impact involves a smaller scale distortion of the recapitulation rather than a literal rejection. In relation to Sibelius’s Fifth, Hepokoski adds that a breakthrough is only ‘seemingly new’ but is ‘normally motivically related’ to what precedes it.

The ‘breakthrough deformation’ is not a concept that Hepokoski has returned to since these two studies of the early 1990s. Using recent Sonata Theory, the concept may be further enriched by the notion of ‘parageneric spaces’. Hepokoski and Darcy distinguish ‘parageneric spaces’ from ‘sonata-space’: these ‘spaces’ are additions to the basic sonata structure such as introductions or codas. Other parageneric spaces may include ‘interpolations within the movement that withdraw from the sonata-action’, such as reoccurrences of parts of a slow introduction in the sonata-proper, much like the fanfare in Mahler’s First Symphony. Consequently, the definition of parageneric spaces may be expanded to include breakthroughs, yet the occurrence of breakthroughs in codas complicates their own categorization as parageneric spaces. In instances where a coda is ruptured by a breakthrough, the implication might be that
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rejection of coda conventions and their various historical roles within sonata movements are themselves rejected. For instance, if the coda is cast as an additional space to overcome a struggle left unresolved in the body of the movement, a breakthrough might explode to provide instantaneous fulfilment, in the Adornian sense, thereby rendering any previous ‘work’ to reach resolution as redundant. Or a breakthrough might have the opposite effect, to begin a process of undoing that leads to an Adornian ‘collapse’. Readings of these sort will depend, of course, on the breakthrough’s specific material, if it has been heard in any other form in the piece, and what this might mean in context.

4.2.3 A re theorization of breakthrough: ‘liminal crossings’

Significant attention has been paid to the impact of each individual breakthrough on its surrounding movement or movement cycle, especially in terms of its implications as a narrative intrusion, but there has been insufficient exploration of the breakthrough as a formal gesture. A probable reason behind this oversight is that establishing dialogic relationships between a group of pieces that contain breakthroughs threatens to undermine the unexpectedness and suddenness of such a gesture that allows it to be labeled as a breakthrough in the first place. Nevertheless, breakthroughs found in the works of different composers throughout the nineteenth century and even the early twentieth century share common characteristics and functions. As has already been established, the features of a breakthrough involve differentiation from the music surrounding it: a sudden change of timbre (dynamics and orchestration) and a brass fanfare or call, which creates a sense of spatial distance. The breakthrough also initiates a structural change of some sort that could not be predicted from the structure of the music prior to the breakthrough. Yet there has been little or no attention paid to the positioning of breakthroughs within a movement and exactly why they recur in these positions. Hepokoski’s definition specifies that a breakthrough must occur at some post-expositional point, while Johnson observes that Mahler habitually marked his recapitulations with fanfare preparation, but this is the extent of existing theorization.
A closer look at the emergence of the trumpet fanfare in Leonore Overture No. 3 is illuminating in this respect. Analysts such as Hepokoski and Darcy have already explored the impact of the fanfare breakthrough on the recapitulation. The fanfare-like call interrupts the developmental rotation at bar 272 and again at bar 294. (Ex. 4.1) Hepokoski and Darcy discuss the analytical issues surrounding the onset of the recapitulatory rotation in an argument for the elevation of rhetorical, rotational recapitulations over tonal resolution in instances where there is no double return of P and the tonic. Following the B♭ major trumpet fanfare, dominant preparation for the recapitulation unfolds in the ‘wrong’ dominant (V of V) leading to a variation of the primary theme (bar 330). Hepokoski and Darcy argue that despite its G major tonality (V), this statement of P¹ provides the rhetorical impression of a recapitulation. The tonic major is only attained at the TR proper in bar 378. The trumpet ‘breakthrough-interpolation’ prior to the off-tonic sounding of P interrupts the drive initiated by the C minor TR material at bar 252 to the expected tonic minor recapitulation, and profoundly changes the course of the sonata. According to Hepokoski and Darcy, this process leaves the impression that re-attaining the tonic will be ‘an uncommonly arduous enterprise’. The trumpet interjection may also function to anticipate the new orchestral theme heard subsequently in B♭.
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Example 4.1  Beethoven, Leonore Overture No. 3, Op. 72, bars 237-281
TR, MC, and Trumpet fanfare, in developmental rotation (Rotation 2)
Example 4.2  Beethoven, Leonore Overture No. 3, Op. 72, bars 95-120
TR, MC, S in Exposition (Rotation 1)
An application of Sonata Theory’s rotational principle to the material preceding the breakthrough reveals that the developmental rotation (bb.180-329) cycles through the expository material (bb. 180-71 correspond to P material and bb. 252-71 correspond to the TR, bars 102-118, Ex. 4.2) up until a point equivalent to the medial caesura (bar 118 corresponds to bar 272). It is at this moment that the trumpet begins its fanfare (Ex. 4.1). Cataloguing other works that contain a breakthrough reveals three places in a symphony where the fanfare interruption most commonly appears: 1) the end of the development as in Leonore Overture No. 3 and Mahler’s First; 2) replacing S in the recapitulation; 3) in the coda. It is perhaps no coincidence that the first two of these options occur at the caesurae in the form: the end of development caesura and the medial caesura in the recapitulation. In order to understand why breakthroughs might occur at caesurae in the structure, it is important at this point to define the structural function of these gestures.

The concept of the medial caesura and caesura-fill is perhaps Hepokoski and Darcy’s greatest contribution to sonata analysis. They define the mid-rotational gesture as ‘the brief, rhetorically reinforced break or gap’ that serves to cleave an exposition into two halves and key areas. The gap is most frequently built around a ‘half-cadence effect’ or ‘dominant-arrival effect’ in either the tonic or dominant key. The function of the caesura is to end Part 1 of the exposition (P and TR) and ‘forcibly open up S-space’ (Part 2), consequently defining the rotation as a two-part exposition as opposed to a continuous exposition. According to Hepokoski and Darcy, this moment of articulation is simultaneously the peak of the energetic TR drive and a discharge of that tension before the sudden drop in dynamics and texture change that comes with the entry of S. In mid to late eighteenth-century expositions, the MC often follows a hammer blow gesture and typically lasts a beat or two as a literal gap (a general pause) or may be filled with a simple scalar figure.
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When the MC lasts longer than a few beats it may be filled with connective material in a single voice, which ‘sonically articulates’ the energy-loss between the end of the TR and the beginning of S with a diminuendo. This mediating music is known as caesura-fill (CF). In the later-eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, composers experimented with extended MCs, which could last several bars, and are often filled with expanded or ‘extraordinarily’ expanded caesura-fill which may have its own thematic character or even be required to modulate to the ‘correct’ key following complications in the TR. Hepokoski and Darcy emphasize that the CF is neither part of the TR nor S, but occupies ‘a space of non-motion or of relative stasis’ between the two. They describe CF as a ‘filling-in of the generically implied silence – plugging the MC gap’. In relation to the expanded CF of some of Mozart’s works, Hepokoski and Darcy evoke metaphors of floating and weightlessness. This description seems appropriate for music that is often in one voice and descends from a zone of heightened energy (TR) to a more tranquil zone (S), sometimes with a literal descent (SD 5-1 linear pattern). Rather than the CF blocking up the MC or ‘plugging’ it, which eliminates any sense that there is a conceptually present gap in the form, the CF most commonly acts as a bridge or transportation for the ear from one end of the silence to the other.

One possible reason for a breakthrough to be positioned after the MC in a recapitulation is that the expected energy-loss at the MC makes the appearance of a violent ff breakthrough even more explosive and shocking in contrast to a generically piano S, which may have been heard following the TR and MC in the exposition, as in Leonore Overture No. 3. Yet instead, the breakthrough replaces the caesura fill in the half-rotational development. A more tantalizing reason could be that the MC acts both as a ‘liminal crossing’ between P and S and as a perforation in sonata-space through which liminal music from a parageneric-space or from outside the movement altogether may penetrate, in place of a simple CF.

The expanded Type 1 finale of Brahms’s Symphony No. 1 in C minor, op. 68, is exemplary of this kind of intrusion (Table 4.1). Before the expected emphatic articulation of the MC chord in Rotation 1 (b. 114), the forte TR returns to the tonic minor and runs
into a dynamic blockage (a blocked MC). There is a drop to piano and the ‘Alphorn’ theme from the Più Andante of the Introduction bridges the caesura – a Rigi Ranz topic much like the Swan of Tuonela’s suspensions – and is elided with the beginning of the S-theme at bar 118. The chorale is heard in the horns and upper woodwind over falling broken chords in the strings. The corresponding point in the second rotation is more of a colossal interruption. The fortissimo tutti chord at bar 285 brings about the end of the developmental expansion of P, and the expository material is subsequently cycled through, bar for bar. These moments constitute a ‘breaking through’ the form, but they are not the breakthrough topic. They may be treated as interpolated ‘parageneric spaces’ within the movement: a withdrawal from sonata-action. If the ‘outward container’ is to be heard as a ‘higher reality’ or even an exterior narrator, then the inclusion of musical material from the introduction at the caesura-fill linkage following the blocked MCs can also be heard as outside or narrative intrusions and the concept of parageneric spaces can also be expanded to included CF in some instances.  

