

INFLUENCE, INNOVATION, AND STRUCTURE: MODERNIST EVALUATIVE
CRITERIA IN THE RECEPTION HISTORIES OF
CHARLES IVES AND JEAN SIBELIUS

A THESIS IN
Musicology

Presented to the Faculty of the University
of Missouri-Kansas City in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF MUSIC

by
ANDREW HOWARD STOUT

B.A., Northwest Nazarene University, 2008
M.M., Boise State University, 2011

Kansas City, Missouri
2016

©2016

ANDREW HOWARD STOUT

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

INFLUENCE, INNOVATION, AND STRUCTURE: MODERNIST EVALUATIVE
CRITERIA IN THE RECEPTION HISTORIES OF
CHARLES IVES AND JEAN SIBELIUS

Andrew Howard Stout, Candidate for the Master of Music Degree

University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2016

ABSTRACT

In 1987, Maynard Solomon published an article titled “Charles Ives: Some Questions of Veracity,” which challenged the priority and probity of Charles Ives’s technical innovations and ignited a scholarly firestorm. Nearly twenty years later, John McGinness ruminated on the uproar, asking, “While unquestionably of historical importance, why, in our postmodern times, should dissonance and/or the addition of dissonance play a crucial role in the critical evaluation of Ives’s music?” McGinness continued by questioning the effects of what he called “Modernist Criticism” on Ives studies and concluded by problematizing its usefulness to evaluations of Ives’s music.

This thesis continues the conversation that McGinness began. First, I broaden his discussion to include the reception history of Jean Sibelius and recent contributions to Sibelius studies, for throughout their respective reception histories, the musics of Ives and Sibelius have been particularly vulnerable to negative valuations based on modernist criticism. Next, I borrow Richard Taruskin’s definition of modernist criticism, which he

describes as comprising three tenets: influence, innovation, and structure. Taruskin's three tenets serve as the subjects of the central chapters of this thesis, each of which seeks to outline the origin of its subject as a criterion of musical evaluation in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century German philosophy and to sketch a brief narrative of its application to the reception histories of Ives and Sibelius in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Finally, I explore the ramifications of modernist aesthetic assumptions that the parallels and similarities in the reception histories of Ives and Sibelius reveal.

My research continues a budding tradition that examines and uncovers the biases musicologists bring into their discipline. My purpose is to demonstrate the pervasiveness of modernist criticism in musicology and the related fields of theory and criticism and to challenge influence, innovation, and structure as evaluative criteria in the reception histories of Ives and Sibelius.

APPROVAL PAGE

The faculty listed below, appointed by the Dean of the Conservatory of Music and Dance, have examined a thesis titled “Influence, Innovation, and Structure: Modernist Evaluative Criteria in the Reception Histories of Charles Ives and Jean Sibelius,” presented by Andrew Howard Stout, candidate for the Master of Music degree, and certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Supervisory Committee

Andrew Granade, Ph.D., Committee Chair
Conservatory of Music and Dance

William Everett, Ph.D.
Conservatory of Music and Dance

David Thurmaier, Ph.D.
Conservatory of Music and Dance

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Veracities and Fallacies	1
Review of the Literature	10
The Plan of the Thesis	25
2. INFLUENCE	29
Philosophical Underpinnings	30
The Exclusivity of the Mainstream	43
Rapprochement	59
3. INNOVATION	65
Ives the Great American Innovator	66
Museum Pieces	71
Sibelius the Progressive	75
4. STRUCTURE	80
Cumulative Form in Ives's Music	82
Teleological Genesis in Sibelius's Symphonies	97
A Biological Metaphor	109
EPILOGUE	116
BIBLIOGRAPHY	121
VITA	139

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Veracities and Fallacies

In the fall of 1987, Maynard Solomon published an incendiary essay titled “Charles Ives: Some Questions of Veracity.” It was the first article in the *Journal of the American Musicological Society* dedicated to research on Charles Ives. Writing with twenty-five years of hindsight, David Paul asserts, “To this day, [Solomon’s] article remains unsurpassed as the most influential scholarly essay ever written about Ives.”¹ The article’s significance, however, was neither its timing nor its esteemed place of publication, but the explosion of scholarship it ignited.

Solomon suggested that by attributing a number of the twentieth century’s most innovative techniques to his father, Ives “may have crossed the line between delusion and deception.”² Continuing, Solomon insinuated that a mature Ives doubled down on his duplicity, altering and backdating his manuscripts in order to ensure the priority of his father’s innovations. Solomon’s allegation reiterated a claim that the composer Elliott Carter made in several published criticisms of Ives’s revisions beginning with a 1939 review of the “Concord” Sonata in *Modern Music* and repeated in a 1969 interview with Vivian Perlis.³ But Solomon added physical evidence to Carter’s eyewitness testimony

¹ David C. Paul, *Charles Ives in the Mirror: American Histories of an Iconic Composer* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2013), 187.

² Maynard Solomon, “Charles Ives: Some Questions of Veracity,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 40, no. 3 (Autumn 1987): 447.

³ “The fuss that critics make about Ives’s innovations is, I think, greatly exaggerated, for he has rewritten his works so many times, adding dissonances and polyrhythms, that it is probably impossible to tell just at what date the works assumed the surprising form we now

and ultimately made plain a vicious accusation. “The evidence thus far,” Solomon averred, “suggests a systematic pattern of falsification sufficient for the prudent scholar to withhold acceptance of Ives’s datings pending independent verification of his assertions and scrupulous testing of the evidentiary trail that he left on his autographs.”⁴

The popular press responded immediately. Published on the front page of the *New York Times*’s Arts and Leisure section on February 21, 1988, Donal Henahan’s article “Did Ives Fiddle With the Truth?” disseminated Solomon’s accusation to the general public.⁵ Henahan inferred that by attacking Ives’s historical precedence Solomon was attacking Ives’s historical significance as well. In a June 10, 1990 article in the *New York Times* titled “The Polysided Views of Ives’s Polytonality,” Henahan called Solomon’s

know.” Elliott Carter, “The Case of Mr. Ives” (1939), in *Collected Essays and Lectures, 1937-1995*, ed. Jonathan W. Bernard (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1997), 89; “A matter which puzzles me still is the question of Ives’s revision of his own scores. I can remember vividly a visit on a late afternoon to his house on East 74th Street, when I was directed to a little top-floor room where Ives sat at a little upright piano with score pages strewn around on the floor and on tables—this must have been around 1929. He was working on, I think, *Three Places in New England*, getting the score ready for performance. A new score was being derived from the older one to which he was adding and changing, turning octaves into sevenths and ninths, and adding dissonant notes. Since then, I have often wondered at exactly what date a lot of the music written early in his life received its last shot of dissonance and polyrhythm. In this case he showed me quite simply how he was improving the score. I got the impression that he might have frequently jacked up the level of dissonance of many works as his tastes changed. While the question no longer seems important, one could wonder whether he was as early a precursor of ‘modern’ music as is sometimes made out. A study of the manuscripts would probably make this clear.” Vivian Perlis, *Charles Ives Remembered: An Oral History* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974), 138.

⁴ Solomon, “Some Questions of Veracity,” 463.

⁵ Donal Henahan, “Did Ives Fiddle With the Truth?” *New York Times*, February 21, 1988. J. Peter Burkholder writes, “Few articles published in the *Journal of the American Musicological Society* have garnered as much attention in the media as Maynard Solomon’s article.” J. Peter Burkholder, “Charles Ives and His Fathers: A Response to Maynard Solomon,” *Institute for Studies in American Music Newsletter* 18, no. 1 (November 1988): 8.

charge “a moral and artistic indictment.”⁶ Yet in both articles Henahan was conflicted. He acknowledged in his initial response that Solomon never challenged Ives’s canonical status, but, clearly, the timing of Ives’s compositions was a significant criterion in Henahan’s conception of the composer. He conceded, “It is going to be impossible for many of us ever to hear an Ives piece in quite the same way as before.” In his conclusion, Henahan quipped:

Does such deception in pursuit of a career (see the lives of Beethoven, Wagner and many others) greatly matter if the music itself continues to interest us? Probably not. . . . In view of these heavily documented attacks on his veracity, can he retain his place of honor as the foremost icon of American music? That, for the moment, is the Unanswered Question.

Solomon had anticipated the hand-wringing his article would induce, and he was careful to qualify his accusations. “It cannot be sufficiently stressed,” he added in his conclusion, “that the value of Ives’s music is wholly independent of issues of priority and modernism.”⁷ Carter said much the same.⁸ And the musicologists who would counter Solomon’s charge did so under the assumption that it was not the quality of Ives’s music being debated, but its chronology. J. Peter Burkholder said of Ives in a response to Solomon that was published in November of 1988, “[His] lasting reputation will rest not on the priority of his innovations, but on the superiority of his creations.”⁹ Yet Burkholder’s response also correctly identified the source of the din surrounding Ives’s

⁶ Donal Henahan, “The Polysided Views of Ives’s Polytonality,” *New York Times*, June 10, 1990.

⁷ Solomon, “Some Questions of Veracity,” 466.

⁸ “The accepted dates of publication are most likely those of the compositions in their final state. Anyhow, the question is not important.” Carter, “The Case of Mr. Ives” (1939), 89; “The question [of dates] no longer seems important.” Perlis, *Charles Ives Remembered*, 138.

⁹ Burkholder, “Charles Ives and His Fathers,” 11.

manuscripts. “The main reason Solomon’s article has caused such a stir,” he observed, “is that it calls into question this view of Ives as the great American innovator.”¹⁰ Henahan’s ambivalence revealed that at least outside of academic discourse Ives’s canonicity was tied inextricably to his reputation as an innovator.

In the 1970s, Frank Rossiter identified what he called the “Ives Legend.” He outlined eight tropes in the literature on Ives, many of which—while not necessarily fictitious—seemed greatly exaggerated. Specifically, Rossiter challenged the narratives that overstated Ives’s seclusion, his American heritage, and his lack of notoriety, but Rossiter identified “Ives’s precedence as a musical pioneer and ‘father of the moderns’” as the foremost tenet of the legend.¹¹ Following Rossiter’s lead, musicologists working in the 1980s and 1990s were cautious in making inflated claims about Ives’s precedence, but Ives’s reputation as the “great American innovator” maintained credence with layperson audiences.

Thus, Ives scholars were deliberate in their responses to Solomon’s provocation, and their research produced invaluable results. Because Solomon couched his subject in psychoanalytical theory, Stuart Feder—a trained psychoanalyst—reexamined Solomon’s analysis of Ives’s relationship with his father in a 1992 book, *Charles Ives, “My Father’s Song”: A Psychoanalytic Biography*.¹² But the invitation to reexamine Ives’s manuscripts through the traditional methods of musicology ultimately undermined any supposed

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Frank R. Rossiter, *Charles Ives and His America* (New York: Liveright, 1975), 249. The “Ives Legend” is summarized in Gayle Sherwood Magee, *Charles Ives Reconsidered* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 2.

¹² For Feder’s direct response to Solomon, see Stuart Feder, *Charles Ives, “My Father’s Song”: A Psychoanalytic Biography* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992), 351-57.

“systematic pattern of falsification.” Working independently of one another throughout the 1990s, Carol Baron and Gayle Sherwood Magee established a nominally revised chronology of portions of Ives’s oeuvre through paper-type and handwriting analysis, marginally modified the narrative of Ives’s compositional development, and, most significantly, reestablished Ives’s reputation and refuted the mendacity Solomon and Carter alleged.¹³ Magee wrote of her investigation in a rebuttal published in 1994, “The early results of this objective chronology verify Ives’s reputation as an innovator and experimenter at the turn of the century and thus help to confirm his unique role in the development of North American Music.”¹⁴

In the 1950s and 1960s, Johann Sebastian Bach’s manuscripts underwent a chronological reassessment similar to the reexamination of Ives’s manuscripts in the 1980s and 1990s. Musicologists including Alfred Dürr and Georg von Dadelsen revised many dates provided in early Bach-biographer Philipp Spitta’s chronology of the composer’s corpus. While the reassessment of Bach’s chronology included an element of demythologization, with respect to Bach’s legacy there was little more than a historical

¹³ Baron’s and Sherwood’s findings were published in the following: Carol K. Baron, “Dating Charles Ives’s Music: Fact and Fictions,” *Perspectives of New Music* 28, no. 1 (Winter 1990): 20-56; Gayle Sherwood, “Questions and Veracities: Reassessing the Chronology of Ives’s Choral Works,” *Musical Quarterly* 78, no. 3 (Autumn 1994): 429-47; Sherwood, “The Choral Works of Charles Ives: Chronology, Style, Reception,” (PhD diss., Yale University, 1995); and Sherwood, “Redating Ives’s Choral Sources,” in *Ives Studies*, ed. Philip Lambert (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 77-101. For an account of the unpublished discourse surrounding the published documents, see Drew Massey, “The Problem of Ives’s Revisions,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 60, no. 3 (Fall 2007): 599-645, and Paul, *Charles Ives in the Mirror*, 186-95.

¹⁴ Sherwood, “Questions and Veracities,” 444.

narrative at stake.¹⁵ It was taken for granted that issues of chronology were irrelevant to Bach's canonical status. Bach was not an innovator; his legacy is his mastery of earlier styles. But the emotions elicited by Solomon's article and the resolve with which scholars defended the priority of Ives's technical innovations suggest that in Ives's case there was perceived to be more on trial than merely an embellished narrative or historical trivia.¹⁶ At least in the court of public opinion, Ives's legacy was unsettled prior to the testimonies of Baron and Magee.

Written nearly two decades after Maynard Solomon's controversial publication and in response to Solomon and the proliferation of scholarship his challenge produced, John McGinness's 2006 article, "Essay: Has Modernist Criticism Failed Charles Ives?" questions the aesthetic priorities implicit in Ives scholarship. Directing his question toward neither Solomon and Carter nor Baron and Magee but toward the wider scholarly community surrounding them, McGinness wonders, "While unquestionably of historical importance, why, in our postmodern times, should dating and/or the addition of dissonance play a crucial role in the critical evaluation of Ives's music?"¹⁷ McGinness, like Henahan before him, perceives a discord. Critics and scholars have insisted that

¹⁵ See Joseph Kerman, *Contemplating Music: Challenges to Musicology*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985), 50-52, and Gerhard Herz, "Toward a New Image of Bach," *Bach* 1, no. 4 (October 1970): 9-27.

¹⁶ For additional responses to Solomon, see H. Wiley Hitchcock and Noel Zahler, "Just What *Is* Ives's Unanswered Question?" *Notes*, Second Series 44, no. 3 (March 1988): 437-43; William Bolcom, "Of Ives, Music and Insurance," *New York Times*, March 13, 1988; and J. Philip Lambert, "Communications," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 42, no. 1 (Spring 1989): 204-09.

¹⁷ John McGinness, "Essay: Has Modernist Criticism Failed Charles Ives?" *Music Theory Spectrum* 28, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 99.

modernist issues of priority are irrelevant to value judgments on Ives's music, yet modernist criteria have preoccupied their scholarship on Ives.