Table 4.1  Brahms, Symphony No. 1 in C minor, Op. 68, Finale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRODUCTION</th>
<th>Adagio</th>
<th>Più Andante</th>
<th>Breakthrough, p. dolce</th>
<th>Chorale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-61</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I’ (‘Alphorn’)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>52-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTATION 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td></td>
<td>P ⇒ TR dissolve</td>
<td>Blocked MC + CF (Più Andante-based)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-185</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-94</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94-113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTATION 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>P-Development</td>
<td>MC + CF (Più Andante-based)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185-366</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>234-84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Più Allegro</td>
<td></td>
<td>BREAKTHROUGH, ff. tutti brass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367-437</td>
<td>P-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>367-406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By far the most common position for a breakthrough to occur is at the end of the development or at least where the development is expected to end, before the onset of the recapitulation. Examples include: Beethoven’s Leonore Overtures no. 2 and 3; the first movement of Schumann’s First and Fourth Symphonies and the finale of his Third; the first movement of Mahler’s First Symphony; Strauss’s Don Juan; the first movements of Nielsen’s First and Sixth Symphonies; and the first movements of
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Sibelius’s Second and Fifth Symphonies. One of the most conventional options for the content of a developmental rotation (Sonata Types 3, 4, 5) is a treatment of Part 1 materials from the exposition, often in order: P, TR. Hepokoski and Darcy consider these developments to be half-rotations: those that are ‘incomplete’ or ‘blocked’ mid-cycle. They recognize that ‘the structural-dominant lock on a VA and the harmonic interruption at the end of a half-rotational development are the equivalents of the drive to and the accomplishment of the expositional MC’. This concept may be taken further. When TR material coincides with this drive, acting as the retransition in preparation for the recapitulation, a MC-like gesture – sometimes the MC itself – may actually appear at the end of the TR/RTR. It is from this caesura that a breakthrough erupts in the examples above, deferring the expected recapitulation until some later point. The trumpet breakthrough in *Leonore* is a touchstone example of a breakthrough emerging from the end of development caesura (Ex. 1). The MC in the exposition and the end of the expository and recapitulatory rotations are also liminal gaps through which musical material from outside-sonata space may interject. Nevertheless, there are no examples of breakthroughs following the expositional MC. The type of form needs to be fully established and communicated to the listener before it can be rejected or critiqued through any interruption from outside the form. Unlike the earlier breakthroughs of Schumann and Brahms, early modernist breakthroughs also tend to be preceded by a protracted build up which often gives the impression that it is an immense effort to reach the breakthrough itself. Examples include the passage preceding the breakthroughs in the first movement of Mahler’s First, Sibelius’s, Second and Fifth. It may be suggested that this driving force corresponds to the rhetorical drive of the TR in half rotational developments of earlier sonatas.

The third space through which a breakthrough may burst is in the coda. The finale of Brahms’s First Symphony provides yet another an example. Hepokoski observes that the finale of Brahms’s First Symphony ‘shares affinities’ with his ‘introduction-coda
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frame’ family of sonata deformations as described in Sibelius, Symphony No. 5. This kind of deformation produces the effect of subordinating the ‘sonata-activity to the overriding contents of an encasing introduction and coda (whose identity may also intrude into certain inner sections of the ‘sonata’ [as they do in Brahms’s First Symphony finale]). A common result is the furnishing of two levels of aesthetic presence, for example (as often in works with a ‘national’ turn), that of a fuller, more emphatic framing-reality – or even that of a metaphorically ‘present’ narrator – which unfolds a subordinate sonata-process that is eventually absorbed back into the original, fuller presence at its end. Of course, this definition is inclusive of all movements that have an introduction and coda, implying that all of these movements are deformations and highly non-normative. The ‘Introduction-Coda Frame deformation’ is refined in Elements of Sonata Theory to only include those movements with introductions and codas in which material from the introduction returns as all or part of the coda.

The fortissimo brass breakthrough (b. 407) in the coda of the Finale, appears first in the Più Andante section of the introduction, where it is piano and dolce (Table 4.1). The S-theme fails to attain any semblance of an ESC in the second rotation of the internal expanded-Type 1 sonata, and the rotation comes to a close with a PAC in the tonic minor, what Hepokoski and Darcy might refer to as ‘sonata failure’ (b. 367). The tonic major is established at the beginning of the coda (Più Allegro) and it is only after the majestic breakthrough chorale that the perfect authentic cadence and ESC can be sounded. The breakthrough functions to emancipate the movement from the minor mode, C minor, a key strongly associated with tragedy.

The Allegro Finale of Brahms’s Symphony No. 3 in F, op. 90 contains another passage that Daverio identifies as a breakthrough, but he claims that it is ‘a reminder that
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64 Ibid.; Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 304-5. The examples listed in Hepokoski’s Sibelius, Symphony No. 5 are: first movement of Schubert’s Symphony No. 9 in C; Mendelssohn’s A Midsummer Night’s Dream Overture, The Fair Melusine Overture, and first movement of Symphony No. 3; Berlioz’s Benvenuto Cellini Overture; Wagner’s Tannhäuser Overture; first movements of Tchaikovsky’s Symphony No. 2 and Symphony No. 4; finale of Symphony No. 5; Overture “1812”; first movement of Dvorak’s Symphony No. 8; first movement of Glazunov’s Symphony No. 4; and first movement of Elgar’s Symphony No. 1.
breakthrough need not be a noisy affair’. More important than sheer volume to Daverio, is the ‘visionary quality and the element of reversal, either from low to high comedy, the mundane to the otherworldly, or from the heroic to the reflective’, although he does not actually discuss what specific musical features make it a breakthrough. It is ‘a theme that recurs as a parenthetical aside in the first group, […] builds to a climax during a later developmental passage, and ultimately achieves a state of transcendent repose in the breakthrough chorale of the coda’. The compound-duple metre chorale enters through a caesura, contrasts with the character of simple-duple metre P (bars 1-17) and seems to occupy a space distinct from the rest of the rotation (Table 4.2). It is also tonally distinct from the F minor P that surrounds it. In its first appearance (bars 18-28) it attempts to establish the relative major (D♭) but a sudden trombone swell at bar 28 interrupts the cadence, and transports the ear back to P and the tonic minor. The chorale finally brings about redemption from the minor mode in the coda, after S fails to secure the ESC in R2, by providing a PAC in the tonic major and a peripeteia or a ‘reversal in fortune’.

Table 4.2 Brahms, Symphony No. 3 in F major, Op. 90, Finale (Expanded Type 1 sonata)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROTATION 1</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Chorale</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>V:HC MC</th>
<th>S (no EEC or PAC)</th>
<th>C ⇒ RT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>1-105</td>
<td>i (no PAC)</td>
<td>Vi/VI</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>viii</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>I:HC MC</td>
<td>S (no ESC or PAC)</td>
<td>C ⇒ RT (+P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106-251</td>
<td>i → 106-148</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i → 149-171</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>194-216</td>
<td>217-240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Chorale</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>280-309</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite characteristics that make it distinct from the surrounding movement, several features of the chorale undermine a breakthrough reading. The fact that the chorale also appears in the same position – interpolated into the P-zone – in the second and
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third rotations of the piece somewhat undermines its suddenness, making it a rotational likelihood even in the coda. Furthermore, the chorale does not occupy the same mid-rotational space that most breakthroughs do and first appears in the opening rotation, rather than at a post-expositional point. It is orchestrated for strings and lower woodwind in the exposition rather than brass, although brass instruments are added in R2, and in the coda the brass choir dominates the chorale. The crucial breakthrough feature that the chorale lacks is a sudden forte eruption to initiate it. In fact, it is piano at its apotheosis in R3. We have therefore a chorale that is closer to the sort that sometimes follows a breakthrough and it is arguably not a breakthrough at all. This demonstrates that perhaps Daverio has stretched the concept beyond its limits in order to support his theory that Schumann’s symphonic structures influenced Brahms’s. The chorale can be better described as a suspension in the Adornian sense and an interpolated episode. Much like the chorale portion of the Finale of Sibelius Third Symphony, this passage provides a reversal of fortune without having the characteristics of a breakthrough.

In summary, for a passage of a symphonic movement or tone poem to be classified as a breakthrough, it must present a sudden contrast in timbre, a violent fortissimo burst of energy in one voice. It is orchestrated for one or more brass instrument, as a fanfare or hunting horn topic and these instruments may be withheld entirely or at least given a less prominent role until the breakthrough itself. It is a specific kind of episodic interpolation that should be treated as occupying a space outside the ongoing sonata and may be formulated out of motivic material from a ‘parageneric space’ such as the introduction. The spatializing effect of the brass-call may open up a separate episode, which may also be considered to be outside sonata space and often takes the form of a chorale. The breakthrough frequently occurs at one of three possible places in a sonata where a mid-rotational caesura acts as a liminal gap through which the breakthrough may burst: 1) between the end of the development and the beginning of the recapitulation; 2) after the MC in the recapitulation replacing CF or S; 3) in the coda. The sonata must react to the breakthrough and compensate for the intrusion of an outside force, and indeed the breakthrough often initiates a structural change. A
breakthrough in position 1 leaves the expectation that something in the recapitulation will be altered thematically or tonally, perhaps something that proved to be structurally problematic in the exposition. The onset of the recapitulation is often re-orchestrated to include prominent brass when preceded by a breakthrough. Breakthroughs commonly appear in minor-mode Type 1 sonatas, where the tonic minor remains an ‘oppressive force’ for the majority of the movement due to the rotational structure. The breakthrough theme may provide a reversal of fortune and, therefore, tonal closure in the form of the ESC if it occurs in positions 2 or 3. A more drastic peripeteia may involve a rejection of the previous form in favour of an entirely different form. Conversely, the breakthrough may just provide a ray of hope and the promise of tonal attainment, which is ultimately not taken up by the following sonata.

4.3 Filling in the gaps: Caesurae in Sibelius’s music

One of the crucial features of Sibelius’s music is the concealment of caesurae through textural and timbral continuity. This makes the musical landmarks of sonata form less easily discernable, increasingly so after the Third Symphony. Often an accompaniment figure from the end of one rotation will bleed into the beginning of the next rotation. Removing caesurae rather than filling them in the sense of a CF, is an inclination specific to early modernists. These composers sought to defamiliarize the structural moments that characterize a sonata by concealing the demarcations between themes or zones that distinguish them from each other. One example is the junction between the fused scherzo and chorale-finale of the Third Symphony. The chorale theme is elided with the end of the development, which fades into nothing, giving the impression that the chorale comes into focus or comes nearer. Although the violas announce this theme, doubled-stopped and marcato (upbeat to b. 29), it is somewhat obscured by not only the chattering quavers of the violins in the same register, but also the horns and bassoons which sustain forte Es (V of the relative minor). The incessant chromatic quavers seem diametrically opposed to the melodic piano dolce legato wind interruptions, which make every effort to bring the development to the ‘right’ key, C major. When the chorale proper begins at b. 246, there is the distinct feeling that this
theme has been heard before, which of course it has, but only moments ago: it emerges as if from the subconscious. Unlike the emergence of the scherzo in the first movement of Sibelius’s Fifth, this movement does not involve a breakthrough. Breakthroughs continue to occur in formal positions that are comparable to those in early nineteenth-century sonatas that featured caesurae.

4.3.1 Breakthrough and the Fusion of Movements

Complicating the concept of breakthrough is its appearance in a work that fuses movements of a multimovement cycle into a single movement. Hepokoski has acknowledged that ‘any single musical structure may combine aspects of two or more families’ of deformation. Further, Hepokoski and Darcy have already bracketed the combination of various subtypes of teleological genesis and Klang under the title ‘Brucknerian deformation’. Nevertheless, other combinations of deformations and structural features require deeper exploration. It might be appropriate for sonata deformations that frequently occur together to be considered as a ‘group deformations’ or even as forms in their own right, especially if they are to be expected of certain composers and are deformational ‘norms’. One such group of deformations involves three of Hepokoski’s deformations in particular – ‘episodic substitution in the development’, the ‘breakthrough deformation’, and ‘multimovement form in a single movement’. These may be considered to be an interrelated, even co-dependent group of compositional gestures in early modernist music rather than distinct categories. All three deformations involve the conceptual replacement of one normative rotation – the development or recapitulation – with new material. This rotational replacement is likely to have been a strategy to avoid predictable Formenlehre options – academic developments and merely reiterative recapitulations – within an aesthetic system that increasingly valued innovation. Furthermore, all deformations are inherited from the genre of overture. It is worth defining each of these categories and discussing them
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critically, before moving on to explore the impact of the fusion of movements in the first movement of Sibelius’s Fifth Symphony.

The first of these deformations involved the substitution of the developmental rotation by two contrasting episodes. It is a deformation particularly common in Strauss’s tone poems and can be found in his Macbeth, Don Juan, Death and Transfiguration, Till Eulenspiegel, and Also Sprach Zarathustra.\(^{71}\) These episodes are usually separated from the music surrounding them by a combination of caesurae, tonal insularism, contrast in orchestration, and lack of developmental rhetoric. As is the case in Macbeth, the character of these episodes frequently corresponds to a slow or lyrical movement and a scherzo or minuet movement (where two episodes are substituted).\(^{72}\) It is probable that the interpolation of a slow episode in the development of eighteenth-century overtures is the source of this procedure.\(^{73}\) When a developmental rotation has been replaced by interpolations reminiscent of the interior movements, the recapitulation may be interpreted as a finale and the exposition retrospectively reinterpreted as a first movement, and may be called sub-movements. Movements with this structure may be labeled ‘multimovement forms in a single movement’ or ‘four movements in one’.\(^{74}\)

Sonata Theory argues that when a normative space or rotation is replaced and its expectations not realized – in this case the development – it remains conceptually present despite its literal absence.\(^{75}\) Following this argument, the four sub-movements may also retain its function as a single sonata movement and take on a double-form, especially when the movement is also part of a multimovement cycle such as a symphony or sonata. Besides Hepokoski, many other musical analysts have observed this kind of structure. The same procedure has been called ‘four movements in one’,

\(^{71}\) Hepokoski, ‘Structure and Program in Macbeth’, 78.
\(^{72}\) Ibid.
\(^{73}\) Opera overtures that have slow episode interpolations in their developmental spaces include Mozart’s Overture to Die Entführung aus dem Serail, K. 384 (1781) and Beethoven’s Leonore Overture, No. 1, op. 138 (1805).
\(^{74}\) Carl Dahlhaus, Nineteenth-Century Music (University of California Press, 1989), 239 and James Hepokoski, Sibelius: Symphony No. 5, 7.
\(^{75}\) Hepokoski and Darcy, 612.
‘double-function sonata’,\textsuperscript{76} and most recently ‘two-dimensional sonata’\textsuperscript{77} Liszt has been attributed as the originator of this form, and it has been discussed at great length in relation to his Sonata in B minor and tone poems, although precedents exist such as Schubert’s \textit{Wanderer Fantasy} for piano, op. 15 (1822) and Schumann’s No. 4 in D minor, op. 120 (1841, rev. 1851).\textsuperscript{78} This approach is also a widely noted Straussian and Sibelian procedure, with examples including the former’s \textit{Don Juan} and the last movement of the latter’s Third, the first of the Fifth, and the entire Seventh Symphony.\textsuperscript{79} The simultaneous function of a movement as an individual sonata and as a multimovement cycle means that the finale rotation normatively recapitulates expositional material (first sub-movement), as a finale might reflect upon first movement material in a multimovement cycle. In several early modernist movements, however, this last rotation is entirely replaced by new or at least seemingly new material, especially when there has been a breakthrough at the end of the development, which profoundly changes the expected course movement. Hepokoski’s analysis of Strauss’s \textit{Don Juan} finds all three of these deformations occurring together, and a return to this work enriches the argument for these structural features as an interrelated group.

\textbf{4.3.2 \textit{Don Juan}’s Breakthrough into Two-Dimensions}

\textit{Don Juan} has proven to be structurally problematic for any straightforward sonata or rondo reading. Analysts have either argued for a ‘free’ sonata or rondo structure, or rejected a sonata reading entirely and ascribed the problematic ordering of themes to programmatic considerations. Hepokoski argues that the rationale for the structure of \textit{Don Juan} is ‘not exclusively programmatic’ and he identifies the non-programmatic aspect as a breakthrough ‘sonata deformation’ that converts the sonata-rondo structure of the first two thirds of the work to a sonata form.\textsuperscript{80} Hepokoski claims that the sonata-rondo disintegrates over the course of the piece, finally shifting genres at the point

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{76} W. S. Newman coined the term in relation to Liszt’s Sonata in B minor.
\item \textsuperscript{77} Steven Vande Moortele, \textit{Two-Dimensional Sonata Form: Form and Cycle in Single-Movement Liszt, Strauss, Schoenberg, and Zemlinsky} (Leuven University Press, 15 Nov 2009).
\item \textsuperscript{78} Kenneth Hamilton, \textit{Liszt: Sonata in B Minor} (Cambridge University Press, 1996).
\item \textsuperscript{79} Examples in Strauss’s music include \textit{Macbeth}, \textit{Don Juan}, \textit{Death and Transfiguration}, \textit{Till Eulenspiegel}, and \textit{Also Sprach Zarathustra}.
\item \textsuperscript{80} Hepokoski, ‘Fiery Pulsed Libertine’, 148, 150.
\end{itemize}
where the Heldenthema or ‘Hero theme’ is sounded in the horns (bb. 313-350) during the development to replace the expected return of the Don Juan theme (P) and undermine the rondo principle. He considers this to be the ‘announcement of the breakthrough-intention’, which induces a ‘radically altered’ recapitulation of a pure sonata form (Type 3 ‘textbook form’) and allows the previous portion of the piece to be retrospectively read as a sonata form. According to his reading, it is the fortissimo ‘grand statement’ of the E major Heldenthema, which replaces the TR and S in the recapitulation (bb. 510ff), that is the ‘true’, ‘fully realized’ breakthrough and the climax of the work.

Vande Moortele’s critique of Hepokoski’s Don Juan analysis and his subsequent application of his reconsidered multimovement form in a single movement methodology – or ‘two dimensional sonata form’, as he terms it – almost threatens to strip Hepokoski’s breakthrough of its structural power to fuse sonata types. As Moortele observes, the sonata-rondo Hepokoski describes equates to a Type 4 sonata-rondo, recast in recent Sonata Theory language. Evidently, Hepokoski wrote his Don Juan article before the sonata types were concretized. Furthermore, Moortele identifies the main flaw in Hepokoski’s ‘virtuosic’ reading: that almost all sonata types, including Type 4s, begin with the same expositional structure, which means for a listener ‘it is impossible to judge whether he or she is dealing with a sonata rondo or a sonata form (a “Type 4” or a “Type 3” sonata) on the basis of the sounding surface alone’. Furthermore, the recapitulation of a Type 4 sonata is structurally identical to a Type 3 sonata undermining Hepokoski’s perceived contrast between the type of structure before and after the breakthrough. Either Hepokoski’s argument for a Type 4 sonata does not come from anything in the exposition or this is yet another example of concepts in early 1990s Sonata Theory not aligning with those in Elements of Sonata Theory. Vande Moortele finds it ultimately unconvincing to base a structural reading on
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programmatic concerns (rondo theme = Don Juan, episodes = womanizing), arguing that ‘there is no point in changing the horizon of expectation if the change is not supported by the music’, especially given the structural similarities between it and other symphonic poems.85

In sum, the standpoint of the breakthrough is left uncertain if the structure of the symphonic poem is not altered irrevocably. Despite this, Vande Moortele does not consider what consequences the taxonomical issues he raises might have on Hepokoski’s breakthrough and continues to refer to the Heldenthema as ‘the breakthrough’. He even mentions its ‘strong impact on the second half of the composition’ without further comment on what this impact is, having rejected the idea of conversion from a Type 4 to Type 3 sonata.86 Nor does Hepokoski reconsider the structural impact of the breakthrough.