As a defense for his objection to the modernist orientation of Ives studies, McGinness appeals to Richard Taruskin's 2004 article "The Poietic Fallacy," which excoriates a book by the composer and critic Allen Shawn that attempts to elucidate the music of Arnold Schoenberg.¹⁸ Taruskin charges Shawn with applying naïve and anachronistic criteria to Schoenberg's music.¹⁹ Taruskin, in turn, appeals to a model of communication borrowed from the field of semiotics. The French linguist Jean Molino first introduced the concept into musicology in 1975, though his article was not published in English until 1990. Molino explains musical transmission through a tripartite model: "What is called music is simultaneously the production of an acoustic 'object', the acoustic object itself, and finally the reception of the object."²⁰ "Poietic" refers to the sending of the acoustic object, and "esthetic" refers to its reception.

Taruskin's title, "The Poietic Fallacy," refers to an overemphasis on a composer's production of a musical object at the expense of consideration for an audience's reception of the object. Taruskin identifies this imbalance in Shawn's evaluation of Schoenberg's music, writing, "The all-important results are described entirely in terms of the making of

¹⁸ See Allen Shawn, *Arnold Schoenberg's Journey* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002).

¹⁹ Taruskin questioned what Shawn meant by advocating the "tautology—'to listen to music as music.'" Richard Taruskin, "The Poietic Fallacy," *Musical Times* 145, no. 1886 (Spring 2004): 7-8.

²⁰ Jean Molino, "Musical Fact and the Semiology of Music," trans. J. A. Underwood, intro. Craig Ayrey, *Music Analysis* 9, no. 2 (July 1990): 113-14.

the art object, not its effect.”²¹ Next, Taruskin identifies three evaluative criteria indicative of the Poietic Fallacy and inescapable in the literature on Schoenberg: “[1] The measurement of an artist’s value in terms of influence on other artists, [2] the concomitant overrating of technical innovations, [and 3] the delimitation of the purview of criticism to matters of structure and craft.” Taruskin adds, “Schoenberg and discourse about Schoenberg has always been among the chief bulwarks of the Poietic Fallacy in music.”²² Taruskin concedes that Molino’s model is dated in the field of semiotics, but remains useful for describing the aesthetic criteria—*influence, innovation, and structure*—by which Shawn evaluates Schoenberg’s music.

Finally, Taruskin advocates and provides a rationale for further research into the origins and applications of *influence, innovation, and structure* as evaluative criteria:

What are these seemingly misguided values pertinent to? That is a question very much worth investigating historically, for there is simply no point in maintaining the pretence that Schoenberg’s music is music like any other music. More than any other body of music that I know, it represented a crux in the history of ideas. . . . We must do a better job of comprehending the sources of Schoenberg’s ‘inner compulsion’—and of the poietic fallacy too—if we want to escape from them, or even accept them in full, free consciousness.²³

As identified by McGinness’s essay and as demonstrated by both Solomon’s article and the reactions it elicited, elements of Taruskin’s Poietic Fallacy—in this case, the timing of Ives’s innovations—have lurked beneath the surface of the discourse on Ives for some time. More broadly, the tenets of the Poietic Fallacy, or issues of “Modernist Criticism” as McGinness labels them, engrossed musicology as a discipline

²¹ Taruskin, “The Poietic Fallacy,” 10.

²² Taruskin includes masculinity and “the derogation of other critical approaches” as additional tents of the Poietic Fallacy. *Ibid.*, 11-12.

²³ *Ibid.*, 17.

and the related fields of theory and criticism for much of the twentieth century. Ives is one of many composers whose reception histories have been animated by analyses of influence, innovation, and structure.

Richard Taruskin's *Poietic Fallacy* functions as a springboard for my research. In response to his invitation, my purpose is to explore, describe, and problematize the origins, applications, and effects of influence, innovation, and structure as modernist evaluative criteria. As John McGinness demonstrates, the literature on Charles Ives is a particularly useful test case; building on his scholarship, my goal is to expand the examination of Ives studies that McGinness began. Next, in order to illuminate the currency that modernist criticism continues to hold in musicological studies, it is useful to compare the literature on Ives with that of Jean Sibelius.

In many ways, Sibelius's critical reception parallels Ives's reception history. Both Ives (1874-1954) and Sibelius (1865-1957) were contemporaries of Schoenberg (1874-1951), but unlike Schoenberg, who was born in Austria, both Ives and Sibelius were removed—at least geographically—from the mainstream of the development of Western music. Ives was born in the United States, Sibelius in Finland. Ironically, throughout their reception histories, the music of both Ives and Sibelius has been particularly vulnerable to negative valuations based on modernist criticism, a mode of evaluation that emerged from Central Europe. Too often Ives's unstable position in the canon has depended on the priority of his innovation. In contrast, Sibelius's lack of harmonic innovations has often excluded him from serious musicological studies despite continued commercial success. Throughout their reception histories, even American advocates of Ives and Finnish

advocates of Sibelius have succumbed to the critical tools created for assessing the music of Schoenberg. In their criticism, Ives has been precariously portrayed as a revolutionary while Sibelius has been marginalized as a reactionary.

The subject of my thesis is neither Ives's reception history nor that of Sibelius, but rather the origin, application, and effects of the modernist criteria by which their music has been evaluated throughout their respective reception histories. The forgotten roots of modernist criticism reach into eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Germanic intellectual traditions and warrant unearthing; my survey of the reception histories of Ives and Sibelius seeks to demonstrate the prevalence and inconsistencies of influence, innovation, and structure as evaluative criteria in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

Review of the Literature

My research builds on three different categories of literature and two different types of sources within each category. The three categories comprise literature on Charles Ives, Jean Sibelius, and the origins of modernist criticism. Within each of these categories, there are primary sources, including early reviews, critical analyses, treatises, and monographs, and secondary sources, including reception histories and musicological studies. Whereas I survey primary sources for the origins of modernist ideologies and evidence of modernist aesthetic assumptions, I rely on secondary sources and recent reception histories for broader narratives and contemporary musicological approaches.

Jean Sibelius, Reactionary

Theodor Adorno's infamous "Gloss on Sibelius" and the subsequent responses of critics and scholars demonstrate the role that influence, innovation, and structure have played in Jean Sibelius's critical reception.²⁴ Because Adorno's essay and the literature responding to it are central to my thesis, Adorno's essay deserves context. Therefore, I focus my research on Sibelius's wild celebrity in English, which provoked Adorno's caustic criticism in 1938. I conclude with recent literature that has attempted to counter Adorno's criticism of Sibelius.

Sibelius's music has enjoyed continuous success in Finland for over a century, but around 1912, his critical reception in English-speaking countries diverged from his reception in Central Europe. The attributes that won him fame in the former earned him scorn in the latter, and to a certain extent, the division is still discernable. Alex Ross describes Sibelius's standing in the 1920s and 1930s, writing, "He was being lionized as a new Beethoven in England and America and dismissed as a kitsch composer in the taste-making Austro-German music centers."²⁵ Sibelius's Fourth Symphony was the catalyst for the rupture.

When he was young, Sibelius studied in Germany and had his music performed and published there; he was influenced by Richard Wagner and, later, intrigued by Arnold Schoenberg. But despite his interest in Schoenberg's harmonic innovations, Sibelius described his own Fourth Symphony as a challenge to contemporary Central-

²⁴ See Theodor W. Adorno, "Gloss on Sibelius" (1938), in *Jean Sibelius and His World*, ed. Daniel M. Grimley, trans. Susan H. Gillespie (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011), 331-37.

²⁵ Alex Ross, *The Rest is Noise: Listening to the Twentieth Century* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007), 157.

European trends. Sibelius's advocate and confidant Axel Carpelan wrote in the *Göteborgs Handels-och Sjöfartstidning* (Gothenburg Daily Newspaper), "As a whole the symphony can be regarded as a protest against prevalent musical tendencies...above all in Germany, [the symphony's] birthplace, where orchestral music is becoming a mere technical operation, a kind of musical civil-engineering, which tries to disguise its inner emptiness behind an enormous mechanical apparatus."²⁶ Shortly there after, Sibelius echoed Carpelan's assessment in his correspondence with the English critic Rosa Newmarch. "[My Fourth Symphony] stands as a protest against present-day music," he wrote, "It has nothing, absolutely nothing of the circus about it."²⁷ In light of the ascendancy of the German avant-garde, it is unsurprising that Sibelius's symphony was a critical failure in Central Europe.

In England, however, the symphony was lauded following its premiere at the Birmingham Festival of 1912. Philip Heseltine, who would later write under the pseudonym Peter Warlock, gushed, "Sibelius's new symphony was by far the best event of the evening: it is *absolutely original*—quite in a class by itself and uninfluenced by anything, save Nature!"²⁸ Heseltine's review revealed the growing geographic divide in Sibelius's reception: what was perceived as reactionary in Central Europe was seen as revolutionary in England.

Sibelius's reception in the United States paralleled his success in England. In the decades following the premiere of his Fourth Symphony, critics including Ernest

²⁶ Erik Tawaststjerna, *Sibelius*, vol. 2, 1904-1914, trans. Robert Layton (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 172.

²⁷ *Ibid.* See also Rosa Newmarch, *Jean Sibelius* (Boston: C. C. Birchard, 1939), 24.

²⁸ Barry Smith, *Peter Warlock: The Life of Philip Heseltine* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 36.

Newman, Rosa Newmarch, Cecil Gray, Constant Lambert, and Bengt de Törne in England and Olin Downes and Gerald Abraham in the United States championed Sibelius in a variety of popular and scholarly publications.²⁹

The geographic delineations of recent Sibelius reception histories reflect the geographic divide in Sibelius's early critical reception. Glenda Dawn Goss's research traces Sibelius's reception in the United States, and Laura Gray and Byron Adams extensively explore Sibelius's critical triumphs in England.³⁰ Much of their research explores the tension between the aesthetic assumptions of critics in the English-speaking world and critics in Central-European countries. In contrast, Tomi Mäkelä's recent scholarship focuses on Sibelius's reception in Germany and Central Europe.³¹

In 1938, Adorno published his essay on Sibelius as a condemnation of the composer and his celebrity in the English-speaking world. Four years earlier, Adorno—a German philosopher and music critic—sought refuge from Nazi Germany in England. In 1935, while Adorno was at Oxford, Sibelius received the Goethe Medal for Arts and

²⁹ See Cecil Gray, *Sibelius* (London: Oxford University Press, 1931); Constant Lambert, *Music Ho!: A Study of Music in Decline* (London: Faber & Faber, 1934); Gray, *Sibelius: The Symphonies* (London: Oxford University Press, H. Milford, 1935); Bengt de Törne, *Sibelius: A Close-Up* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1938); Newmarch, *Jean Sibelius*; Gerald Abraham, ed., *The Music of Sibelius* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1947); and Olin Downes, *Sibelius the Symphonist* (New York: The Philharmonic-Symphony Society of New York, 1956).

³⁰ Glenda Dawn Goss, *Jean Sibelius and Olin Downes: Music, Friendship, Criticism* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1994); Laura Jean Gray, "Sibelius and England," in *The Sibelius Companion*, ed. Glenda Dawn Goss (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996), 293-308; Laura Gray, "'The Symphonic Problem': Sibelius reception in England prior to 1950" (PhD diss., Yale University, 1997); Byron Adams, "'Thor's Hammer': Sibelius and British Music Critics, 1905-1957," in *Jean Sibelius and His World*, ed. Daniel M. Grimley (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011), 125-57; and Goss, "Jean Sibelius and His American Connections," in *Jean Sibelius and His World*, ed. Daniel M. Grimley (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011), 158-72.

³¹ Tomi Mäkelä, *Jean Sibelius*, trans. Steven Lindberg (Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2011).

Sciences and a personal letter of congratulations from Adolf Hitler in honor of the composer's seventieth birthday.³² In 1937, Bengt de Törne's enthusiastic book *Sibelius: A Close-Up* was published in London. Each of these events contributed toward Adorno's frustration; in 1938, he wrote, "To anyone who has grown up in the Austro-German musical sphere, the name of Sibelius does not say much. . . . But come to England, or even America, and the name begins to become boundlessly inflated."³³ The essay, later titled "Gloss on Sibelius," continued, "If Sibelius is good, then the criteria of musical quality that have endured from Bach to Schoenberg—a wealth of relations, articulations, unity in diversity—are done in once and for all."³⁴

Daniel Grimley writes that Adorno's attack has acquired a significance to subsequent Sibelius studies "out of all proportion to its length."³⁵ In fact, Adorno's "Gloss on Sibelius" is the central text around which a substantial number of subsequent Sibelius debates have revolved. The American critic and composer Virgil Thomson added his assent to Adorno's assertion. "Twenty years' residence on the European continent has largely spared me Sibelius," Thomson wrote, "Last night's Second Symphony was my first in quite some years. I found it vulgar, self-indulgent, and provincial beyond all description."³⁶ In 1955, the French composer and conductor René

³² See Michael Meyer, *The Politics of Music in the Third Reich* (New York: Peter Lang, 1991), 162-63.

³³ Adorno, "Gloss on Sibelius" 333.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 336.

³⁵ Daniel M. Grimley, ed., *Jean Sibelius and His World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011), 331.

³⁶ Virgil Thomson, "Age Without Honor" (1940), in *Virgil Thomson: A Reader: Selected Writings 1924-1984*, ed. Richard Kostelanetz (New York: Routledge, 2002), 48.

Leibowitz reiterated Adorno's main points in his pamphlet "Sibelius, the Worst Composer in the World."³⁷ Although Leibowitz's vitriol merely regurgitated the main points of Adorno's polemic, its exaggerated title underscores the influence Adorno exercised in certain spheres.

The numerous responses of musicologists sympathetic to Sibelius are of particular interest in my study. Their rebuttals have sought to uncover Adorno's motivations and assumptions, but simultaneously reveal the musicologists' own aesthetic assumptions.³⁸ Recent theorists and analysts have claimed that Sibelius was actually a progressive composer and have redefined the term "progressive" to include innovations that Adorno ignored.³⁹ Ironically, the reassessments that have responded to Adorno's attack have

³⁷ See René Leibowitz, *Sibelius, le plus mauvais compositeur du monde* (Liège: Éditions Dynamo, 1955).

³⁸ See Erik Tawaststjerna, "Über Adornos Sibelius-Kritik," in *Adorno und die Musik*, ed. Otto Kollerisch (Graz, Universal-Edition, 1979), 112-24; Ilkka Oramo, "Sibelius, le plus mauvais compositeur du monde," *Boréales, revue du centre de recherches inter-nordiques* 54, no. 57 (1993): 51-58; Eero Tarasti, "An Essay in Post-Colonial Analysis: Sibelius as an Icon of the Finns and Others," in *Sibelius Studies*, ed. Timothy L. Jackson and Veijo Murtomäki (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 3-13; Vesa Sirén, "Theodor Adorno vs. Jean Sibelius: Seconds Out for the Final Round?" *Finnish Music Quarterly*, no. 4 (2002): 46-55; Antti Vihinen, "Adorno's Critique of Sibelius: The Political Dimension," in *Sibelius Forum II: Proceedings from the Third International Jean Sibelius Conference, Helsinki, December 7-10, 2000*, ed. Matti Huttunen, Kari Kilpeläinen, and Veijo Murtomäki (Helsinki: Sibelius Academy, Department of Composition and Music Theory, 2003), 394-400; Tomi Mäkelä, "Sibelius and Germany, *Wahrhaftigkeit* beyond *Allnatur*," in *The Cambridge Companion to Sibelius*, ed. Daniel M. Grimley (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 169-81; Ilkka Oramo, "The Sibelius Problem," *Performances Magazine* (October 2007): 19-20; Timothy L. Jackson, "Thierfelder's 1935 Open Letter to Sibelius and Adorno's Critique—Some Preliminary Observations," in *Säteitä 2010: Sävellyksen ja musiikinteorian osaston vuosikirja 2*, ed. Veijo Murtomäki (Helsinki: Aalto-Print, 2010), 19-42; Tomi Mäkelä, "The Wings of a Butterfly: Sibelius and the Problems of Musical Modernity," in *Jean Sibelius and His World*, ed. Daniel M. Grimley (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011), 89-124; and Max Paddison, "Art and the 'Ideology of Nature': Sibelius, Hamsun, Adorno," in *Jean Sibelius and His World*, ed. Daniel M. Grimley (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011), 173-85.