In order to determine the effect, if any, of the breakthrough on the sonata structure, it is important to first explore the structure of the work and taxonomical issues when distinguishing between sonata types. Rather than existing as opposing forms, the Type 4 sonata lies somewhere on a continuum between a Type 3 sonata and a “‘pure’ symmetrical seven-part rondo’ as defined in Elements of Sonata Theory.87 It is only at a post-expositional point that the sonata type is fully realized and communicated to the listener. This realization further clarifies the temporal process that distinguishes sonata types and can be termed a point of structural realization, with similar connotations to Hepokoski and Darcy’s ‘point of conversion’ in a continuous exposition. They define this point as ‘a moment of psychological conversion – a personal understanding at some mid-expositional point that the more standard, two-part form is not going to be realized’.88 This kind of ‘psychological conversion’ may also be conceptually applied to the point at which the listener can discern the sonata type from its structural features. The first point of realization occurs at the beginning of the second rotation in a sonata
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88 Ibid., 52-3.
movement and at the moment of initial tonal resolution to tonic after the development (Table 4.3). Other aspects of the piece such as genre, title, and type of P theme also give the audience vital sonata type clues. The point of realization in a Type 4 comes at the beginning of the second rotation, the development. This rotation begins with a statement of P in the tonic, distinguishing it from Types 2 and 3, and it is prepared for by a retransition featuring an active dominant at the end of the exposition, distinguishing it from Type 1. It is this pair of features at the onset of R2 that need to be located in Don Juan for the sonata-rondo reading to be upheld.

Table 4.3  Pathways and Points of Realization in Sonata Types
The first point of structural realization is shaded in light grey; the second is darker grey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROTATION 1</th>
<th>ROTATION 2</th>
<th>ROTATION 3</th>
<th>ROTATION 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P I TR S V C</td>
<td>P-development</td>
<td>TR S I C</td>
<td>(Coda P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>RT VA</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>(Coda P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>P-development</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>S C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>P-development</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>S C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first full return of P is at bars 161-196 in the symphonic poem and begins the second rotation. It is also the moment of realization that makes a Type 4 reading most problematic. Out of the exposition’s lyrical S theme (bars 90-119), grows a yearning Tristan-like passage (bars 119-149, S') that builds sequentially to the expected EEC: confirmation of the dominant key (B major). However, instead of ending with a perfect cadence prepared for at bar 148 (II\(\frac{3}{4}\)), triple forte E minor chords are reiterated at bars 150-152 and again at bars 157-159, which Hepokoski suggests is ‘probably a musical representation of masculine sexual climax’ in Don Juan’s key, E, after a sexual encounter with a woman (S). This moment may be loosely equated with an EEC, after S fails to assert its key. The retransition that should follow to prepare for the tonic onset of R2 if the form is a Type 4 is conspicuously absent. What is more, the statement of P at bar 161ff is off-tonic and recomposed. As these features are the only features that characterize Type 4, it is insufficient to regard their absence as a deformation of the

---

89 Ibid., 404.
type as Hepokoski does, or as a rondo-sonata at all. Therefore, the moment when the Heldenthema intrudes is not the point of realization of a sonata type but of a two-dimensional form. It is at this point that the framing conditions of the work are shifted to that of a multimovement cycle, both in retrospect and in terms of what is to come.

In Hepokoski’s ‘extra-musical’ reading, it is only after the G major idyll episode and the breakthrough that Don Juan ‘the penetrator is himself penetrated’ by emotion and possibly love. He is unable to continue womanizing, and the rondo principle accordingly breaks down after the ‘thunderbolt from heaven’ (Lenau) that is the breakthrough. The promise of transformation that the C major Heldenthema provides is rejected however, and P returns. This moment has its formal and programmatic parallel in the Swan’s C major calls followed by the tragic funeral march in Sibelius’s Swan of Tuonela. In Strauss’s Don Juan however, the breakthrough opens a scherzo-like space (bars 351-459) that allows the previous G episode interpolation to be aligned retrospectively with a slow movement. Also possible are retrospective readings of the exposition as a first movement and the following recapitulation as a finale, although these should not be overstated. The scherzo portion of the development – the ‘carnival’ or ‘masquerade’ – features an internal struggle between P and Heldenthema identities, resulting ultimately in a ‘crisis, nonresolution, and collapse’ (bars 421-24).

4.3.3 The Fusion of Movements in Sibelius’s Fifth Symphony

Unlike other multimovement forms in a single movement, the first movement of Sibelius’s Symphony No. 5 in E♭, Op. 82, is composed of two fused movements in clearly discernable halves: a sonata exposition and development, and a scherzo. These halves
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90 Owing to the roots of the symphonic poem in the double-rotational genre of the overture, Don Juan may invite a Type 1 (‘overture’ or ‘sonatina’ form) or Type 2 sonata reading. The opening of R² may invite a Type 2 reading due to the closeness of the statement of P to that in the exposition and because of the interpolated slow-movement episode that follows it, replacing a P-development. The return to the tonic at the end of the previous rotation, albeit unexpected and in the minor mode, may perhaps also be an allusion to the RT of a Type 1 sonata’s R1. The continuing development of exposition material following the breakthrough however, likely indicates that this is going to be a Type 3 sonata with a full recapitulation to follow. Furthermore, the return of P material at bar 337 gives the impression that the development has been restarted, creating a very large developmental rotation that can be split into two smaller subrotational cycles through expositional material (S is replaced by the G episode in Subrotation 1).


92 Ibid., 150.
not only display the surface character of first movements and scherzos but are also structured as these movement types. A breakthrough at the end of the development radically redefines the structure of the movement and a new course is set: the scherzo replaces the recapitulation, and there is no separate scherzo movement. The emphasis of many previous analyses has been to justify the coherence of this movement as a unified whole, despite or perhaps as a response to the internal fusion of independent movements. Gray exemplifies this tendency with his claim that the ‘two sections [or movements] are in fact one single, indivisible moment’. Gray dissolves any distinction between the sonata and scherzo components by arguing that the dissimilarity between them is superficial because the same thematic material can be found in both. Identifying intense motivic interconnectedness in this manner is the most common analytical approach to Sibelius’s music. Formal compression, coherence, and ‘musical logic’ are ideas that have been propagated by almost all Sibelius scholars. Tim Howell claims that despite the apparent temporal evolution of musical material from the sonata to take on scherzo characteristics, the function of the fusion of movements in the Fifth Symphony is ‘actually “static”: concerned with large-scale repetition’ of ‘essentially the same material’. Gray’s notion of ‘evolution from fragmentation’ has been particularly influential on Sibelius studies, whereby whole themes grow from ‘germ’ or ‘kernel’ motives, as noted in previous chapters. While Sibelius did perhaps ‘venerate’ the ‘musical logic’ that he was exposed to during his studies in Berlin and Vienna from 1889 to 1891, this aspect of his music has arguably been overemphasized in an effort to prove Sibelius’s worth and right to a place in the repertory as a ‘great symphonic master’.

In same vein as Gray, Murtomäki, in *Symphonic Unity*, aims to demonstrate that Sibelius was a continuation of the central European tradition, and directly followed in the footsteps of Mozart and Beethoven. His chronological analysis of the symphonies establishes a teleological narrative towards the attainment of unity and ‘formal compactness’ in the Seventh Symphony. At the time of writing, Murtomäki recognized

---

95 Hepokoski, ‘Sibelius’ in *The Nineteenth-Century Symphony*, 429.
that unity of this sort had come under intense fire in musicology in the decade before – the 1980s – but believes that in the case of Sibelius, it is justified ‘as long as even the slightest doubts about the coherence of his music (Adorno and other, mainly German writers) resist their long postponed burial’. Murtomäki’s book is therefore an attempt to reconcile the perceived damage caused to Sibelius’s reputation by Adorno et al and prove that he is not simply a nationalist composer from the peripheries of Europe, but a composer who could write symphonic music on central European – in other words, Germanic – terms. Arguably, Sibelius studies can now move on from this apologetic perspective. This is not to say that there is no unity in Sibelius’s music, only that it is a feature that has been grossly overemphasized at the expense of other interesting Sibelian attributes. Placing a primary importance on the ‘sameness’ of the Sibelius’s musical material means that prominent moments of definition, sudden transformation, and rejection are overlooked. Indeed, it may be the reason that breakthroughs in Sibelius’s symphonies – music that is from outside and therefore does not reinforce arguments for unity or coherence – have not attracted more attention from scholars.

The unfortunate result of an analysis that only aims to show internal coherence is that the piece cannot be related to any context or to show the significance of any intertextual dialogue with other pieces. Hepokoski has condemned claims that late nineteenth-century pieces are characterized by ‘an essentially self-generating or ad hoc structure that has by and large wrestled free from the gravitational force-fields of past architectonic norms’, as ‘naïve in the extreme’. Further, he argues that this remains the case even when any individual piece (such as *Till*) might also be capable, from certain angles of perception, of giving the (mis)impression of arising as a purely generative object, crafted inexorably out of only the inherent properties of its own musical material and idiosyncratic premises, a readily analyzable feature that was one of the prized compositional fictions (through overstatement) of the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

This supports his claims that for any work – whether working in or against a cultural...
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96 Murtomäki, *Symphonic Unity*, vii. Murtomäki mentions Joseph Kerman, Ruth A. Solie, Leo Treitler, Anthony Newcomb, Janet M. Levy, and Alan Street, amongst those who have challenged the ideal of unity.
97 Hepokoski, ‘Framing *Till Eulenspiegel*’, 29.
98 Ibid., 29.
tradition – institutional expectations are inescapable. He writes that ‘the structural power of any such freer forms lay precisely in their high-fiction, dialogic relationships with preexisting conceptual categories’, despite the outward intentions of composers. Hepokoski’s assertions here are in striking contradiction to his earlier theorization of ‘content-based forms’ in *Sibelius, Symphony No. 5*, a compositional principle supposedly reassessed in Sibelius’s late works, and closely related to ‘teleological genesis’. ‘Content-based forms’ are defined as ‘freely logical, intuitive, or ad hoc shapes – dictated by Sibelius’s listening to what might be called the “will of the selected material”’. On the surface, it seems that this is another example of the tensions between early and later Sonata Theory, but a semi-defensive reading that accommodates discrepancies within a theoretical development is not quite so easy to make. In an article published the year before *Sibelius, Symphony No. 5*, Hepokoski also argues that ‘appeal[s] to a nongeneric “unique form” are insufficient’. Perhaps Hepokoski believes that Sibelius really did achieve an organic, generative and thus ‘modernist’ compositional process in his late period, rendering this type of musical structure no longer an ‘overstatement’ or ‘fiction’. After all, Hepokoski’s objections can be found within the context of his discussion of Strauss’s *Don Juan* (1888) and *Till Eulenspeigel* (1894-95), both composed decades earlier than *The Bard* and *Luonnotar* (1913), the first of Sibelius’s ‘mature’ works. It seems more likely that the concept of ‘content-based forms’ are a hangover from earlier analytical literature that venerated the idea of musical material generating its own large-scale structure and thus gaining unity. It is also a catchall for analytically ‘difficult’ structures, particularly those that do not adhere to the sonata principle. ‘Content-based forms’ is another of Hepokoski’s 1993 concepts that requires close interrogation and rethinking, and may ultimately have to be dispensed with.

One symptom of this overemphasis on unity and coherence of motives has caused terminological issues to arise in relation to the first movement of the Fifth Symphony,

99 Ibid., 30.
100 Hepokoski, *Sibelius, Symphony No. 5*, 21-22.
101 Hepokoski, ‘Fiery-Pulsed Libertine’, 143.
relating to Gray’s widely accepted assessment that the first and second halves of the first movement are ‘one indivisible moment’. While acknowledging that this fusion produces a highly unusual sequence of events, Hepokoski and Murtomäki both define the Scherzo as a recapitulation, even if it is ‘fundamentally altered’.\textsuperscript{102} They are in agreement that recapitulatory features are introduced one after the other in a staggered effect: theme followed by tempo and tonic colour.\textsuperscript{103} This ‘reconceived’ recapitulatory rotation might well attain tonal closure – which is one generic function of the recapitulation as defined in \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory} – and cycle through the material of the referential rotation in order, but it does not recapitulate these materials. No doubt, post-2006 Sonata Theory would not define this as a recapitulation since it does not contain initial P modules. In most cases, a double return of P\textsuperscript{1} and the tonic at the outset are required for a post-expositional rotation to be considered a recapitulation.\textsuperscript{104}

The term ‘recapitulation’ does not do justice to the transformative function of the sudden tutti outburst in a non-tonic key (B major) that leads from the developmental rotation to the Scherzo (bar 106-113). The term imposes a false unity on the movement, implying that it is experienced as one form. The first half of the movement is abandoned, and its themes are transformed rather than merely recapitulated. The second half of the movement acts simultaneously as a scherzo and provides the first half with tonal closure but it is not a recapitulation. The same argument applies to the last movement of the Third Symphony, which fuses a scherzo movement with a chorale-finale without a breakthrough to trigger this transformation. Hepokoski similarly falls into the problem when using the term ‘reconceived recapitulation’ to describe the chorale.\textsuperscript{105}

Early sketches of the Fifth Symphony further support this conclusion. The first version of the symphony (1915), reconstructed from instrumental parts, demonstrates that Sibelius originally conceived of this as a four-movement symphony with the scherzo (originally \textit{Allegro commodo}) as an entirely separate movement to the \textit{Tempo molto moderato}.\textsuperscript{106}

\textsuperscript{102} Hepokoski, \textit{Sibelius, Symphony, No. 5}, 67.
\textsuperscript{103} Ibid., 67-68.
\textsuperscript{104} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, 231-2. The second rotation of a Type 2 sonata is not considered to be a recapitulation because the tonic is only returned to in its S-zone, therefore there is no ‘double return’.
\textsuperscript{105} Hepokoski, ‘Sibelius, Jean’, \textit{Grove Music Online}.
The first movement of the 1915 version proceeds from the development to a pastoral section in the tonic, E♭, with the opening horn call over pizzicato strings after a long fermata, which Erik Tawaststjerna claims ‘interrupt[s] the musical argument’. He also locates it within the archaic tradition of placing caesurae at the end of the scherzo, before the trio and this can be heard in dialogue with the generic sonata form practice of demarcating rotations from one another. By 1916, the break had been bridged, perhaps as part of the growing impulse to disguise the boundaries between rotations. Murtomäki has interpreted this section of the 1915 version as an allusion to a recapitulation owing to its return to the tonic and the opening motive, albeit brief. Accepting Murtomäki’s assessment may enrich the argument for a breakthrough at this point. The breakthrough passage is conspicuously missing in the 1915 version and replaces the short recapitulation-like ending in the final 1919 version. In this sense, Sibelius presents a literal and metaphorical rejection of the sonata form in the 1919 version. It is the B major passage that interrupts the ‘musical argument’ and defies listener expectations, allowing another form – a scherzo – to step in and attain the tonal closure that could not be reached previously. In this movement, the initial sonata is rejected, rendered inadequate retrospectively, and a normative recapitulation becomes inconceivable.

As Hepokoski has shown, breakthrough proves to be the most illuminating approach to the junction between fused movements. Although the B major passage at the end the developmental rotation is based on the rising ‘bucolic’ horn call figure (P) from the expositional rotations, the sudden fortissimo tutti outburst, enharmonic shift of key - an ‘epiphany of bright tonal colour’ - and general timbral change, separate this passage from what has come before and may be interpreted as an interjection from ‘outside’ the diegesis of the movement (Ex. 4.3, bars 48-55). This catastrophic event rejects and corrects the originally proposed structure of a sonata. The rupture disrupts the rotational process of the sonata so profoundly that the new material does replace the last rotation,
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107 Ibid.
108 Murtomäki, Symphonic Unity, 161.
110 Hepokoski, Sibelius, Symphony No. 7, 67.
and the recapitulatory rotation does not remain conceptually present, unlike the scherzo interpolation into the developmental rotation of Don Juan.

Before returning to the concept of breakthrough and the metaphors that it may invoke, it is worth exploring the implications of this juncture on the movement. The first three rotations and their themes – a double rotation through expositional materials and a developmental rotation – are not separated by texture changes, cadences, or caesurae as they would be in an eighteenth-century or early nineteenth-century sonata. The place where the medial caesura (MC) should separate the transition (TR) from the secondary theme (S) provides one example of this blurring effect (Ex. 4.4). The onset of the transition is marked by an interrupted cadence (b. 11), which is redefined as the secondary dominant of the obscure key centre towards which TR seems to meander to, B major. A dominant seventh is reached in b. 17 (although the tonic pedal (B) persists) and something that resembles a caesura fill in the flutes and oboes gives promises to lead to a perfect cadence and tonal stability in the secondary theme zone. This caesura-fill is crudely interrupted by a fz string entry, which announces the new tonic, G major, and causes a false relation to arise. Unlike the caesura-fill, the tremolo string entry does not bridge the gap between the transition and secondary theme: it forcibly fills it. The B pedal that continues through S is redefined as the third of G, providing further blurring
Example 4.3 Sibelius, Symphony No. 5 in Eb, Op. 82, First movement
Breakthrough to Scherzo (bars 46-129)
Scherzo
Allegro moderato (ma poco a poco stretto)
between the first and second parts of the rotation. Significant blurring is also created by the extension of accompaniment figures from one rotation into the next. This occurs between the end of the first rotation, and the beginning of the second, when the semiquavers of the violas and cellos continue from a cadential gesture resembling an EEC, through the closing zone, and into the next rotation (Ex. 4.5).