³⁹ Tim Howell, *Jean Sibelius: Progressive Techniques in the Symphonies and Tone-Poems*, Outstanding Dissertations in Music from British Universities (New York: Garland, 1989); Veijo Murtomäki, *Symphonic Unity: The Development of Formal Thinking in the Symphonies of*

assessed Sibelius's music in terms of influence, innovation, and structure—the same criteria by which Adorno wrote his criticism.

Sibelius reception histories, such as those written by Laura Gray, Byron Adams, Glenda Dawn Goss, and Tomi Mäkelä, have focused on Sibelius's reception in specific countries or time periods; few have examined the specific criteria by which Sibelius's music has been evaluated and the assumptions of those who have participated in the evaluations. My goal is to uncover the biases of both early and recent Sibelius scholars and to challenge the usefulness of modernist criticism as a way of evaluating Sibelius's music.

Charles Ives, Revolutionary

Whereas Theodor Adorno's criticism of Jean Sibelius painted the composer as a reactionary, Charles Ives's early advocates promoted his music as revolutionary. Maynard Solomon's challenge to that narrative was part of a broader revision of Ives's biography that corresponded to the centenary celebrations of Ives's birth in 1974. The literature that contributed toward the creation of Ives's image as "the great American innovator" and the literature that reconsiders that narrative are of particular significance to my study.

Scholars have approached Charles Ives's reception history from different angles. Henry and Sidney Cowell began the first assessment of Ives's reputation while Ives was

Sibelius, trans. Henry Bacon (Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 1993); and Howell, "Sibelius the Progressive," in *Sibelius Studies*, ed. Timothy L. Jackson and Veijo Murtomäki (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 35-57.

alive and completed it shortly after the composer's death.⁴⁰ Subsequent historians and biographers have imitated the Cowells' chronological account of the last third of the composer's life during which he moved from obscurity toward mainstream acceptance. In contrast, various scholars and musicologists have responded to the narratives that lapsed into hagiography preceding and surrounding the centennial celebrations of Ives's birth; they have approached Ives's place in musical history not as chroniclers but as revisionists. Finally, and more recently, the individuals who contributed to Ives scholarship have themselves been studied; this last approach considers reception history, criticism, and musicology as subjects deserving of scrutiny. My thesis takes its cue from this budding tradition.

While Jean Sibelius's critical reception was divided geographically, the discontinuity of Ives's early reception history paralleled his intermittent engagement with the musical public. In 1902, Ives resigned from his position as organist of Central Presbyterian Church in Manhattan after the premiere of his cantata *The Celestial Country* received lukewarm reviews. It was Ives's last professional position as an organist, choir director, or composer; in his words, he "gave up music."⁴¹ In 1921, following years of prolific but private composition, Ives made an enterprising foray back into the professional world of music while in the midst of a career in the life insurance industry. David Paul calls it "the biggest gambit he would ever attempt to get his music noticed."⁴²

⁴⁰ See Henry Cowell and Sidney Cowell, *Charles Ives and His Music* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955).

⁴¹ Charles Ives, *Memos*, ed. John Kirkpatrick (New York: W. W. Norton, 1972), 57. Two reviews of *The Celestial Country* have been reprinted in J. Peter Burkholder, ed., *Charles Ives and His World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), 275-77.

⁴² Paul, *Charles Ives in the Mirror*, 10.

At his own expense, Ives printed and distributed—to anyone interested and to many who were uninterested—a collection of thirty thousand words of prose, titled *Essays Before a Sonata*, and a sixty-eight-page composition for solo piano, the “Concord” Sonata. While it was decades before his music was widely noticed and many copies of his sonata were destined to “adjust the height of the piano bench,” his gambit worked.⁴³ Henry Bellamann’s review in a New Orleans magazine, the *Double Dealer*, was the first positive review of Ives’s “Concord” Sonata. Bellamann recognized that the piece was unusual, and he described it as “music unlike anything one has seen before...with no recognizable derivations from Debussy, Strauss or Stawinsky.”⁴⁴ Thus Ives began a long trek toward acceptance and, eventually, canonization based on his reputation as an innovator.

Significantly, Bellamann referenced seeing the “Concord” Sonata rather than hearing it. It was not until 1939 that the pianist John Kirkpatrick finally premiered the piece in its entirety. Lawrence Gilman’s review of the first performance in the *New York Herald Tribune* called Ives “one of the pioneers of modern music” and “a visionary, a sage, and a seer.” Gilman added that Ives was “probably the most original and extraordinary of American composers.”⁴⁵ Even negative reviews agreed; Elliott Carter

⁴³ Cowell, *Charles Ives and His Music*, 90.

⁴⁴ Henry Bellamann, “Review: ‘Concord, Mass., 1840-1860’ (A Piano Sonata by Charles E. Ives)” (1921), in J. Peter Burkholder, ed., *Charles Ives and His World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), 281.

⁴⁵ Lawrence Gilman, “Music: A Masterpiece of American Music Heard Here for the First Time” (1939), in J. Peter Burkholder, ed., *Charles Ives and His World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), 317-18.

wrote, “[Ives’s] music is more often original than good.”⁴⁶ Thus, the narrative of Ives as an innovator continued to grow.

In 1955, one year after Ives’s death, Henry and Sidney Cowell published the first full-length Ives biography, *Charles Ives and His Music*. Ives’s innovations inspired Henry’s initial advocacy, and his discovery of Ives’s music constituted a portion of the narrative. Cowell recalled that he recognized musical materials in Ives’s early scores “that had meanwhile made the reputation of men such as Milhaud, Hindemith, Stravinsky, and Schoenberg.”⁴⁷ The Cowells’ book included a chapter on the critical reception of Ives’s music from the publication of the “Concord” Sonata through Ives’s death in 1954; this chapter was the first published reception history of Ives’s music. Establishing a format that would be followed by later biographers, the Cowells collected an inventory of positive reviews, foremost among them the contributions of Bellmann and Gilman.⁴⁸ Understandably, the Cowells’ relationship with Ives and their proximity to his family colored their writing, thus, as Paul points out, the Cowells are principal players and their writings are primary sources in any contemporary reception history of Ives.⁴⁹ *Charles Ives and His Music* is not only important as the first Ives biography and the first reception history of Ives’s music, but also for its role in propagating Ives’s reputation as an innovator.

⁴⁶ Carter, “The Case of Mr. Ives” (1939), 89.

⁴⁷ Cowell, *Charles Ives and His Music*, 105.

⁴⁸ Henry Cowell and Sidney Cowell, “The Career of Ives’s Music,” in *Charles Ives and His Music* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955) 98-118.

⁴⁹ Paul, *Charles Ives in the Mirror*, 2.

In response to idealized images of Ives preceding and surrounding his 1974 centenary, Frank Rossiter's 1975 book, *Charles Ives and His America*, initiated a needed corrective. Distilling the common narrative supported by publications such as the Cowells' book into eight points, he outlined the "Ives Legend":

First, there was Ives's precedence as a musical pioneer and 'father of the moderns.' Second, there was his pre-eminence as a fundamentally *American* composer. Third, there was his self-chosen isolation from the professional world of music. ...Fourth there was the disgraceful neglect of his music, a neglect for which professional musicians were to blame. Fifth, there was his discovery by the younger composers of the early 1930s, who felt a deep kinship with him. Sixth, there was the slow recognition of his music, resulting from others' appreciation of his genius rather than from his efforts in his own behalf. ...Seventh, there was the certainty that music lovers of the future would finally understand and vindicate him. Eighth, there was the flagellation of American culture (past and present) for neglecting him.⁵⁰

Problematizing the "Ives Legend" has occupied musicologists and Ives scholars since Rossiter coined the term. J. Peter Burkholder's research questions the American origins of both Ives's philosophy and compositional techniques.⁵¹ Ronald Nick Bukoff's dissertation provides an account of the extensive critical appraisals written in the mainstream press between Ives's publishing of the "Concord" Sonata in 1920 and its premiere in 1939.⁵² And Gayle Sherwood Magee's scholarship demonstrates the

⁵⁰ Rossiter, *Charles Ives and His America*, 249.

⁵¹ See J. Peter Burkholder, *Charles Ives: The Ideas Behind the Music* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985), and J. Peter Burkholder, *All Made of Tunes: Charles Ives and the Uses of Musical Borrowing* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995).

⁵² See Ronald Nick Bukoff, "Charles Ives, a History and Bibliography of Criticism (1920-1939), and Ives' Influence (to 1947) on Bernard Herrmann, Elie Siegmeister, and Robert Palmer" (PhD diss., Cornell University, 1988).

influence of the German-trained Horatio Parker—Ives’s composition teacher at Yale—and explains Ives’s role in disseminating his own music throughout his career.⁵³

In contrast to scholars who have either imitated the Cowells’ chronicling of Ives’s later life or followed Rossiter’s lead and reimagined a more nuanced Ives, John McGinness article “Essay: Has Modernist Criticism Failed Charles Ives?” examines the scholars themselves who have written about Ives. His article, provoked by Solomon, is not a reception history, but an examination of aesthetic issues in Ives’s recent reception history. As a theorist, he focuses his critique on the inclination to use structural coherence, or organicism, to place Ives within the European tradition.⁵⁴ Following McGinness, the more historically-minded David Paul and Drew Massey have written about the most significant players in Ives’s reception history.⁵⁵ Paul’s account in *Charles Ives in the Mirror: American Histories of an Iconic Composer* is the most current and comprehensive Ives reception history. Rather than examining specific evaluative criteria, however, he presents “a series of mirrors that reflect the way Americans have viewed themselves” by illustrating “the changing images of Ives across the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.”⁵⁶ I rely extensively on Paul’s book, but rather than focusing on the

⁵³ See Sherwood, “Questions and Veracities,” 442, and Gayle Sherwood Magee, *Charles Ives Reconsidered* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 47-66, 105-06, and 138.

⁵⁴ Publications that place Ives within the European tradition include: J. Peter Burkholder, *All Made of Tunes: Charles Ives and the Uses of Musical Borrowing* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995); Burkholder, *Charles Ives and His World*; Geoffrey Block, *Charles Ives: Concord Sonata* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Geoffrey Block and J. Peter Burkholder, eds., *Charles Ives and the Classical Tradition* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996); and Philip Lambert, *The Music of Charles Ives* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997).

⁵⁵ Paul, *Charles Ives in the Mirror*, and Drew Massey, “Institution: The Charles Ives Society,” in *John Kirkpatrick, American Music, and the Printed Page* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2013), 129-52.

⁵⁶ Paul, *Charles Ives in the Mirror*, 2.

different images of Ives constructed by different scholars, I focus on the motivations of Ives scholars that led to the construction of certain images of Ives.

Besides Jean Sibelius, Ives has been frequently written about in connection with other composers. The Cowells specifically compared him with Schoenberg and Stravinsky.⁵⁷ More recent musicologists have compared Ives with Johann Sebastian Bach, Béla Bartók, Ludwig van Beethoven, Alban Berg, Aaron Copland, Claude Debussy, Antonín Dvořák, George Gershwin, Percy Grainger, Edward MacDowell, Gustav Mahler, and Edgard Varèse.⁵⁸ McGinness questions the purpose of these comparisons and calls

⁵⁷ Cowell, *Charles Ives and His Music*, 6.

⁵⁸ Carol K. Baron, “‘Father Knew (and filled me up with) Bach’: Bach and Ives—Affinities in Lines and Spaces,” in *Bach Perspectives 5: Bach in America*, ed. Stephen A. Crist, 151-77 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003); Karen Stern, “Notes in Passing,” *Adirondack Life* 20, no. 2 (1989): 48-51; Geoffrey Block, “Ives and the ‘Sounds That Beethoven Didn’t Have,’” in *Charles Ives and the Classical Tradition*, ed. Geoffrey Block and J. Peter Burkholder (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996), 34-50; Philip Lambert, “Ives and Berg: ‘Normative’ Procedures and Post-Tonal Alternatives,” in *Charles Ives and the Classical Tradition*, ed. Geoffrey Block and J. Peter Burkholder (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996), 105-30; Larry Starr, “Ives, Gershwin, and Copland: Reflections on the Strange History of American Art Music,” *American Music* 12, no. 2 (Summer 1994): 167-87; John Jeffrey Gibbens, “Debussy’s Impact on Ives: An Assessment,” (DMA diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1985); Stuart Feder, “Homesick in America: The Nostalgia of Antonin Dvořák and Charles Ives,” in *Dvořák in America, 1892-95*, ed. John C. Tibbetts (Portland, OR: Amadeus Press, 1993) 175-92; David Lambourn, “Grainger and Ives,” *Studies in Music* 20 (1986): 46-61; Ronald L. Davis, “MacDowell and Ives,” in *A History of Music in American Life, Vol. 2: The Gilded Years, 1865-1920* (Huntington, NY: Robert Krieger, 1980), 108-38; Robert P. Morgan, “Ives and Mahler: Mutual Responses at the End of an Era,” *19th Century Music* 2 (1978): 72-81; Leon Botstein, “Innovation and Nostalgia: Ives, Mahler, and the Origins of Modernism,” in *Charles Ives and His World*, ed. J. Peter Burkholder (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 35-74; David C. Paul, “Converging Paths to the Canon: Charles Ives, Gustav Mahler, and American Culture,” (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2006); Keith C. Ward, “Ives Schoenberg, and the Musical Ideal,” in *Charles Ives and the Classical Tradition*, ed. Geoffrey Block and J. Peter Burkholder (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996), 87-104; Andrew Buchman, “Ives and Stravinsky: Two Angles on ‘The German Stem,’” in *Charles Ives and the Classical Tradition*, ed. Geoffrey Block and J. Peter Burkholder (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996), 131-49; and Robert P. Morgan, “Rewriting Music History: Second Thoughts on Ives and Varèse,” *Musical Newsletter* 3, no. 1 (January 1973): 3-12.

them part of “the effort to show Ives as part of a wider tradition.”⁵⁹ However, the motivation behind my comparison of Ives and Sibelius is not to locate the composers historically. My purpose is to identify common issues in their reception histories and to assess the effects of those issues on their receptions and on musicology as a discipline.

Modernist Criticism

Finally, my thesis seeks to retrace the origins of modernist criticism. After identifying Arnold Schoenberg and his advocates as among the foremost defenders and disseminators of influence, innovation, and structure as evaluative criteria, Richard Taruskin begins exploring the philosophical underpinnings of Schoenberg’s “inner compulsion.”⁶⁰ Both his article “The Poietic Fallacy” and his magnum opus *The Oxford History of Western Music* identify the German Idealist philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel’s philosophy of history as a starting point.⁶¹ Taruskin credits German music critic and historian Karl Franz Brendel with applying Hegel’s interpretation of history to musical historiography.⁶² Brendel disseminated his philosophy as editor of the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, a position he held following Robert Schumann from 1845

⁵⁹ McGinness, “Has Modernist Criticism Failed Charles Ives?” 105.

⁶⁰ Schoenberg used the phrase “inner compulsion” in the following context: “I have for the first time succeeded in approaching an ideal of expression and form which has been in my mind for years. ...I am being forced in this direction not because my invention or technique is inadequate, nor because I am uninformed about all the other things the prevailing aesthetics demand, but that I am obeying an inner compulsion, which is stronger than any upbringing: I am obeying the formative process which, being the one natural to me, is stronger than my artistic education.” Willi Reich, *Schoenberg: A Critical Biography*, trans. Leo Black (London: Longman, 1971), 49.

⁶¹ See, Taruskin, “The Poietic Fallacy,” and Richard Taruskin, *The Oxford History of Western Music*, vol. 3 (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

⁶² Taruskin, “The Poietic Fallacy,” 18.

until his own death in 1868, and through his influential book *History of Music in Italy, Germany, and France from the Earliest Christian Times to the Present*.⁶³ Brendel first published the book in 1852, and eight subsequent editions followed, the last in 1906. Taruskin summarizes Brendel's scholarship as "a view of history cast in terms of the progressive realization of an essential European spirit of which [Italy, Germany, and France] were collectively the protagonist."⁶⁴ He adds that according to Brendel's narrative, "The value of music could be measured best, on the Hegelian view, in terms of the degree to which it embodied its own epoch's evolutionary synthesis and pointed the way to the next."⁶⁵ In drawing the connection between Hegel and Brendel, Taruskin establishes the inception and ensuing propagation of influence and its corollary, innovation, as evaluative tools.

My research builds on a trio of dissertations: Karen Stevenson's 1994 study of Brendel's criticism, Sanna Pederson's 1995 examination of Romantic German criticism, and Barbara Titus's research into Friedrich Theodor Vischer's criticism. Each of these illuminates various interpretations of Hegel and the corresponding historiography of prominent nineteenth-century music critics.⁶⁶ A series of recent articles by Golan Gur forges the final link between these critics and Schoenberg, connecting external influences

⁶³ See Franz Brendel, *Geschichte der Musik in Italien, Deutschland und Frankreich. Von den ersten christlichen Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart* (Leipzig: Bruno Hinze, 1852).

⁶⁴ Taruskin, "The Poietic Fallacy," 18.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 19.

⁶⁶ Karen M. Stevenson, "The Music Criticism of Franz Brendel" (PhD diss., Northwestern University, 1994); Sanna Pederson, "Enlightened and Romantic German Music Criticism, 1800-1850" (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1995); and Barbara Titus, "Conceptualizing Music: Friedrich Theodor Vischer and Hegelian Currents in German Music Criticism, 1848-1887" (PhD diss., St. Anne's College, Oxford, 2005).

with his “inner compulsion.”⁶⁷ These secondary sources point toward a variety of primary sources; in particular, I borrow Stevenson’s, Pederson’s, and Gur’s translations of Brendel’s original writings.

Parallel to the implicit criteria of influence and innovation, Taruskin suggests a third criterion in Brendel’s account of music’s evolution: “the progressive attainment of aesthetic unity.”⁶⁸ Taruskin discerns the origins of structure and craft as aesthetic criteria not only in the writings of Hegel, but also in the writings of Hegel’s contemporary, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe.⁶⁹ Goethe was an amateur botanist, and the concept of “organicism” entered the lexicon of musical criticism through his botanical writings. Gary Don has written extensively about Goethe’s influence on musical composition.⁷⁰ In my examination of organicism as an aesthetic criterion, I rely on his translations of Goethe’s diary entries.

The Plan of the Thesis

The three main tenets of Richard Taruskin’s Poietic Fallacy—influence, innovation, and structure—serve as the subjects of the following three chapters. Each

⁶⁷ Golan Gur, “Schoenberg and the Ideology of Progress in Twentieth-Century Music Thinking,” *Search: Journal for New Music and Culture* 5 (Summer 2009): 1-11; Gur, “The Spectre of the End: Musical Avant-Gardism and the Philosophical Turn,” *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music* 42, no. 2 (December 2011): 267-84; and Gur, “Music and ‘Weltanschauung’: Franz Brendel and the Claims of Universal History,” *Music & Letters* 93, no. 3 (August 2012): 350-73.

⁶⁸ Taruskin, “The Poietic Fallacy,” 20.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 24-25, and Richard Taruskin, *The Oxford History of Western Music*, vol. 3 (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 276-77.

⁷⁰ Gary W. Don, “Goethe and Schenker,” *In Theory Only* 10, no. 8 (1988): 1-14; Don, “Music and Goethe’s Theories of Growth” (PhD diss., University of Washington, 1991); and Don, Goethe, Boretz, and the ‘Sensuous Idea,’” *Perspective of New Music* 34, no. 1 (Winter 1996): 124-39.

chapter seeks to outline the origin of its subject as a criterion of musical evaluation in either eighteenth- or nineteenth-century German philosophy and to sketch a brief narrative of its application to the reception histories of Charles Ives and Jean Sibelius in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Ultimately, my goal is to demonstrate the inconsistencies and limitations of what John McGinness calls modernist criticism.

In Chapter 2, I broaden Taruskin's definition of influence; he writes that modernist criticism evaluates composers according to their "influence on other artists." This has been true of Sibelius's recent reception history; however, critics have often assumed Ives was influential.⁷¹ Instead, both early and contemporary critics and musicologists have debated who and what influenced Ives. My research focuses on how music histories have been constructed and how Ives's and Sibelius's advocates have fit them into particular music-history constructions in order to promote their music. Following Taruskin's scholarship, I begin with G. W. F. Hegel's philosophy of history and trace a constellation of ideas that permeated the music criticism and historiography of Franz Brendel and Arnold Schoenberg and ultimately resulted in the twentieth-century criterion of influence. Next, I examine the writings of Ives's and Sibelius's early proponents, which attempted to separate Ives and Sibelius from the German mainstream of musical progress—essentially severing them from their nineteenth-century influences.

⁷¹ John McGinness writes, "It is also interesting to note the category that has interested modernist critics [of Ives] the least: the measurement of an artist's value in terms of influence on other artists. I speculate that this is a consequence of the persistent, unrevised experimentalist connection. David Nicholls, for example, recognizes Ives's powerful influence on American music, identifying a compositional legacy extending from Cowell, Crawford, and Seeger to composers like Lou Harrison, Henry Brant, LaMonte Young, and Meredith Monk. The various styles of the latter group, wonderful composers all, do not particularly strengthen the argument for Ives's indebtedness to European Culture." McGinness, "Has Modernist Criticism Failed Charles Ives?" 104.

Finally, I turn my attention toward contemporary scholars whose writings have reconciled Ives and Sibelius with an ever-widening mainstream of music history.

Rather than focus on Maynard Solomon's challenge to Ives's innovations, in Chapter 3, I examine the early emphases in Ives's reception history on his innovations—the reviews and promotional materials that made Ives's legacy vulnerable to Solomon's challenge. I survey the biographical and autobiographical writings that attributed Ives's innovations to his father, George Ives. Next, I reexamine the link between influence and innovation as evaluative criteria in the writings of Hegel and Brendel and trace their influence on twentieth-century composers. Finally, I conclude Chapter 3 by investigating the role of innovation in recent Sibelius literature. Once considered traditional, Sibelius has been reimagined as a progressive composer.

Chapter 4 traces the critical reception of Ives's and Sibelius's music in regard to form. I begin with their early critics who recognized the difficulty of applying traditional analytical models to their structures. Next, I outline the writings of advocates for both composers who searched for new explanatory models. Ives's advocates argued that he used transcendentalism as an organizing principle, and Sibelius's proponents devised a linguistic metaphor to explain his symphonies. Subsequently, I investigate the work of contemporary musicologists who have rejected such explanations and instead employ traditional analysis to demonstrate the unity, or "organicism," of Ives's and Sibelius's music. In response to the last point, I conclude by considering the sources of organicism as a metaphor for structure. I trace an outline from Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's botanical writings to Schoenberg's invention of the twelve-tone technique.

In the Epilogue, I reflect on the usefulness of influence, innovation, and structure as evaluative criteria and assess the effects of modernist criticism on the reception histories of Ives and Sibelius. More so than offering new aesthetic criteria, my thesis seeks to reveal the assumed aesthetic criteria that have shaped the discourse on Ives and Sibelius. Drew Massey's 2013 book on an early Ives scholar, *John Kirkpatrick, American Music, and the Printed Page*, highlights the value of investigating the aesthetic assumptions—he uses the term “agency”—of the principle players in the reception histories of Ives and, by extension, Sibelius:

As Ives studies enter the twenty-first century, a new shift is apparent: Ives's critics and advocates increasingly merit examination themselves. Such an approach promises to provide a more useful historiographic apparatus for future Ives studies. ... The move toward historiographic frames of discussion in Ives studies is important because the individuals (like Kirkpatrick) and institutions (like the Ives Society) responsible for the dissemination of Ives's music left long, detailed, and generally understudied paper trails. These archival materials show how the agency of actors such as Kirkpatrick influenced perceptions of the nominally immutable qualities of Ives's printed and manuscript sources. Furthermore, by exploring more fully the attitudes and goals of figures like Kirkpatrick, we can ensure that the field of Ives studies—which includes future editorial projects—becomes more able to assess its own assumptions about the composer as he has come to be known.⁷²

Likewise, Sibelius studies benefit from an examination of the evaluative criteria assumed by Sibelius critics and scholars alike.

My thesis is part of a broader trend in musicology that seeks to acknowledge the interests and biases that have contributed to our constructions of music history. As Massey writes, in doing so I hope to enable the discipline to better assess its own assumptions.

⁷² Drew Massey, *John Kirkpatrick, American Music, and the Printed Page* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2013), 152.

CHAPTER 2

INFLUENCE

The construction of the conventional music-history narrative in the nineteenth century corresponded to the rise of Modernity and all of its critical tools.¹ When Richard Taruskin writes of influence as a modernist evaluative criterion, he specifically refers to value judgments made according to a composer's influence on subsequent artists.² But more broadly, modernist criticism valued composers by both who influenced them and whom they influenced within the conventional narrative of music history. Thus, the idea of historicism is closely related to influence. Historicism justifies a composition by the music that preceded it; influence justifies the piece by what followed it. From either direction, a composer's work is valued according to external developments. Because influence plays no role in the communication between a composer and audience, Taruskin calls it a "neutral" criterion.³ Instead, influence is the construction of historians.

G. W. F. Hegel, Franz Brendel, and Arnold Schoenberg contributed to a particular account of history that has been perpetuated down to the present, but they were neither its sole creators nor exclusive contributors to the German-centric narrative that persists in music history. Instead, they were significant and representative voices. This chapter begins by outlining their contributions to influence as an evaluative criterion and, next, examines influence as an element of twentieth-century criticism. For even in the twenty-

¹ Golan Gur, "Music and 'Weltanschauung': Franz Brendel and the Claims of Universal History," *Music & Letters* 93, no. 3 (August 2012): 350.

² Richard Taruskin, "The Poietic Fallacy," *The Musical Times* 145, no. 1886 (Spring 2004): 11.

³ *Ibid.*, 9.

first century, the music and legacies of Charles Ives and Jean Sibelius have been susceptible to valuations based on an external criterion—the lingering historiography of Hegel, Brendel, and Schoenberg.

Philosophical Underpinnings

Hegelian Historicism

Throughout the nineteenth century, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel’s philosophy of history proved surprisingly durable.⁴ Although elements of his Idealist philosophies eventually lost currency, three salient ideas in Hegel’s construction of world history exerted enormous influence on music criticism and historiography.

First, Hegel systematized history according to the movement of what he termed the World Spirit (*der Weltgeist*) through time. He taught that “the history of the world is a rational process, the rational and necessary evolution of the World Spirit.”⁵ Because the World Spirit moved through history according to a rational process, Hegel reasoned that its evolution was discernable by rational observers. Hegel believed it was his responsibility to identify the logic that the World Spirit disclosed through history.

As a corollary, Hegel identified the *telos* toward which the World Spirit evolved, writing, “The aim of the World Spirit in world history is to realise its essence and to obtain the prerogative of freedom.”⁶ Because the World Spirit advanced toward this

⁴ René Wellek, *A History of Modern Criticism, 1750-1950*, vol. 2, *The Romantic Age* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1955), 318.

⁵ Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History: Introduction, Reason in History*, trans. H. B. Nisbet (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 29.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 63.

single goal, Hegel argued that its evolution was a series of unilinear steps.⁷ Each step replaced its predecessor as the World Spirit moved toward its teleological goal.

Finally, Hegel described the mechanism by which the World Spirit developed into each successive stage of history. He taught that the World Spirit was visible in oppositions and that it “becomes divided against itself and destroys the form it earlier occupied, but in so doing it rises up to a new stage of development.”⁸ The inherent tension in opposing dialectics gave birth to a higher manifestation of the World Spirit. In its Hegelian use, the verb “to sublimate” (*aufheben*) meant simultaneously and contradictorily “to cancel,” “to abolish,” “to preserve,” “to retain,” and “to raise up.”⁹ Through the sublation (*die Aufhebung*) of dialectics, the World Spirit developed through world history toward self-awareness, self-realization, and freedom—in later Marxist terms, through the *synthesis* of *thesis* and *antithesis*. By identifying opposing elements, a historian could trace the underlying logic of history; by anticipating the sublation of contemporary dialectics, the future was foreseeable. In this way, a work of art was valued by its relationship to works of art that preceded and succeeded it.

Hegel’s rational, teleological, and dialectical narrative of world history influenced a number of nineteenth-century German intellectual traditions. By the 1830s, Hegelian historicism was commonplace in the educated middle-class, and in 1844, Franz Brendel purchased Robert Schumann’s *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* and began disseminating an explicitly Hegelian interpretation of music history. Richard Taruskin calls Brendel the

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid., 32-33.

⁹ Glenn Alexander Magee, *The Hegel Dictionary* (New York: Continuum, 2010), 238.