Defining the first two rotations raises some terminological problems. The second rotation cycles closely through the material of the first with its tonal plan reversed and some reorchestration: only P is varied thematically through the removal of the descending bassoon figure and some rhythmic displacement in bb. 39-42.111 Hepokoski has labelled the second rotation a ‘counter-exposition’ or ‘complementary exposition’, while other analysts, such as Olivio Kauko claim that it is a ‘recapitulation’. Considering its place in the entire movement – before a more generic development – it is nonsensical to define the rotation as a recapitulation, even if S returns in the tonic as it would at the end of a Type 3 sonata. As Murtomäki has aptly asked, ‘what is needed after a recapitulation?’ 112 Hepokoski locates the ‘content’ of the second rotation in its ‘generative process’, yet this rotation does not present any new material and cycles through the material presented in the first very closely: the only thing it generates is the move back to the tonic.113 As already stated, the end of the first rotation initiates the new semiquaver accompaniment rather than anything in the second rotation. Like many claims of the ‘generative’ function of Sibelius’s music, Hepokoski’s is not justified with an explanation of how or what exactly is generated.
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111 The TR is also rhythmically displaced by half a bar with the early entry of the clarinets in b. 46.
112 Murtomäki, Symphonic Unity, 160.
113 Hepokoski, Sibelius, Symphony, No. 5, 65.
Example 4.4 Sibelius, Symphony No. 5 in E♭, Op. 82, First movement
TR and MC (bars 1-20)
Example 4.5  Sibelius, Symphony No. 5 in E♭, Op. 82, First movement
End of R1 (bb. 30-8)
The second rotation can possibly be heard to be in dialogue with the tradition of the expositional repeat, with some variation to avoid mere repetition: its presence may represent an effort to balance the first half of the movement with the lengthy scherzo. As Hepokoski points out, however, the return to the tonic in the second rotation threatens to undermine any dialogue with this archaic feature.\textsuperscript{114} Hepokoski protests that a double-exposition is completely without precedent in Sibelius’s music, further undermining this dialogue; however, the last movement of the Third Symphony, which incidentally fuses a scherzo and finale, also has a double-exposition, and examples can be found in Sibelius’s tone poems.\textsuperscript{115} The pair of rotations may also allude to the Type 2 sonata – a double-rotational sonata where the second rotation often begins with a developmental treatment of $P$ in a non-tonic key (as we have in this rotation, $P'$) and rejoins cycling through expositional material around the transition. A fleeting allusion to this form would not be completely unfounded, before the onset of the development confirms that the movement is more than double-rotational. The first movement of Sibelius’s Symphony No. 4 in A minor may also be heard to be in dialogue with the Type 2 sonata: this movement is conceptually paired with the ensuing scherzo.

A more convincing reading of the first two rotations, specific to the first movement of Sibelius’s Fifth Symphony, is that the first rotation through thematic materials is somehow inadequate and requires revisiting. The moment of breakthrough is anticipated by sudden tutti bursts at the ends of the first two rotations, which fade back into the texture and ultimately fail either to provide adequate closure to the rotations or to ‘break through’ the prevailing form to something that can provide such closure. The dovetailing between rotations (which closes any potential caesurae in the structure), the ‘plugging’ of the MC, and the lack of cadences or root position chords, combine to give an overall impression that this is a faded memory of sonata procedures. This analytical observation further enriches Hepokoski’s interpretation of this half of the

\textsuperscript{114} Hepokoski, \textit{Sibelius, Symphony No. 5}, 65.

\textsuperscript{115} The \textit{Oceanides}, Op. 73 (1914) is an example, and Grimley considers bars 276-461 of \textit{En Saga}, Op. 9 (1902) to be a ‘counter-exposition’ (bars 276-461). See Grimley, ‘The tone poems’, 98.
movement as a ‘premodern wholeness remembered or dreamt of, now fading rapidly or inaccessible in current times’. In contrast, the theme and tonality of the scherzo are in sharper focus. The theme is in clear eight bar phrases, punctuated by cadences, and can be broken down into four bar and two bar units (Ex. 3, bar 114ff). This musical clarity creates an even greater distance between the scherzo and the sonata form. The sonata portion is corrected by the breakthrough, which allows the ‘banished’ language of cadences to return. Arnold Whittall aptly summarizes this effect:

The recovery of ‘the banished language of cadences’ in the transition to the scherzo section brilliantly compensates for the modernist generic irony of the fact that the movement can only find closure by ceasing to be the expansive Molto moderato in which that ‘language’ was lost. Rather than Hepokoski’s transformation of circular weakness into rapid, forceful activity, this can be seen as a transformation of slow-moving yet aspirational activity into a blithely exuberant display, which rejects the aspirational depth of feeling so palpable from the very first bar for unreflective excitement. The symphony will only achieve satisfying and convincing closure when it allows these two worlds of feeling to converge, rather than forcing them further apart.

The distancing affect of the horn calls acts as an aural time machine transporting the ear from a ghostly fading sonata space in complex modern times to a comforting space reminiscent of earlier nineteenth century scherzos. This movement is a characteristic demonstration of the paradox inherent in the modernism of fin-de-siècle symphonic music: an explosive break with and rejection of past compositional procedures yet at the same time a desperate clutching for a ‘pre-modern wholeness’ and an unwillingness to give up these ‘old world’ forms, gestures or ‘banished language of cadences’. The ‘blithely exuberant display’ of overtly tonal processes cannot last in a Europe where the New Music of the younger generation of radicals was eclipsing the language of the 1860s generation of symphonists. The decay of these processes begins towards the end trio, in recognition that such wholeness cannot last in such a time.

116 Hepokoski, Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 5.
117 Ibid., 68.
PART III
5 | A Meditation
on Sibelius’s Musical Appearances

The aim of this section is to meditate upon three quotations to conclude the thesis and draw together its findings on Sibelius’s musical appearances. The second quotation is an extract from Sibelius’s diaries and the third from Adorno’s Aesthetic Theory. The first is as follows:

When a tree falls in a lonely forest, and no animal is nearby to hear it, does it make a sound?¹

An anthropocentric answer is ‘no’. If there are no ears, there is no auditory sensation. Yet this philosophical thought experiment draws attention to the gap between experience and existence, encouraging us to not only imagine possibilities beyond our own perception but the nature of perception itself.

Irish Philosopher and empiricist, George Berkeley (1685-1753), is perhaps the earliest to formulate this thought experiment in 1710, two-hundred years before its form quoted above, although it is difficult to locate a single source of origin for the idea. In this early appearance of the idea, Berkley does not specifically consider the sound of the tree, only the problem of its unobserved presence. Addressing the reader directly, he declares: ‘but say you, surely there is nothing easier than to imagine trees, for instance, in a park, or books existing in a closet, and no body by [which] to perceive them’.² Yet this imagining, he continues, shows simply that you have the power to imagine. It does not show that you have the power to conceive that it is possible for ‘the objects of your thought [to] exist without the mind’.³ It is not possible to conceive of ‘external bodies […] existing unconceived or unthought of’.⁴ To claim to do so is, according to Berkeley, a ‘delusion’ and ‘manifest repugnancy’. In sum, ‘when we do our utmost to conceive of the existence

¹ Charles Riborg Mann and George Ransom Twiss, Physics (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1910), 235.
² George Berkeley, A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge, ed. by Jonathan Dancy (Oxford University Press, 1998), Section 23, 111.
³ Ibid. Italics are my own.
⁴ Ibid. Italics are my own.
of such external bodies, we are all the while only contemplating our own ideas’.\(^5\)

Returning to the tree again later in his treatise, Berkeley reaffirms this view and expresses the claim at the core of his subjective idealism:

> The objects of sense exist only when they are perceived: the trees therefore are in the garden, or the chairs in the parlour, no longer than while there is some body by to perceive them. Upon shutting my eyes all the furniture in the room is reduced to nothing, and barely upon opening them it is again created.\(^6\)

The thought experiment reappeared again in the 1880s with the perceiving sense in question shifted from sight to sound. In this form, a single tree is to be heard (or not heard) on an uninhabited island, but it is the form found in the second edition of Charles Riborg Mann and George Ransom Twiss’s *Physics* (1910), quoted above, that is most commonly known today.\(^7\) The textbook was published to address what the author’s perceived to be a lack of training ‘in scientific thought’.\(^8\)

While the observed – the thud of the tree falling to the ground – might change in the presence of the observer *a la* the ‘observer effect’,\(^9\) the reality of the observed sound – a physical wave – is *not necessarily* negated in the absence of that observer.\(^10\) The question thus also draws attention to the limits of our capacity to experience and leads back to the transcendental idealism of Kant’s ‘dynamic sublime’ explicated in Section 1.4. This was formulated by Kant, among other things, to replace Berkeley’s immaterialism. Kant’s philosophy views the mind-independent world as existent but in

\(^1\) Berkeley, *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*, Section 3, 118.

\(^5\) Ibid., Section 45, 118.

\(^7\) Nun Sun Eidsheim identifies two examples of the question in North American magazines in 1883 and 1884. See Nun Sun Eidsheim, *Sensing Sound: Singing and Listening as Vibrational Practice* (Duke University Press, 2015), 187, n. 1. Both answer the question with a categorical ‘no’, justified by a definition of sound as a wave entering an ear.

\(^8\) Mann and Twiss, v. The question is posed in a ‘Questions and Problems’ section at the end of a chapter on the physics of ‘Sound and Wave Motion’ among other ‘real life’ conundrums like how to calculate the distance from a thunderstorm, and more bizarrely, ‘Do women talk faster than men?’. See Mann and Twiss, 235-6.

\(^9\) The ‘observer effect’ is a phenomenon whereby the properties of something change under observation. For instance, when I check the pressure of my bike’s wheels, some air escapes when I attach the pump, thus changing the pressure inside the wheel.