“first self-consciously Hegelian historian of music.”¹⁰ And though his name has been relegated to historical trivia, a number of contemporary musicologists acknowledge Brendel’s contribution to modernist criticism.¹¹

Brendel’s New German School

Karl Franz Brendel’s music criticism and historiography navigated the turbulent confluence of Hegelian historicism, German Romanticism, and debates of nationalism verses cosmopolitanism. He was versed the writings of the Romantic poets August Wilhelm Schlegel and Karl Wilhelm Friedrich Schlegel and studied at the University of Leipzig with Christian Hermann Weisse, a student of Hegel, and at the University of Berlin, where Hegel had lectured.¹² But Barbara Titus cautions that Hegel’s influence on Brendel’s criticism and historiography was indirect. “Musicological research, and notably the studies in English tend to neglect the differences between Hegel and his followers,” she writes, “Even when nineteenth-century music critics refer to Hegel, their interpretation of Hegel’s thought has been mediated by aestheticians such as [Friedrich Theodor] Vischer.”¹³ In the 1840s and 1850s, Vischer published nine volumes of

¹⁰ Taruskin, “The Poietic Fallacy,” 19. Before Brendel, Adolf Bernhard Marx wrote of musical forms in Hegelian terms, but never applied Hegel’s historical methodology to music history. Marx’s contributions to formal analysis are most relevant to the discussion of structure as an element of modernist criticism.

¹¹ Karen M. Stevenson, “The Music Criticism of Franz Brendel” (PhD diss., Northwestern University, 1994), iv; Barbara Titus, “Conceptualizing Music: Friedrich Theodor Vischer and Hegelian Currents in German Music Criticism, 1848-1887” (PhD diss., St. Anne’s College, Oxford, 2005), 127; and Gur, “Music and ‘Weltanschauung,’” 351.

¹² Sanna Pederson, “Enlightened and Romantic German Music Criticism, 1800-1850” (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1995), 61.

¹³ Titus specifically criticizes Taruskin’s article “The Poietic Fallacy” for neglecting to differentiate between Hegel and his followers. Titus, “Conceptualizing Music,” 77-79.

aesthetic writings, derived from Hegel's teachings, which transmitted Vischer's interpretation of Hegelian aesthetics to the educated middle class.¹⁴ A number of Hegel's students published similar interpretations of Hegelian thought, each with their own idiosyncrasies, and such mediators shaped Brendel's understanding of Hegelianism.¹⁵ Consequently, in Brendel's criticism, interpretations of Hegelian historicism merged with competing philosophical ideas and literary traditions.

Most significantly, Brendel associated with the Young Hegelians (*die Junghegelianer*), a group of liberal intellectuals that included Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.¹⁶ Following Hegel's death in 1831, the Young Hegelians politicized his philosophy of history. They interpreted the development of the World Spirit toward freedom as an analogue for the middle class's impending liberation from the ruling aristocracy. Citing Hegelian dialectics, the Young Hegelians justified violent revolution as the inevitable result of social progress toward freedom.¹⁷ Their discontent boiled over in 1848 when Marx and Engels published *The Communist Manifesto* and a series of insurrections swept across Europe—the Revolutions of 1848.¹⁸ The uprisings, however,

¹⁴ Published as Friedrich Theodor Vischer, *Aesthetik oder Wissenschaft des Schönen*, 9 vols. (Reutlingen: Carl Mäken, 1846-1858). In the 1930s, Hegelian thought influenced many middle-class Germans, but few were familiar with Hegel's actual writings. Until the 1840s, his philosophy, theology, and aesthetics were available only in the form of student notes taken during his lectures.

¹⁵ Titus, "Conceptualizing Music," 34.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 188-89, and Pederson, "Enlightened and Romantic German Music Criticism," 188.

¹⁷ Titus, "Conceptualizing Music," 21.

¹⁸ Published as Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei* (London: Office der Bildung-Gessellschaft für Arbeiter, 1848).

were unsuccessful, and many revolutionaries were forced to flee.¹⁹ As a result, Hegel's philosophy of history had to be reinterpreted in light of its political failure. Alexander Rehding describes the intellectual climate of subsequent, mid-nineteenth-century Germany as characterized by a "lopsided brand of Hegelianism, breaking with Idealism but hanging on to the shards of its teleological history."²⁰ Disillusioned Hegelians, including Brendel, abandoned Hegel's theological and aesthetic ideas, but retained his rational, teleological, and dialectical interpretation of world history. In the diffusion of Hegel's philosophy of history over the second half of the nineteenth century, one central premise persisted: the necessity of progress.²¹

Brendel's writings specifically traced the World Spirit's progress through music history. Shortly after he assumed the editorship of the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, Brendel wrote in unambiguously Hegelian terms, "It is the task of criticism to make conscious the life of the Spirit, not merely to form individual taste."²² Just as Hegel interpreted world history as rational, Brendel interpreted music history as disclosing its own logic: "The history of music is the best teacher. ...It is the history of music that makes the undeniable consequence of development visible and also teaches [us] to conceive the manifestations

¹⁹ Richard Wagner was among the revolutionaries and published "Art and Revolution" as a response. See Richard Wagner, *Die Kunst und die Revolution* (Leipzig: Otto Wigand, 1849).

²⁰ Alexander Rehding, "Wagner, Liszt, Berlioz and the 'New German School,'" in *Nationalism Versus Cosmopolitanism in German thought and Culture, 1789-1914*, ed. Mary Anne Perkins and Martin Liebscher (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellon Press, 2006), 161.

²¹ Titus, "Conceptualizing Music," 77-78, and Pederson, "Enlightened and Romantic German Music Criticism," 205-06.

²² Franz Brendel, "Zur Einleitung," *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 22, no. 1 and 2 (January 1, 1845): 4. Translation in Stevenson, "The Music Criticism of Franz Brendel," 90.

of the present as logical results of the past.”²³ To identify contemporary manifestations of the World Spirit, Brendel employed the Hegelian dialectic—he identified ideas in opposition and searched for their sublation.

Brendel hypothesized that musical composition would merge objective and subjective approaches in the imminent future.²⁴ He identified Felix Mendelssohn and Robert Schumann—who sold Brendel the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* in order to focus on composition—as representing the objectivity of Classicism and the subjectivity of Romanticism respectively.²⁵ Expecting their sublation, Brendel searched their collected catalogs for a synthesis of objectivity and subjectivity, but on finding none, concluded that the two composers were ignorant of the World Spirit’s progress.²⁶ As a critic and historian, Brendel believed it was his task to show the way forward. He explained:

Musical Science [*Musikwissenschaft*] should follow only one purpose, to explore the artistic productions of past and present in every way they can be approached, in order to bring them into the consciousness of the living as clearly as possible, to plant the kernel of new creations with the recognition of what has gone before, and in this way to facilitate that immense process of expanded development that is the law of this world and is called “progress.”²⁷

Brendel’s music criticism, or “Musical Science,” contributed toward progress by sublating Hegel’s objective methodology with a subjective art form. In 1848, he wrote in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, “As a matter of fact, at this time criticism and composition

²³ Franz Brendel, *Grundzüge der Geschichte der Musik* (Leipzig: Heinrich Matthes [R. O. Schurmann], 1861), 7-8. Translation in Gur, “Music and ‘Weltanschauung,’” 361-62.

²⁴ Pederson, “Enlightened and Romantic German Music Criticism,” 252-53.

²⁵ See Franz Brendel, “Robert Schumann with Reference to Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy and the Development of Modern Music in General” (1845), in *Schumann and His World*, ed. R. Larry Todd, trans. Jürgen Thym (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 334-35.

²⁶ Pederson, “Enlightened and Romantic German Music Criticism,” 196.

²⁷ Franz Brendel, “Zum neuen Jahre,” *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 34, no. 1 (January 3, 1851): 1. Translation in Pederson, “Enlightened and Romantic German Music Criticism” 198.

go hand in hand, and what we speak theoretically will at the same time be aspired to by our best composers of the age.”²⁸

In 1852, Brendel published his influential *History of Music in Italy, Germany, and France from the Earliest Christian Times to the Present*. In it, he criticized his contemporaries’ subjective approach to criticism—he called it “arbitrary”—and contrasted it with his own objective, “scientific” criticism:

As in earlier times, the subjectivity of the one who judges forms the sole background, and without any objective point of reference. Indeed, the fragmentation and arbitrariness—corresponding to the predominant Romantic trend—is almost greater than in earlier times. The necessary progress and the later supplement had to, first of all, point the way out of this arbitrariness and fragmentation. The goal was to graft the great art history of the modern age to the field of music. . . . It became necessary to give up the completely isolated, incoherent observations of any artistic phenomenon, and to learn to grasp the laws of development.²⁹

By interpreting music history through the lens of Hegel’s philosophy of history, Brendel discovered the sublation for which he was looking in Franz Liszt’s program music.

Brendel found that Liszt’s symphonic poems connected poetry—which he interpreted as an objective medium—with music—which he saw as a subjective medium.³⁰ As evidence for the historical necessity of the connection, Brendel cited the chorus in the final movement of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony, which Brendel

²⁸ Franz Brendel, “Fragen der Zeit. IV. Der Fortschritt,” *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 29, no. 37 (November 4, 1848): 215. Translation in Pederson, “Enlightened and Romantic German Music Criticism,” 197.

²⁹ Franz Brendel, *Geschichte der Musik in Italien, Deutschland und Frankreich: von den ersten christlichen Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*, 4th ed. (Leipzig, Heinrich Matthew [E. O. Schurmann], 1867), 592. Translation in Gur, “Music and ‘Weltanschauung,’” 366.

³⁰ Franz Brendel, “F. Liszt’s symphonische Dichtungen,” *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 49, no. 9 (August 27, 1858): 86. Paraphrased from Titus, “Conceptualizing Music,” 122.

interpreted as the death of purely instrumental music and the birth of program music.³¹ He wrote, “I am of the opinion, that...instrumental music can only survive as a part of a greater whole, and can no longer exist in isolated independence.”³² Therefore, Liszt’s symphonic poems were the logical conclusion to the symphonic tradition of which Beethoven was the apex.

Concurrent with Brendel’s historical substantiation of Liszt’s symphonic poems, Richard Wagner described his own music dramas as the only logical development beyond Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony.³³ Just as Brendel reasoned that the sublation of poetry and music would supplant the symphony in the imminent future, Wagner described his music dramas as both *Gesamtkunstwerk*—the total work of art, which united all art forms—and the “artwork of the future.”³⁴ But Brendel was less impressed by Wagner’s fusion of disparate art forms than by his engagement with both philosophy and composition, which Brendel understood as a synthesis of objectivity and subjectivity. Golan Gur writes, “Thus, far from being the revival of Greek drama, Wagner’s work was seen as a thoroughly modern invention by virtue of its self-reflexive nature.”³⁵ Like Liszt, Wagner supplemented his musical scores with philosophical prose. But Wagner possessed one attribute that Liszt lacked: Wagner was German.

³¹ Franz Brendel, “Zeitgemäße Betrachtungen,” *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 49, no. 2 (July 9, 1858): 20. Summarized in Rehding, “Wagner, Liszt, Berlioz and the ‘New German School,’” 178.

³² Franz Brendel, “Die bisherige Sonderkunst und das Kunstwerk der Zukunft.” *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 38, no. 10 (March 4, 1853): 103. Translation in Stevenson, “The Music Criticism of Franz Brendel,” 316.

³³ Klaus Kropfinger, *Wagner and Beethoven: Richard Wagner’s Reception of Beethoven*, trans. Peter Palmer (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 252.

³⁴ See Richard Wagner, *Das Kunstwerk der Zukunft* (Leipzig: Otto Wigand, 1850).

³⁵ Gur, “Music and ‘Weltanschauung,’” 363.

At the first *Tonkünstler-Versammlung* (Composers' Assembly) in 1859, corresponding to the fiftieth biannual volume of the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, Brendel addressed a skeptical crowd of composers and critics concerned over the future prospects of the existing tradition.³⁶ His conservative contemporaries were wary of Liszt and Wagner; they were especially suspicious of Wagner's "artwork of the future." Sensing their apprehension, Brendel explained music history as comprising two streams: the German, which progressed from Bach to Beethoven, and the cosmopolitan from Handel to Mozart.³⁷ He contended that the two streams were currently sublating in the "New German School" (*Die Neudeutsche Schule*)—a designation he coined to categorize Liszt, Wagner, and Hector Berlioz. All three composers of Brendel's New German School combined composition with criticism and music with poetry, which resulted in programmatic genres distinct from the inherited symphonic tradition.

Of the group, only Wagner was ethnically German, so the title "New German School" served two purposes. First, it attempted to reassure those who were indignant at Wagner's oft-derided and parodied term "artwork of the future."³⁸ Second, and more significantly, it represented the sublation of the national with the cosmopolitan. Rehding explains, "In Brendel's conception, then Wagner's type of narrowly focused Germanness is in fact dialectically related to Liszt's and Berlioz's complementary, international ones."³⁹ All three composers were successors to Beethoven's symphonic tradition and, therefore, were part of the evolution of the German tradition. Rather than a deviation

³⁶ Rehding, "Wagner, Liszt, Berlioz and the 'New German School'," 164.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 168.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 166-67.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 174.

from the mainstream, Brendel described their programmatic symphonies, symphonic poems, and music dramas as a widening of the mainstream; he specifically wrote of Liszt's music: "It showed itself to be not a byway, but rather a broadening."⁴⁰

Not all who attended the *Tonkünstler-Versammlung* were convinced by Brendel's rhetoric. Johannes Brahms represented the main opposition.⁴¹ Rehding summarizes Brahms's irritation concisely: "By proclaiming themselves to lead into the future—or, to be precise, to represent a future that had already begun in the present—the [New German School] simultaneously confined their contemporaries to the dustbin of history."⁴² The side effect of Hegel's philosophy of history as applied to music is the privileging of some composers and the exclusion of others. But Brahms escaped this fate. Arnold Schoenberg's account of *fin-de-siècle* music history positioned Brahms in opposition to Wagner and the New German School and, consequently, Brahms functioned as one half of the dialectic that sublated into early-twentieth-century music. More succinctly, Brahms's influence on Schoenberg vindicated the elder composer.

Schoenberg's Inner Compulsion

By the twentieth century, the diffusion of Hegel's philosophy of history was so pervasive that composers and critics often referred to history's evolutionary progress, but rarely recognized its provenance. Instead, Hegelian historicism commingled with a variety of political, intellectual, and social developments including Karl Marx's historical

⁴⁰ Franz Brendel, "Franz Liszt in Leipzig," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 46, no. 10 (March 6, 1857): 103. Translation in Stevenson, "The Music Criticism of Franz Brendel," 246.

⁴¹ Rehding, "Wagner, Liszt, Berlioz and the 'New German School'," 177.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 167.

materialism, biological evolutionism and social Darwinism, and the optimism of technological and scientific advancements. The perceived logical evolution of history and the necessity of progress animated each ideology.⁴³ Arnold Schoenberg's writings were representative of both ideas and were significant to modernist understandings of music history.

Scholars concede that Schoenberg's critical writings reference neither G. W. F. Hegel nor Franz Brendel; instead he cited Arthur Schopenhauer and Eduard Hanslick as influences.⁴⁴ But Schoenberg suffused his writings with the same Hegelian ideas, terminologies, and methodologies that Brendel employed. Most famously, Schoenberg wrote of "the emancipation of dissonance," which recalled the ultimate, emancipatory *telos* of Hegel's philosophy of world history.⁴⁵ Similarly, Schoenberg described Brahms's use of irregular phrase lengths as "a more advanced stage of the development toward liberation."⁴⁶ And Schoenberg often appealed to spiritual authorities reminiscent of Hegel's World Spirit, even identifying "the Spirit" as the source of Beethoven's genius. In the original German, Schoenberg wrote that Beethoven composed "wenn der Geist ihn packt" (when the Spirit seized him).⁴⁷

⁴³ Golan Gur, "Schoenberg and the Ideology of Progress in Twentieth-Century Music Thinking," *Search: Journal for New Music and Culture* 5 (Summer 2009): 5.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 5, and Janet Schmalfeldt, "Form as the Process of Becoming: The Beethoven-Hegelian Tradition and the 'Tempest' Sonata," *Beethoven Forum* 4 (1995): 48.

⁴⁵ Arnold Schoenberg, "Opinion or Insight?" (1926), in *Style and Idea: Selected Writings of Arnold Schoenberg: 60th Anniversary Edition*, ed. Leonard Stein, trans. Leo Black (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010), 258.

⁴⁶ Arnold Schoenberg, "Brahms the Progressive" (1947), in *Style and Idea: Selected Writings of Arnold Schoenberg: 60th Anniversary Edition*, ed. Leonard Stein, trans. Leo Black (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010), 417.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 440.

But Schoenberg's essay "Brahms the Progressive," is the best example of dialectical historiography in his prose.⁴⁸ He began by setting Wagner and Brahms in opposition to one another. According to Schoenberg's description of the 1880s, "It was the attitude of the time; those who disliked Wagner clung to Brahms, and vice versa. There were many who disliked both. They were perhaps, the only non-partisans."⁴⁹ Although he shared many of Wagner's musical, political, and nationalistic sentiments, Schoenberg reserved the highest praise in his essay for Brahms's technique of developing variation. Initially, Schoenberg offered a prescription for the sublation of Brahms's technique with Wagner's music dramas. "[Brahms's] influence has already produced a further development of the musical language toward an unrestricted, though well-balanced presentation of musical ideas," Schoenberg wrote, "but, curiously, the merits of his achievements will shine brighter when more and more are incorporated into the dramatic technique."⁵⁰ Although Schoenberg refrained from identifying himself as the sublation of Brahms and Wagner, in his conclusion he alluded to their sublation in the work of an unnamed composer: "It seems—if this is not wishful thinking—that some progress has already been made in this direction, some progress toward an unrestricted musical language which was inaugurated by Brahms the Progressive."⁵¹ Elsewhere, however, Schoenberg was not so coy and referred explicitly to himself as the main protagonist in the development of music history. Following the invention of his twelve-tone technique, he was reported to have said, "Today I have made a discovery that will

⁴⁸ See Taruskin, "The Poietic Fallacy," 22-24.

⁴⁹ Schoenberg, "Brahms the Progressive," 399.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 440.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 441.

ensure the supremacy of German music for the next hundred years.”⁵² Just as Schoenberg justified Brahms’s symphonies by their subsequent influence, so Schoenberg sought to justify his own compositional choices by prescribing a method of composition for future generations.

In his portrayal of the twelve-tone technique as a discovery rather than an invention, Schoenberg alluded to two additional Hegelian ideas. In “Brahms the Progressive,” Schoenberg substituted “the Lord” for Hegel’s World Spirit as the instigator of musical development, writing:

It does not matter whether an artist attains his highest achievements consciously, according to a preconceived plan, or subconsciously, by stepping blind-folded from one feature to the next. Has the Lord granted to a thinker a brain of unusual power? Or did the Lord silently assist him now and then with a bit of His own thinking? ...He likes helping in their spiritual problems those He has selected.⁵³

First, as Hegel interpreted history as a realization of the World Spirit, Schoenberg interpreted his musical development as a realization of the Lord’s thinking. Second, the preordained, unilinear march of progress was necessarily exclusive. Just as in Hegel’s philosophy, in Schoenberg’s account of music history, the Lord selected certain nationalities and excluded the rest. Schoenberg’s discovery, therefore, was for the preservation of the German tradition.

Musicologists have reached different conclusions regarding Schoenberg’s intentions. Some, like Richard Taruskin, have determined that Schoenberg’s rhetoric was nothing more than a defense of his music.⁵⁴ Golan Gur disagrees suggesting that

⁵² Josef Rufer, *The Works of Arnold Schoenberg: A Catalogue of His Compositions, Writing, and Paintings* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1959), 26.

⁵³ Schoenberg, “Brahms the Progressive,” 428-29.

⁵⁴ Taruskin, “The Poietic Fallacy,” 22.

Schoenberg genuinely felt his “inner compulsion” to be irresistible. What made serialism inescapable for other composers was neither Schoenberg’s apologia nor serialism’s historical inevitability, but the security provided by a common practice. Gur contends, “Schoenberg’s solution to the problem of tonality—which, when seen for what it is, was in fact the problem of stylistic pluralism—met with widespread interest, not least because it was conceived as effectively leading back to the safe track of a unified and homogenous compositional tradition.”⁵⁵ At a time when the plurality of musical languages confounded traditional critical tools, Schoenberg’s “discovery” reestablished the German mainstream and its corresponding evaluative criteria. With serialism, Schoenberg sought to secure his own legacy by the historical criterion established in the writings of Hegel and Brendel—his influence on subsequent artists.

The Exclusivity of the Mainstream

Ironically, for many years critics and scholars emphasized the divergence of Charles Ives and Jean Sibelius from the German mainstream. Proponents promoted their music as nationalistic and underscored their paternal influence in their home countries. Even while Ives and Sibelius were still active, their advocates employed their respective American and Finnish identities as part of a reaction against the hegemony of Central Europe; critics reasoned that rather than succumbing to the supremacy of German music at the turn of the twentieth century, Ives and Sibelius established their own national traditions. The two World Wars only intensified efforts to depict Ives and Sibelius as

⁵⁵ Gur, “Schoenberg and the Ideology of Progress in Twentieth-Century Music Thinking,” 10.

something other than German, and, correspondingly, both composers benefitted critically and commercially from such designations.

By mid-century, however, nationalistic descriptors became a liability. In the United States, the change coincided with the proliferation of serial techniques in university classrooms, the institutionalization of musicology as an academic discipline, and the first musicological accounts of musical development through the twentieth century.⁵⁶ The pervasive influence of European-trained American composers and Arnold Schoenberg's physical presence provided the American musical establishment with a sheen of cosmopolitanism. In contrast, nationalism implied amateurism, provincialism, and conservatism. The drawback to inclusion in national narratives is often exclusion from the universal narrative: it is implied that while Ives wrote American music and Sibelius wrote Finnish music, Schoenberg wrote music. In response to such insinuations, advocates of Ives and Sibelius have rebranded the composers and reconciled their music with the conventional music-history narrative. By demonstrating their Central-European heritage and international influence, Ives and Sibelius have been successfully grafted back into the mainstream of musical development in contemporary musicological studies.

Sibelius as a Finnish Composer

In the early-twentieth century, English critics in particular celebrated Jean Sibelius's Finnish identity. Over the course of his career, Sibelius made multiple trips to England, but during his first visit in 1905 he won the advocacy of Ernest Newman and

⁵⁶ See William W. Austin, *Music in the 20th Century* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1966); Richard L. Crocker, *A History of Musical Style* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966); and Leonard B. Meyer, *Music, the Arts, and Ideas: Patterns and Predictions in Twentieth-Century Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967).

Rosa Newmarch.⁵⁷ Laura Gray contends that Newman—who wrote variously for the *Manchester Guardian*, the *Birmingham Daily Post*, and the *New Witness*—was Sibelius’s most important advocate in England.⁵⁸ In his 1905 review of Sibelius’s Second Symphony, Newman wrote, “The music comes from a civilization so radically different from ours. . . . We feel dimly that the men and women, the history, the mythology, the landscapes, the climate of Finland are behind it all.”⁵⁹ In similar terms, Newmarch suggested there was no trace of German influence in Sibelius’s Second Symphony; there were only Finnish qualities.⁶⁰ Over the following decades, the portraits of Sibelius painted by both Newman and Newmarch continually emphasized the national spirit of Sibelius’s music.

The critically-acclaimed performance of his Fourth Symphony at the Birmingham Festival of 1912 only reinforced Sibelius’s connection with the geography of Finland. When Philip Heseltine wrote that Sibelius’s Fourth Symphony was “uninfluenced by anything, save Nature!” he reiterated the connection that Newman had drawn between Sibelius’s music and the physical attributes of Sibelius’s homeland.⁶¹ More significantly, by denying influence, Heseltine suggested that the composer’s music diverged from the development of Central-European music. In many ways, Sibelius’s success in England

⁵⁷ Laura Gray, “Sibelius and England,” in *The Sibelius Companion*, ed. Glenda Dawn Goss (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996), 293.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 296.

⁵⁹ Ernest Newman, “The Hallé Concerts,” *Manchester Guardian*, March 3, 1905.

⁶⁰ Laura Jean Gray, “‘The Symphonic Problem’: Sibelius Reception in England Prior to 1950” (PhD diss., Yale University, 1997), 53.

⁶¹ Smith, *Peter Warlock*, 36. See also Bryon Adams, “‘Thor’s Hammer’: Sibelius and British Music Critics, 1905-1957,” in *Jean Sibelius and His World*, ed. Daniel M. Grimley (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011), 126-28.

was the result of English sympathy for expressions of Finnish nationalism that paralleled their own musical renaissance and English reactions against the ascendancy of the German avant-garde.⁶²

World War I only increased anti-German sentiments in the English-speaking world. In describing the state of music during WWI, Newman said, “All the war will do, I think—so far as England is concerned—is to accelerate a process that has been going on for at least ten years—a process of disillusionment as to the most recent German music.”⁶³ Sibelius’s symphonies provided a felicitous alternative.⁶⁴ But the scarcities of war thwarted his growing celebrity, and his Fifth Symphony was not premiered in England until 1921—six years after its Finnish premiere and nine years after Sibelius’s triumph at the Birmingham Festival. In the 1920s, Sibelius had to start over in England. The enthusiasm of the next generation of English critics, however, surpassed even that of Newman and Newmarch.

English critics of the 1930s have been labeled the “Sibelius Cult.”⁶⁵ Cecil Gray and Constant Lambert were the most vocal of Sibelius’s supporters in England preceding WWII, but their advocacy followed a different mandate than that of Newman and Newmarch. Gray in particular was indignant at the German composer and critic Walter Niemann’s portrayal of Sibelius as a folk-inspired nationalist. Niemann wrote his nationalistic description of Sibelius in the midst of WWI, and a German publisher

⁶² Gray, “The Symphonic Problem,” 54, and Gray, “Sibelius and England,” 299.

⁶³ Ernest Newman, “Music and Musicians: The Present State of Music, IV,” *The New Witness*, September 14, 1916.

⁶⁴ Gray, “The Symphonic Problem,” 55.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 65.

distributed Niemann's book to primarily German audiences.⁶⁶ Gray discerned the marginalizing effect of Niemann's nationalistic account in Sibelius's subsequent German reception. Specifically, Gray saw nationalism as a classification for composers who fell outside the German mainstream; nationalism was a way to discuss them while discounting their accomplishments. Thus, Gray's advocacy of Sibelius endeavored to legitimize the composer's place in the development of the symphony and, therefore, in the development of Western music. Laura Gray identifies two means by which Cecil Gray and Constant Lambert justified Sibelius's place in history: "[First] they portrayed him as having a direct link with the acknowledged classics of the past and [second] as a thoroughly modern and original composer."⁶⁷ Simply put, Sibelius's English supporters of the 1930s began to defend his symphonies with the same criteria by which Schoenberg defended his own twelve-tone technique.

To demonstrate Sibelius's musical heritage, English critics drew a direct connection between his symphonies and the music of Beethoven's late period, a link free of the influence of Brahms, Bruckner, or any other German mediators. In 1931, Cecil Gray wrote, "[Sibelius's] discarding in his later symphonies of the old formal convention of two main themes or groups of themes out of which the movement is constructed is to a great extent only the application to symphonic writing of the revolutionary formal innovations introduced by Beethoven in his last quartets and sonatas."⁶⁸ Later Gray added, "[Sibelius's] entire art, in fact, follows on straight from that of Beethoven, without

⁶⁶ See Walter Niemann, *Jean Sibelius* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1917).

⁶⁷ Gray, "The Symphonic Problem," 76.

⁶⁸ Cecil Gray, *Sibelius* (London: Oxford University Press, H. Milford, 1934), 200.

any intermediary influence of any kind.”⁶⁹ Constant Lambert’s 1934 book *Music Ho!: A Study of Music in Decline* was particularly hostile toward Central-European atonality while simultaneously positing Sibelius’s symphonic approach as the solution to the crisis of Modernity. Echoing the sentiment in Gray’s conclusion, Lambert wrote, “For not only is Sibelius the most important symphonic writer since Beethoven, but he may even be described as the only writer since Beethoven who has definitely advanced what, after all, is the most complete formal expression of the musical spirit.”⁷⁰ On May 26, 1934, the *Yorkshire Telegraph and Star* concurred and called Sibelius “the Beethoven of the twentieth century.”

As with the earlier advocacy of Newman and Newmarch, the thought processes that led to such statements involved more than musical reasoning. Byron Adams explains that the motivation behind the Sibelius Cult’s claims were retaliatory: “It was during precisely the most politically fraught period before the war that the man from the North, Jean Sibelius, stepped ashore at Dover and provided the British a very attractive alternative connection to the Beethovenian symphonic tradition.”⁷¹ It was at a time when claims of ethnic and cultural superiority were being broadcasted from Central Europe that Sibelius functioned for English critics as a repudiation of the German mainstream.

Laura Gray pinpoints England of 1938 as the “highpoint of the Sibelius rage.”⁷² The previous year, Sibelius’s former student Bengt de Törne published a deifying

⁶⁹ Ibid., 201.

⁷⁰ Constant Lambert, *Music Ho!: A Study of Music in Decline* (London: Faber & Faber, 1934), 312.

⁷¹ Adams, “Thor’s Hammer,” 146.

⁷² Gray, “Sibelius in England,” 294.

description of his personal relationship with the composer in *Sibelius: A Close-Up*.⁷³ De Törne's book may have been the spur that provoked Theodor Adorno's 1938 "Gloss on Sibelius."

In 1933, the Nazis had forced Adorno—a prominent sociologist and twentieth-century Hegelian—from his position at Frankfurt University, and from 1934 until 1938 he retreated to Oxford University. As one of Schoenberg's most enthusiastic and eloquent advocates, the mid-1930s were an inopportune time for Adorno's exile in England. Whether it was the inescapable acclaim with which Sibelius was celebrated by English critics or the insinuations of Sibelius's connection to the Nazis, Adorno decided to publish his condemnation at the peak of Sibelius's success.

Adorno attacked the claims of the Sibelius Cult directly. Rather than allow Sibelius inclusion in the mainstream of musical development, Adorno drew a straight line from Bach, through Beethoven, to Schoenberg.⁷⁴ As with Franz Brendel before him, the certainty with which Adorno constructed music's history was underpinned by Hegelian dialectical reasoning; Golan Gur writes, "Among twentieth-century critics and theorists, it was undoubtedly Theodor W. Adorno whose essays were the most significant and influential in articulating the idea that the development of musical language follows a linear process of advancement."⁷⁵ Not only did Adorno exclude Sibelius from his linear

⁷³ De Törne's book was published the following year in the United States as Bengt de Törne, *Sibelius: A Close-Up* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1938).