\(^10\) The other trees in the forest might also ‘notice’ if one of their fellows falls, thus potentially undermining the notion that a lack of animals and their ears equates to an entire lack of consciousness. Research on the way trees and other plants exchange information via chemical signals and networks of fungi has recently made it into public awareness through popular science publications like Peter Wohlleben’s *The Hidden Life of Trees*, trans. Jane Billinghurst (London: William Collins, 2017). This knowledge is an example of something that lay beyond the *capabilities of observation* by those who first pondered the question, neatly encapsulating one possible reading of the question itself. The observer does not necessarily have to be a living thing.
the large part unreachable, other than at the moment of the sublime that seemingly comes out of nowhere to make us aware of the limits of our perception.

Moving from an unobserved presence to an observed absence takes us to the next quotation. In the same year that the question of the falling tree was concretized in print – 1910 – Sibelius described himself in seemingly spectral terms:


[Do not let all these ‘innovations’, third-less triads, etc., keep you from your work. Not everyone can be a ‘pioneering genius’. As a personality and as ‘eine Erscheinung aus den Wäldern’ you will have your small, modest place. Here at home, you are presumably ‘defeated’ in the court of common opinion. Be done with it! Nous Verrons!]

First published by Erik Tawaststjerna, the diary entry has since been quoted as a biographical backdrop to the Fourth Symphony’s fraught composition. The German phrase ‘eine Erscheinung aus den Wäldern’ [an apparition in the forest] is also specifically taken to be a poetic metaphor for Sibelius’s peripheral geographical and musical position in Europe. Hepokoski, for instance, reads between the lines of the entry to propose that ‘the pressure of the continentally “new” was now beginning to grow’ in Sibelius’s mind. Such diary entries, including many that describe Sibelius’s sense of Alleingefühl ['feelings of loneliness'], lead Hepokoski to characterize his life

11 Tawaststjerna was the first to publish the entry in Finnish in Jean Sibelius, III (Helsingissä, Kustannusosakeyhtiö, Otava, 1971), 191 and in the original Swedish quoted here in Jean Sibelius: Åren 1904-14 (Söderström, 1991), 181-2. It was later translated into English by Robert Layton in Tawaststjerna, Jean Sibelius, Vol. II, 139-40. A decade after this particular diary entry, Sibelius repeated the same turn of phrase when he wrote to Busoni (in German) to thank him for his successful concerts of the Second Symphony: ‘[…] Without you the symphony had remained paper and I an apparition from the forest’ (20 November 1921), quoted in Tawaststjerna, trans. Layton, Jean Sibelius, Vol. III, 212-3. For a facsimile of the letter see Erich Brüll, Jean Sibelius: für Sie porträtiert (Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1986), 82. The context and reason for Sibelius’s use of this specific German phrase are unexplored and is a subject for further research.

12 Sibelius’s Diary (with German and French phrases preserved), 13 May 1910, quoted in Mäkelä, Jean Sibelius, 157 and 252. Steven Lindberg’s English translation in Mäkelä’s biography differs slightly to Layton’s.


14 Hepokoski, Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 13.
between 1909-14 as ‘the crisis’ (see Section 1.1.3 above). These were the years that the composer came to terms with the musical innovations in central Europe during multiple visits to Berlin, with the Second Viennese School on the one hand, and Stravinsky, on the other. Traditional symphonic and tonal forms, especially the ‘nationalistic’ folk-inflected ones, were presumably cast as anachronistic against the New Music. They receded into history, as Dahlhaus puts it, and Sibelius vanished back into the forest, perhaps even into prehistory. To Hepokoski, this was Sibelius’s ‘nature-mysticism’ phase. It is all too easy to imagine a musical world being rapidly industrialized by the ‘mechanized’ serial experiments of central Europe, with Sibelius as a Finnish forest spirit – Tapio perhaps – inhabiting a rapidly dwindling landscape of symphonicism. The thought experiment above might then be neatly reformulated as follows: ‘If Sibelius’s symphonic music echoes from the forest of Alleingfühl, does anyone else in Europe hear it?’.

Hepokoski’s reading of the diary entry as a polemical reaction to such musical innovations is echoed by several others, including Ross. The latter claims that ‘composers with strong national ties were haunted by feelings of obsolescence’ and he contextualizes Sibelius’s diary entry alongside Rachmaninov’s self-description as ‘a ghost wandering in a world grown alien’. Propping up his populist agenda against the purported ‘politicians of style’, Ross argues that it was precisely because the music of Sibelius and other symphonists contains ‘lamentations for a lost world’, ‘vanished youth’, and a ‘pretechnological past’, that it had long-lasting relevance to listeners. Regardless of Ross’s motives, the poetic metaphor of Sibelius as an ‘apparition from the forest’ can be productive, though knowingly anachronistic, when read against Dahlhaus’s and later

---

15 The lonely figure of Sibelius that is collaged from such passages of his diaries and letters has become somewhat stereotyped in scholarship and concert programs.
16 Hepokoski, Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 27. The term comes from Sibelius’s famous diary entry, 21 April 1914, describing the sound of swans flying over Ainola. See Hepokoski, Sibelius, Symphony No. 5, 36.
19 Ibid., 174-5.
Taruskin’s histories of Western art music (see Section 1.2) in which the composer is cast back into the nineteenth century.

Mäkelä, however, disputes the understanding of Sibelius’s diary entry as a ‘counter-reaction’ to Schoenberg’s Expressionism. He rejects this critical commonplace on the basis that Sibelius’s ‘vague, polemical statements’ could just as well be made against Debussy or other European composers. It is hard to know just whose music contains ‘third-less triads’ – this actually includes Sibelius’s own music too – and as explored in Section 1.2, Sibelius was more interested in than side-lined by Schoenberg’s music. Mäkelä claims that Sibelius saw himself as ‘anything but an “apparition from the woods” and was far from resigning himself to the outskirts of contemporary European culture’.20

Examining Sibelius’s diaries beyond what was made accessible in Tawaststjerna’s biography, Mäkelä emphasises that Sibelius’s metaphor is ‘not intended seriously’ and was, in fact, articulated with ‘bitter irony’.21 Sibelius’s diaries swing from one extreme emotion to another, and his entries from 1910 are no exception. At the end of April, he was ‘in the deepest depression’ and less than a week later, he was full of ‘light, expectant, hopeful thoughts’.22 On this basis extremes like these, Mäkelä argues that Sibelius was ‘not thinking of a “small, modest place”, but rather of none at all (“in hades”) in his dark hours and of a central place (“on the Himalayas”) on good days’.23 At the risk of becoming tangled up with authorial intent, it might also be suggested that Sibelius’s reference to the forest was meant literally and was not a metaphor for his nation and its geography, as some scholars have taken it. Sibelius did indeed live in a forest in an artist’s commune just outside the town of Järvenpää. What is more, as Chapter 1 of this thesis emphasised, Sibelius’s popularity was beginning to grow rapidly in Britain and the US from the 1910s onwards, and in terms of public popularity and performances, Sibelius’s music far outstripped the more overtly modernist composers in Germany, Finland, Britain, and the US. As Berthold Hoeckner notes – in an entirely different context – to say that someone is an Erscheinung in German, does not only

20 Mäkelä, Jean Sibelius, 252.
21 Ibid., 252 and 157.
22 Tawaststjerna, Sibelius, Vol. II, 139.
23 Mäkelä, Jean Sibelius, 252.
mean that they are an ‘apparition’ or an ‘appearance’, it is also to say that they are ‘impressive’. 24 Hoeckner’s translation adds further nuance to the ironic tone perceived by Mäkelä in Sibelius’s description of himself. As does ‘Nous verrons!’ is a French exclamation that translates as ‘We’ll see!’. According to Fabian Dahlström, who has had privileged access to the diaries, it was one of Sibelius’s favourite phrases, appearing thirteen times along with ‘L’homme propose, Dieu dispose’ – [‘Man proposes, God disposes’]. 25

Purposely extrapolating from the metaphor, a new meaning might emerge from its image of Sibelius as an ‘apparition from the forest’: the ‘appearance’ of new musical interpretations that lie outside those that have become engrained in criticism of the twentieth- and early twenty first centuries. This will be attempted by returning to Adorno and focusing on his use of the word ‘Erscheinung’ in his theoretical writing on aesthetics, the subject of Hoeckner’s already cited observation. Hoeckner begins his own meditation on the word Erscheinung with Adorno’s understanding of the artwork:

Am nächsten kommt dem Kunstwerk als Erscheinung die apparition, die Himmelserscheinung

[The artwork as appearance is most closely resembled by the apparition, the heavenly vision]. 26

As in Sibelius’s diary entry, Adorno uses a Fremdwort – a ‘foreign word’ – to ‘gloss’ the concept that he refers to. ‘Apparition’ in Adorno therefore has an analogous position to ‘Erscheinung’ in Sibelius’s writing. It bares the ‘mark of alterity’ and is used for its ‘authentic form of expression and presentation’, the very things Adorno criticized. 27 Nevertheless, Hoeckner argues that by using such words, Adorno actually performs the aesthetic of the concept of Erscheinung. 28 This linguistic aesthetic is mirrored in Adorno’s understanding of Durchbrüche in Mahler’s music, which ‘explode [the] temporal

25 Fabian Dahlström, ‘Sibelius’s Diary’ in Sibelius Forum II, 12-9 at 15. Sibelius’s diaries are in his first language, Swedish and are ‘seasoned’ with Danish and Norwegian expressions along with other words and phrases in German, Latin, French, Finnish, English, and Russian, in decreasing order of usage.
26 Adorno, Aesthetic Theory, 125.
27 Ibid.
28 Ibid.
continuum’ of his works.29 Durchbruch is a musical character also present in Sibelius’s music where it ruptures the totalities of his forms as apparitions, and change the course of the music from the ‘outside’.