⁷⁴ Theodor W. Adorno, "Gloss on Sibelius" (1938), in *Jean Sibelius and His World*, ed. Daniel M. Grimley, trans. Susan H. Gillespie (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011), 336.

⁷⁵ Gur, "Schoenberg and the Ideology of Progress in Twentieth-Century Music Thinking," 4. Adorno was influenced by Hegel's writings, but he constructed history through what he called "negative dialectics."

process of advancement, but he also described Sibelius's harmonic language as antagonistic toward the mainstream's progress. Adorno wrote that Sibelius's Fourth and Fifth Symphonies "lagged completely behind the technical standard of the times," which was precisely "what [the English critics] considered good about him."⁷⁶ Sibelius's reactionary harmonic language amounted to a moral failure, and, ultimately, Adorno concluded that Sibelius's music was nothing more than a commodity for a capitalist culture. In Adorno's estimation, Sibelius belonged "in the category of...amateurs."⁷⁷

Writing two years later for the *New York Herald Tribune*, Virgil Thomson echoed Adorno's critique for American audiences. The relationship between Adorno and Thomson is the subject of new research, but between 1941 and 1942, while Thomson was living in New York and Adorno was living in California, the two developed a mutual respect for each other's writings.⁷⁸ Based on the timeline of their publications and correspondences, it is most probable that Thomson and Adorno reached similar conclusions about Sibelius's music independently of one another. Either way, Thomson's virulent review of Sibelius's Second Symphony reiterated Adorno's accusation that Sibelius's music fell outside the linear evolution of musical development. Twice

⁷⁶ Adorno, "Gloss on Sibelius," 334.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Often, musicologists situate Adorno and Thomson in opposition as the voices of the mid-century Schoenberg/Stravinsky polemic. However, they were in agreement on many aesthetic issues, including their opinions of Sibelius. For more on their relationship, see James Schmidt, "Unbottled Manuscripts: On the Curious Relationship of Theodor Adorno and Virgil Thomson," *Persistent Enlightenment* (blog), April 22, 2015, accessed January 9, 2016, <https://persistentenlightenment.wordpress.com/2015/04/22/unbottled-manuscripts-on-the-curious-relationship-of-theodor-adorno-and-virgil-thomson/>, and James Schmidt, "Adorno Considers a Career Change: The Relationship between Theodor Adorno and Virgil Thomson (Conclusion)," *Persistent Enlightenment* (blog), May 21, 2015, accessed January 12, 2016, https://persistentenlightenment.wordpress.com/2015/05/21/adorno_thomson_conclusion/.

Thomson used of the pejorative adjective “provincial” to describe Sibelius’s symphony.⁷⁹ The term reveals the geographic exclusivity of the modernist mainstream. It also reveals the lack of influence Thomson could trace to Sibelius in contemporary compositional trends. By 1940, the nationalistic descriptors that had been used to promote Sibelius’s music in 1905 returned to indict the composer. Although Sibelius’s critical decline was not immediate, he would never enjoy the same degree of critical success following Adorno’s and Thomson’s attacks.

Ives as an American Composer

Henry Cowell loyally promoted Charles Ives’s music for the last third of the composer’s life. Although Ives introduced himself to the musical public in the early-1920s by proudly displaying his European heritage in both the musical borrowings of the “Concord” Sonata and the accompanying essays, Cowell promoted Ives as a distinctly American composer.⁸⁰ What is surprising was not Ives’s eagerness to financially assist his biggest promoter, but rather Ives’s complicity in Cowell’s revision of Ives’s identity, which emphasized Ives’s divergence from the mainstream of European music.

In *Essays Before a Sonata*, Ives added his voice to the nineteenth-century argument between advocates of absolute music and proponents of program music. Ives’s essays are replete with dualities, but he posed the distinction between absolute and

⁷⁹ “I found [Sibelius’s Second Symphony] vulgar, self-indulgent, and provincial beyond all description.” Virgil Thomson, “Age Without Honor” (1940), in *Virgil Thomson: A Reader: Selected Writings 1924-1984*, ed. Richard Kostelanetz (New York: Routledge, 2002), 48.

⁸⁰ See Charles E. Ives, *Essays Before a Sonata, and Other Writings*, ed. Howard Boatwright (New York: W. W. Norton, 1962), 85, and J. Peter Burkholder, *All Made of Tunes: Charles Ives and the Uses of Musical Borrowing* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), 195-98.

program music as a deceptive duality—oppositions that could be integrated.⁸¹ By conversing with a nineteenth-century European debate and antebellum American literature, his sonata engaged both European and American histories. In light of his multinational musical and intellectual heritage, the literary references within the classical form of the “Concord” Sonata may be interpreted as an attempted synthesis of the absolute and the programmatic. In his perceptive 1921 review of the “Concord” Sonata, Henry Bellamann—Ives’s first advocate—deciphered the tension in these dualities.

Likewise, European thought—specifically, Ferruccio Busoni’s *Sketch of a New Esthetic of Music*—influenced Bellamann’s criticism. Busoni, who was an Italian pianist, composer, conductor, and friend of both Jean Sibelius and Arnold Schoenberg, published his treatise in 1907 and, four years later, published an English translation.⁸² As Ives attempted in his sonata and accompanying essays, Busoni intended to resolve the tension between absolute music and program music. And like Schoenberg in his prose, Busoni refrained from referencing Hegelian dialectics, but expressed hope for a synthesis of the two genres through Brahms’s developing variation.⁸³ In 1923, two years after his review of Ives’s “Concord” Sonata, Bellamann published an essay titled “Notes on the New Aesthetic of Poetry and Music.”⁸⁴ David Paul calls Bellamann’s essay “an obvious

⁸¹ Ibid., 4-5. Burkholder writes that Ives saw abstract and program music as “poles that must in some sense be integrated to be whole.” J. Peter Burkholder, *Charles Ives: The Ideas Behind the Music* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985), 8.

⁸² Published as Ferruccio Busoni, *Sketch of a New Esthetic of Music*, trans. Theodor Baker (New York: G. Schirmer, 1911).

⁸³ Summarized from David C. Paul, *Charles Ives in the Mirror: American Histories of an Iconic Composer* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2013), 24-28.

⁸⁴ Published as Henry Bellamann, “Notes on the New Aesthetic of Poetry and Music,” *Musical Quarterly* 9, no. 2 (April 1923): 260-70.

homage to the Italian composer's treatise."⁸⁵ The publication reveals Busoni's influence, but it also clarifies Bellamann's enthusiasm about Ives's sonata.

It is clear from Bellamann's review of the "Concord" Sonata that he read the companion *Essays Before a Sonata*, and although his review was ambivalent, Bellamann recognized the similar intentions of Ives and Busoni. Because Ives engaged with a European debate through American, vernacular borrowings, Bellman described the "Concord" Sonata as a local expression of the universal voice.⁸⁶ Bellamann wrote, "Music is always just music, neither *American* music, nor *French* music, nor *Spanish* music, but *music*—the universal voice of thought and feeling on a high plane. Its *national* character is but a superficial difference in idiom."⁸⁷ In its ideology, Bellamann's article resembled Ives's prose. Because of Ives's lofty aspirations, Bellamann concluded, "Mr. Ives' sonata is a piece of work sincerely done, and if a failure, a rather splendid one."⁸⁸ But surprisingly, by 1927, Bellamann was promoting the specifically American qualities of Ives's music at the expense of the universal qualities.

Bellamann wrote the program notes for Eugene Goossens's 1927 premiere of two movements of Ives's Fourth Symphony in a concert sponsored by Pro Musica. In his description of the piece, Bellamann said the music was "of New England—the New England of a granitic Puritanism." Six years after he first encountered Ives's music, all references to the universal spirit were omitted from Bellamann's notes, and instead he

⁸⁵ Paul, *Charles Ives in the Mirror*, 26.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 46.

⁸⁷ Henry Bellamann, "Reviews: 'Concord, Mass., 1840-1860' (A Piano Sonata by Charles E. Ives)" (1921), in *Charles Ives and His World*, ed. J. Peter Burkholder (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 280.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 283.

wrote, “It would seem that the New England spirit of the forefathers had come incredibly into an adequate artistic expression.”⁸⁹ Ives’s New England spirit became a cliché in descriptions of his music; in his 1939 review of the “Concord” Sonata, Lawrence Gilman employed the platitude, writing, “Charles Ives is as unchallengeably American as the Yale Fence.”⁹⁰ When Bellamann first received a copy of the “Concord” Sonata in 1921, he was living in New Orleans, and the universality of Ives’s music appealed to him. But by the premiere of the Fourth Symphony in 1927, he had relocated to New York City where modern American composers including Henry Cowell were scorning European influences in favor of indigenous American musics.

In the same year that Goossens performed parts of Ives’s Fourth Symphony, Cowell was selling subscriptions to his fledgling journal the *New Music Quarterly*, which he created as an organ for modern American composers to disseminate their music. Throughout his career, Cowell promoted American music as a reaction against the hegemony of European-trained composers. Cowell explained his position: “American composition up to now has been tied to the apron-strings of European tradition. To attain musical independence, more national consciousness is a present necessity for American

⁸⁹ Henry Bellamann, “Program Notes,” Pro Musica Concert, January 29, 1927, Charles Ives Papers, Mss. 14, folder 2, box 50, Irving S. Gilmore Library, Yale University, New Haven, CT. In 1933, Bellamann wrote in similar terms, “There is something granitic about this music—a little as though it were hewn out of the stubborn stone of the Connecticut hills. It is tinged with a constant reference to local color.” Henry Bellamann, “Charles Ives: The Man and His Music,” *Musical Quarterly* 19, no. 1 (January 1933), 50.

⁹⁰ Lawrence Gilman, “Music: A Masterpiece of American Music Heard Here for the First Time” (1939), in *Charles Ives and His World*, ed. J. Peter Burkholder (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 317.

composers.”⁹¹ In 1927, the *New Music Quarterly* functioned as Cowell’s mouthpiece for advancing a national consciousness.

After receiving Cowell’s initial prospectus, Ives bought two subscriptions; when nearly half of the *New Music Quarterly*’s subscribers canceled their subscriptions after the journal’s first issue, Ives purchased twenty-five more. His benevolence prompted a meeting with Cowell in 1928.⁹² And although it was Ives’s financial generosity that sparked their friendship, his music captured Cowell’s imagination, and the younger composer became Ives’s most active advocate.

Initially, Ives’s use of traditional American tunes as the thematic material for modern pieces intrigued Cowell. Both the Irish poet John Varian and the Hungarian composer and early ethnomusicologist Béla Bartók had influenced Cowell’s thoughts on folk music, and through his interactions with them, Cowell concluded that American folk tunes could be a useful resource for modern art music.⁹³ After familiarizing himself with Ives’s compositions, Cowell wrote in 1933, “Charles E. Ives is the father of indigenous American art-music, and at the same time is in the vanguard of the most forward-looking and experimental composers of today.”⁹⁴ Cowell’s writings about Ives in the 1930s

⁹¹ Henry Cowell, ed., *American Composers on American Music* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1933), 13.

⁹² Paul, *Charles Ives in the Mirror*, 39.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 48-53.

⁹⁴ Cowell, *American Composers on American Music*, 128. Cowell wrote a nearly identical description the previous year in Henry Cowell, “American Composers IX: Charles Ives,” *Modern Music* 10, no. 1 (November-December 1932): 24.

painted Ives as an American Bartók and persuaded Ives to rethink the way he marketed his own music.⁹⁵

In the early 1930s, Ives wrote a series of autobiographical sketches that were eventually compiled and published as *Memos*.⁹⁶ He presented himself as an isolated, independent, and uncompromising American—the same image Cowell portrayed and would further develop in the 1950s. Ives was inconsistent in describing the influence of Horatio Parker—his European-trained composition teacher at Yale—and, instead, credited his untrained father with having instilled in him a fondness for the American vernacular tradition and an intrepid musical temperament. Likewise, Ives entirely denied the influence of contemporary European composers and included a coarse response to the critic Philip Hale who suggested that Ives and other Americans had been influenced by Arnold Schoenberg, Igor Stravinsky, and Paul Hindemith: “All of the music I have written...was completed before I had seen or heard any of the European composers he cites,” Ives continued:

It is interesting (and perhaps funny) to know that I (as I am included in his sweeping statement) have been influenced by one Hindemith (a nice German boy) who didn't really start composing until about 1920 (according to an article [in] *Modern Music*, March 1928, page 18) and several years after I had completed all of my (good or bad) music, which Aunt Hale says is influenced by Hindemith.⁹⁷

⁹⁵ See Paul, *Charles Ives in the Mirror*, 52, and David C. Paul, “From American Ethnographer to Cold War Icon: Charles Ives Through the Eyes of Henry and Sidney Cowell,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 59, no. 2 (Summer 2006): 406.

⁹⁶ Published as Charles E. Ives, *Memos*, ed. John Kirkpatrick (New York: W. W. Norton, 1972).

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 28.

Ives even turned on the very composers he had praised in his earlier essays, writing, “Even the best music we know, Beethoven, Bach, and Brahms... was too cooped up.”⁹⁸ His misogynistic and chauvinistic statements are difficult to reconcile with the musical borrowings of the “Concord” Sonata and the catholicity of the *Essays Before a Sonata* unless they are understood in the context of Cowell’s writings about Ives. Because Ives found his most receptive audience in experimental composers like Cowell, Ives fashioned his image to take advantage of their biases against European influences.

By Ives’s death in the mid-1950s, Henry Cowell and his wife Sidney had installed Ives as the father of an indigenous, American tradition. In their biography, *Charles Ives and His Music*, the Cowells described Ives as a seer and claimed his innovations preceded those of his European contemporaries:

Nobody today seems to be able to think up any kind of musical behavior that cannot be found, sometimes in embryo, sometimes fully worked out, in the music of Ives. His mature creative life covered little more than twenty years, yet his manuscripts contain a whole new world of music, prophetically suggesting or developing aspects of music whose “discovery” was to make other men famous for years to come.⁹⁹

The Cowells’ image of Ives influenced a number of subsequent studies. In the same year that they published their biography, the musicologist Gilbert Chase published a survey of American music in which he placed Ives at the apex of the American tradition: “We can take almost the whole body of American folk and popular music... and we can feel that all this has been made into the substance of Ives’s music, not imitated but assimilated.”¹⁰⁰

⁹⁸ Ibid., 100.

⁹⁹ Henry Cowell and Sidney Cowell, *Charles Ives and His Music* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955), 3.

¹⁰⁰ Gilbert Chase, *America’s Music: From the Pilgrims to the Present* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955), 658.

Later musicologists constructed American musical histories as variations of Chase's model: H. Wiley Hitchcock made Ives's music the keystone that supported the rest of American music; David Nicholls makes Ives the genesis of the experimental tradition; Kyle Gann casts Ives as the forefather of American music; and Michael Broyles suggests he was a precursor to the American Maverick tradition.¹⁰¹ In each scholar's historiography, however, Ives's influence is limited to American composers.