***

If Sibelius’s music only exists in its reception history, if its sounds only exist in the individual subjective experiences of those who have listened to his music, it remains static – like the Dahlhausian conception of Klangflächen - in the museum of musical works. This would be akin to an understanding of the above thought experiment where the sound of the falling tree only exists as an auditory sensation. Other than this being a self-defeating and nihilistic position, it also naturalizes the critical reception history of Sibelius, which this thesis has shown to be problematic for the various reasons outlined in its chapters. Rather than accept this reception we can only try to reveal its ideological moments and be self-reflexive about our own. While an analysis can never respond to the ‘music itself’ – such a thing always lies out of reach – realizing that there might be something else beyond the limits of our experience of Sibelius’s music might encourage us to go in den Wäldern and hear Sibelius’s music critically, in a ‘small, modest’ way.

This thesis has revealed that certain analytical and historical approaches to Sibelius’s music have become crystallized in Anglo-American scholarship early in the twentieth-century. These approaches mask the ruptures and tears in the musical surface of his music: the breakthroughs and suspensions that are the markers of musical modernism, in Adorno’s words, the Erscheinung. Instead, readings of Sibelius’s music have emphasised a static, picturesque surface and a unified holism (the Schein) of the motivic and tonal content of the works as analogous to the idealistic, nationalistic hopes for coherence and unity of the newly emerging European states in Finland and elsewhere. Yet both the contexts of writers on Sibelius’s music, and Sibelius’s own context were fraught and far from unified. Even after Finland gained independence from Russia in 1917, Sibelius described Finland as ‘my unhappy country’.30 His music is similarly

29 Ibid.
30 Sibelius’s Diary, 18 December 1917, quoted in Mäkelä, Sibelius, 316.
fraught. But rather than simply reject one ideological reading in favour of another – one that ignores unity to find disunity – this thesis has aimed to find new analytical approaches that approach Sibelius’s materials dialectically. By aiming to understand how his music acts in dialogue with nineteenth-century traditions of orchestral music, and in particular, the families of deformations defined by Hepokoski in *Sibelius, Symphony No. 5*, this thesis has revealed musical materials that at special moments, project themselves outside inherited formal conventions, and move towards what Adorno termed a ‘bottom-up’ approach to composition, one where the ‘logic’ of the material (the rotational ordering in this case), not the constellation of conventions of a formal type or genre, briefly govern the architecture of that individual musical form. This kind of rotational overflowing is what I term ‘rotational projection’. It can be found at the micro and macro levels of Sibelius’s musical forms: from the multivalent voices in works like *The Swan of Tuonela* (Chapter 2) to the layered themes in his Second and Third Symphonies (Chapter 3).

As Lemminkäinen treads towards and into the sound of the Swan of Tuonela, Sibelius scholarship should do the same – no to pin it down or ‘solve’ its mysteries, which would result in the deathly stasis of scholarship – but to keep journeying ever onwards, to keep reassessing what appears to be true, and to keep hearing his music in new critical ways. It is only through new analyses that something else might break through – as ‘eine Erscheinung aus den Wäldern’ – to project beyond the all-encompassing static nature representations that have been claimed to fill Sibelius’s musical forms.
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APPENDIX

HUL 1786:
The Textural Transformation of Lemminkäinen into a Swan

The 1901 programme itself seems to have gone through the process of estrangement from The Kalevala’s content and language, a process that can be traced directly from extracts and lines based on The Kalevala; to an early German version of the 1901 programme; and finally, to the 1901 programme itself. The extracts and early German version can be found in a manuscript, HUL 1786, which contains texts for all of the Suite’s movements, including The Swan of Tuonela.1 These were not circulated among concert audiences but, according to Wicklund, were probably produced for the publisher, Breitkopf and Härtel, when the withdrawn movements, Nos. 1 and 4, were going through the drawn-out process of their publication in the 1940s.2 It is highly likely that this document is a copy or version of a much earlier document, which was sent to the publisher around the turn of the century as a draft for the 1901 publication of Nos. 2 and 4. The manuscript is typewritten and unsigned and therefore its authorial provenance cannot be determined.

HUL 1786: Finnish Verse

The second page of the manuscript contains Finnish verse texts that partially correspond to The Kalevala texts distributed at the Lemminkäinen suite’s premieres. In this document, the text for The Swan of Tuonela is extracted from and based upon lines from Runo 14, as Glenda Dawn Goss has identified (Appendix Fig. 1).3

---

2 Wicklund, ‘Introduction’, Vol. 1/12a, XII. In the end, texts were never printed in the scores of the withdrawn movements, Nos. 1 and 3.
3 Glenda Dawn Goss, Sibelius: A Composer’s Life and the Awakening of Finland (University of Chicago, 2009), 222.
II. Tuonelan Joutsen
Tuonen mustassa joessa,  
pyhän virran pyörtehissä  
liukuvi vihanta lintu,  
joutsen Tuonelan joluvi.

II. The Swan of Tuonela
In Tuoni’s black river,  
In the sacred river’s whirlpool  
[the] splendid bird slides,  
[the] swan of Tuonela glides.

The Kalevala’s lines are used to construct two pairs of lines that betray none of the narrative content of the passage they are lifted from. Lines 1-2 are the same as the parallel refrains describing Tuonela’s landscape, which reoccur in Runos 14 and 15 when Lemminkäinen is in the underworld. Lines 3-4 are not directly extracted from the epic. They are, however, based on the recurring pairs of parallel lines that involve the swan in The Kalevala, of which there are only ten. All but one of these swan-related pairs, instruct, or comment upon Lemminkäinen’s attempt to shoot the swan. The first lines of these pairs all involve variations of the verb, ampua (‘to shoot’), while the second lines provide a supplementary description of the swan. The Finnish verse in HUL 1786 draws only on the second line in The Kalevala’s parallel swan-lines to avoid any connotations of violence to the swan and suppress Lemminkäinen’s presence. Line 3 of Fig. 1 corresponds most closely to a line in Louhi’s instructions for Lemminkäinen to shoot the swan, but as the second line in the parallel pair, it is a neutral description: ‘“from the stream the splendid fowl”’ (’virrasta vihannan linnun’). Line 4 is closest to a much later line in the epic that describes other swans: ‘icy swans glide’ (Hyiset joutsenet joluvat).
In the Finnish verse of page 2 (HUL 1786), the motion of Lemminkäinen is replaced by the swan. In the last two of Lemminkäinen’s hunting episodes – the Hiisi Gelding and Swan of Tuonela – it is the hero’s movement towards his prey that is described, not the motions of the supernatural animals themselves. He walks or steps towards the swan in a ‘topsy-turvy’ or ‘swinging’ manner: Astua lykyttelevi, Käyä Kälkäyttelevi.9 Lines 3 and 4 transplant the archaic poetic suffix of these verbs (-vi) onto the ‘sliding’ (liukuvi) and ‘gliding’ (joluvi) motions of the swan to replace the locative case – ‘from’ or ‘in’ the stream – of the swan-lines in The Kalevala.10 Thus the swan directly replaces Lemminkäinen as the subject of The Swan of Tuonela’s programme.

HUL 1786: German Prose

The first page of the same manuscript contains German prose translations of the Finnish verse texts. These appear to be early versions of the final 1901 programme. The text for The Swan of Tuonela on this page (Appendix Fig. 2) only slightly differs from its final published version.

Appendix Figure 2  HUL 1786, Page 1
Early German prose version of Paratext 3 with English translation11

II. Der Schwan von Tuonela

Tuonela, das Reich der Toten – die Unterwelt der finnischen Mythologie – ist vom Lande der Lebenden durch einen breiten Fluss mit schwarzem Wasser und reissendem Lauf getrennt, auf dem der Schwan von Tuonela majestätisch und singend dahinzieht.

II. The Swan of Tuonela

Tuonela, the realm of the dead – the underworld of Finnish mythology – is separated from the land of the living by a wide river with black water and raging waters, upon which the Swan of Tuonela drifts majestically, singing.

9 Ibid., Runo 14, lines 389-90.
10 The standard third-person present tense liukuu (‘sliding’) becomes liukuvi and jolua becomes joluvi (‘gliding’).
11 ‘II. Der Schwan von Tuonela’, HUL 1786, 1.
Translated into prose, the content of the Finnish verse becomes a descriptive explanation of what Tuonela is. The Kalevala meter is of course lost, as are the archaic cases, and the repetitious parallel lines in the epic. The most striking difference between the Finnish verse and German prose, however, is the addition of the swan’s singing, which is not part of the Finnish Kalevala-based verse in the manuscript, nor The Kalevala itself.

The final revisions to the German prose involved subtle changes to the presentation of Tuonela as an afterlife. From the German prose in HUL 1786 (Appendix Fig. 2) to the published version (Chapter 2, Fig. 2.1), there is a shift in Tuonela’s description as an island ‘separated from the land of the living’ by a physical geographical feature, a river, to a Tuonela that is surrounded by a river that is merely part of its landscape and not necessarily its physical threshold. There is no sense in the final version that Tuonela might be reached, at least metaphorically, by travelling to the Northlands and across the river. There is also a shift to a more generic spiritual realm of ‘Death’ rather than of ‘the Dead’. Most strikingly, the new description of Tuonela realigns the afterlife with the ‘Hell’ of the Abrahamic religions rather than with the Finnish shamanistic conception of an ‘underworld’ for all people, not just sinners.