Throughout the twentieth century, nationalistic composers faced prejudice from the musical establishment. In the mid-century United States, European-trained composers and the students of Nadia Boulanger represented the most respected rank of composers and critics, and they described Ives's music as deficient in the same terms they used to deride Jean Sibelius's music. In 1934, Aaron Copland lamented the lack of public performances of Ives's music and suggested that Ives needed the opportunity for self-criticism afforded "professional" composers in public performances.¹⁰² In 1939, Elliott Carter highlighted Ives's amateur status and the rural roots of Ives's music, writing, "[Ives's] esthetic is naive, often too naive to express serious thoughts, frequently

¹⁰¹ H. Wiley Hitchcock, *Music in the United States: A Historical Introduction* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1969); David Nicholls, *American Experimental Music, 1890-1940* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Kyle Gann, *American Music in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1997); and Michael Broyles, *Mavericks and Other Traditions in American Music* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004). Ives's place in history has also been discussed in Hans G. Helms, "Der Komponist Charles Ives: Leben, Werk und Einfluß auf die heutige Generation," *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 125, no. 10 (October 1964): 425-33; Hans G. Helms, "Über statistisches Komponieren bei Charles Ives," *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 127, no. 3 (March 1966): 90-93; Austin, *Music in the 20th Century*; William W. Austin, "Ives and Histories," in *Bericht über den internationalen musikwissenschaftlichen Kongress Bonn 1970*, ed. Carl Dahlhaus, et al. (Kassel, Germany: Bärenreiter, 1971), 299-303; and Ronald Nick Bukoff, "Charles Ives, a History of Criticism (1920-1939), and Ives' Influence (to 1947) on Bernard Hermann, Elie Siegmeister, and Robert Palmer" (PhD diss., Cornell University, 1988).

¹⁰² Aaron Copland, "One Hundred and Fourteen Songs" (1934), in *Charles Ives and His World*, ed. J. Peter Burkholder (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 312.

depending on quotations of well-known American tunes with little comment.”¹⁰³ And Virgil Thomson—who previously criticized Sibelius—added his assent to Copland’s and Carter’s criticisms; in 1970, he wrote, “The tragic aspect of Ives is...the fatal scars left on virtually all his music by a divided allegiance. Business may be a less exacting mistress than the Muse, what with staffs and partners to correct your haste. But Ives’s music does show the marks of haste, and also of limited reflection.”¹⁰⁴ For professional composers, the attributes that made Ives distinctly American also marked him as an amateur.

As with Sibelius, the local flavors that seasoned Ives’s music and earned him a degree of commercial success with American audiences excluded him from the circle of serious composers. Carter claimed that Ives’s heritage and influence were absent from the American conservatory curricula and, therefore, concluded that Ives’s canonization was “a little premature.”¹⁰⁵

Rapprochement

Just as the discourse on Charles Ives and Jean Sibelius turned against them at various points in mid-century academe, by the new millennium the discourse once again pivoted in their favor. It happened for Ives sooner than for Sibelius. The status of both composers, however, hinged on the ability of scholars to shoehorn them back into conventional constructions of music history from which their earlier advocates had removed them. Ives built his reputation on his innovations, and, consequently, his

¹⁰³ Elliott Carter, “The Case of Mr. Ives” (1939), in *Collected Essays and Lectures, 1937-1995*, ed. Jonathan W. Bernard (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1997), 88.

¹⁰⁴ Virgil Thomson, “The Ives Case,” *New York Review of Books* 14, no. 10 (May 21, 1970): 11.

¹⁰⁵ Carter, “The Case of Mr. Ives,” 89.

influence was assumed. Instead, musicologists tried to reconnect him with his roots in nineteenth-century Central-European music. On the other hand, Sibelius's music was written in a late-Romantic harmonic language, so his Germanic heritage was taken for granted. In his case, scholars had to demonstrate his influence on later generations of composers. Thus, Ives has been justified by the music that preceded him and Sibelius by the music that followed him. Rather than by their music's ability to communicate with audiences, Ives and Sibelius have been reevaluated according to their place within the modern, teleological narrative of music history.

In 1974, audiences, enthusiasts, and scholars around the United States celebrated the centenary of Charles Ives's birth. The publications and the publicity surrounding the celebrations initiated a revision of Ives's biography. John McGinness writes that the main occupation of subsequent Ives scholars was "to prove the worthiness of Ives's music, [and] to remove the stigma of its 'outsider' status."¹⁰⁶ Frank Rossiter's identification of the "Ives Legend" was a crucial corrective, but J. Peter Burkholder's writings in the 1980s and 1990s were some of the most significant contributions to the creation of a post-centennial perspective of Ives.

Much of Burkholder's scholarship contradicts Henry Cowell's image of Ives. Burkholder paints a portrait that more closely resembles the composer who studied at Yale, worked as a professional organist, and spoke highly of Beethoven than the curmudgeonly composer of Ives's *Memos*. In 1990, Burkholder wrote:

When one becomes familiar with the music Ives wrote during his studies at Yale and follows the evolution of his music in traditional genres—his symphonies, tone poems, sonatas, and art songs—it becomes clear that this music lies squarely within the European tradition, extending and transforming the aesthetic

¹⁰⁶ John McGinness, "Essay: Has Modernist Criticism Failed Charles Ives?" *Music Theory Spectrum* 28, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 99.

assumptions and compositional procedures of late Romantic tonal music in ways that closely parallel the music of European composers from Mahler to Bartók.¹⁰⁷

In 1995, Burkholder published *All Made of Tunes: Charles Ives and the Uses of Musical Borrowing*. From the perspective of Henry Cowell and Elliott Carter, Ives's use of American tunes dissociated him from any European heritage. But Burkholder argues that by examining how Ives worked with borrowed tunes "we discover that most of the ways in which Ives used existing music are familiar techniques common to many composers, including some of the most fundamental procedures of the European tradition."¹⁰⁸ When Richard Taruskin published *The Oxford History of Western Music* in 2005, he agreed with Burkholder's assessment, writing, "Ives's esthetic outlook is far better understood when its connection with the European—and particularly the German—past is acknowledged. . . . His artistic aims and commitments were neither as radical nor as indigenously American as often claimed."¹⁰⁹ And so a new generation of students is taught that Ives occupies a place alongside his European counterparts in mainstream music history.

An account of Jean Sibelius's influence on still-active composers is currently being constructed. In Western Europe of the 1970s, spectralism emerged as an alternative to serialism; in part, Pierre Boulez's conducting duties in the United States and the vacuum his absence created in France made the coup possible. Concurrently, in New York and California, minimalism developed in opposition to academically-oriented

¹⁰⁷ J. Peter Burkholder, "The Critique of Tonality in the Early Experimental Music of Charles Ives," *Music Theory Spectrum* 12, no. 2 (Autumn 1990): 222.

¹⁰⁸ Burkholder, *All Made of Tunes*, 3.

¹⁰⁹ Taruskin, *The Oxford History of Western Music*, vol. 4 (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 265.

serialism; in the twenty-first century, post-minimalist composers have dominated major-orchestra and film-score commissions and prestigious compositional awards.

Unsurprisingly, spectral, minimalist, and post-minimalist composers—with their use of timbral effects and tonality—construct different genealogies than serial composers. Thus, they have initiated reassessments of some earlier, sometimes-neglected composers.

Sibelius, in particular, has benefitted from these reassessments.

Because of the plurality of competing compositional styles in the late-twentieth- and early-twenty-first centuries, the previous exclusivity of the Central-European mainstream is breaking down. Composers unashamedly acknowledge the influence of Sibelius's formal innovations and orchestral techniques. In 1993, the Finnish composer Magnus Lindberg lamented the difficulties that nationalistic descriptors had created in Sibelius's reception history and reimagined Sibelius as a musical revolutionary, writing:

I have often said that it is a pity that Sibelius was Finnish! His music has been deeply misunderstood. While his language was far from modern, his thinking, as far as form and treatment of materials is concerned, was ahead of its time. While Varèse is credited with opening the way for new sonorities, Sibelius has himself pursued a profound reassessment of the formal and structural problems of composition. I do not think it is fair that he has been considered as a conservative. . . . His harmonies have a resonant, almost spectral quality. You find an attention to sonority in Sibelius works which is actually not so far removed from that which would appear long after in the world of [Gérard] Grisey or [Tristan] Murail.¹¹⁰

Comparisons between Sibelius and spectral composers such as Grisey and Murail have become common.¹¹¹ But critics have connected Sibelius's influence with a variety of contemporary musical styles beyond spectralism.

¹¹⁰ Quoted in Julian Anderson, "Sibelius and Contemporary Music," in *The Cambridge Companion to Sibelius*, ed. Daniel M. Grimley (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 207.

¹¹¹ See Antonin Servièrre, "Sibelius and Contemporary Music: Reinterpretation or Legacy?" Paper presented for NPS Television, NRC Handelsblad, Amsterdam, October 6, 2007,

In 2004, the composer Julian Anderson concluded, “The influence of Sibelius on contemporary music is now so substantial and lasting that one can speak of him as a key figure in the shaping of current musical thought.”¹¹² Though Anderson’s statement initially seems like hyperbole, Alex Ross—the highly-respected music critic for the *New Yorker*—supports Anderson’s conclusion and enumerates a surprisingly long list of prominent composers who claim Sibelius as an influence:

In the last decade of the [twentieth] century, the politics of style changed in Sibelius’s favor. . . . New-music luminaries such as Brian Ferneyhough, Wolfgang Rihm, Tristan Murail, Gérard Grisey, Per Nørgård, Peter Maxwell Davies, John Adams, and Thomas Adès all cited [Sibelius] as a model. A generation of upstart Finns—Magnus Lindberg, Kaija Saariaho, and Esa-Pekka Salonen—found new respect for the national hero after having rejected him in their punkish youth.¹¹³

Each of the composers Ross identifies is part of the international, contemporary mainstream—the descendants of the Central-European tradition—and their endorsements have substantially altered Sibelius’s contemporary reception.

To return to Richard Taruskin’s notion of a “neutral” evaluative criterion, influence is less concerned with a composer’s music than with the historical narratives constructed around their music. There is nothing inherently false about a historical narrative; it is the job of historians to craft narratives and their occupation to place and to periodize. But subjective constructions of music history are inadequate for the objective evaluation of musical compositions that Franz Brendel intended. To evaluate music in

and Antonin Servière, “Notes from Abroad: No Longer the Worst Composer in France.” *Finnish Music Quarterly*, no. 1 (2010): 50-51.

¹¹² Anderson, “Sibelius and Contemporary Music,” 196.

¹¹³ Alex Ross, *The Rest is Noise: Listening to the Twentieth Century* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007), 176-77.

this way is circular reasoning. Even more troubling, if music history is reduced to a single, teleological narrative—as Hegel, Brendel, and Schoenberg attempted—a majority of world’s musics will be dismissed. John McGinness’s “Essay: Has Modernist Criticism Failed Charles Ives?” criticizes contemporary Ives scholars for falling prey to the allure of a teleological music-history narrative and, therefore, perpetuating the modernist mainstream that once ostracized Ives.¹¹⁴ Sibelius scholars are currently following a similar path: they justify Sibelius’s music by the same criteria that Schoenberg used to defend his own music and with which Adorno denigrated Sibelius’s music. But the greatest shortcoming of influence as an evaluative criterion is that it neglects the music itself in favor of the contrivances of musicologists. In the reception history of Ives, subjective historiographies emphasized Ives’s priority and opened the door for Maynard Solomon to question the timing and veracity of his innovations.

¹¹⁴ See McGinness, “Has Modernist Criticism Failed Charles Ives?” 99.

CHAPTER 3

INNOVATION

When Maynard Solomon attacked Ives in his article “Charles Ives: Some Questions of Veracity,” he did so on two fronts: by questioning the priority of Ives’s innovations and by challenging the integrity of his character.¹ In Solomon’s conception, the two issues were closely related. He suggested that twentieth-century artists frequently confused “the patent-office with the Pantheon,” and, thus, Ives’s supposed deception resulted from his yielding to a commonplace temptation.² Although Carol Baron’s and Gayle Sherwood Magee’s research contradicts Solomon’s most sensational claims, Solomon is correct on a few points. Throughout the twentieth century, artists, composers, and critics disproportionately valued artistic originality, and, as Solomon pointed out, at different times Ives and his advocates have disproportionately emphasized his innovations over the other attributes of his compositions. While Ives struggled to find sympathy for his music among the conservative patrons of New York City, he found willing advocates among the most-progressive modernists of the time.

Rather than reconstruct the narrative of Solomon’s infamous essay and the emotional responses it elicited, this chapter begins by examining the early writings that emphasized the priority of Ives’s innovations and set the stage for Solomon’s essay. Next, it examines nineteenth-century philosophies and ideas that contributed to the twentieth century’s demand for innovation. Finally, it details recent literature on Jean

¹ Solomon wrote, “Ives added many of his notations retrospectively and often these entries are self-serving, in conflict with other datings, or patently false.” Maynard Solomon, “Charles Ives: Some Questions of Veracity,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 40, no. 3 (Autumn 1987), 454.

² *Ibid.*, 453.

Sibelius that reimagines him as a progressive composer deserving of reconsideration. While contemporary Ives scholars have busied themselves with disproving Solomon's claims and reestablishing Ives's priority, Sibelius scholars have revised the earlier narratives that described Sibelius as a conservative composer. In the literature on both composers, the modernist criterion of innovation continues to be a significant point of contention.

Ives the Great American Innovator

Over the course of his career, Charles Ives composed in a variety of styles; to label his music modern or avant-garde is to describe only a portion of his oeuvre. But since the 1920s, Ives's reputation has been linked with his most ambitious innovations because of the unusual arc of his career. J. Peter Burkholder explains that the inverse chronology of his premieres still influences contemporary conceptions of the composer:

Making sense of Ives's music has not been made any easier by the way we have come to know it. Ives is the only major composer whose works have come to light in approximately reverse chronological order, beginning with his latest, most difficult and most idiosyncratic pieces. ...The predictable result has been a critical literature weighted down by myths, misconceptions, and half-truths.³

Ives's writings contributed to the myths and misconceptions. Although he marketed the "Concord" Sonata with *Essays Before a Sonata*—a meditation on nineteenth-century literature—he eagerly took a different approach when the opportunity presented itself.

In 1923, Ives met the French pianist E. Robert Schmitz. Schmitz had recently immigrated to the United States and founded the Franco-American Musical Society—

³ J. Peter Burkholder, *Charles Ives: The Ideas Behind the Music* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985), ix-x.

later renamed Pro Musica—to promote new works by French and American composers.⁴ Shortly after their meeting and at Schmitz’s suggestion, Ives paid five dollars to cover the cost of his membership and joined Schmitz’s society.⁵

At the time, Schmitz was particularly interested in quarter tones, and he persuaded Ives to compose a set of quarter-tone piano duos Ives eventually titled *Three Quarter-Tone Pieces*. Two of the three pieces premiered on February 14, 1925 at a Franco-American Musical Society concert. As he had with the “Concord” Sonata, Ives wrote an accompanying essay, which the *Franco-American Society Bulletin* published.⁶ David Paul points out that the dissimilarities between Ives’s *Essays Before a Sonata* and the commentary he wrote to accompany *Three Quarter-Tone Pieces* evinced a change in Ives’s approach to promoting his own music:

Essays and “Some ‘Quarter-Tone’ Impressions,” as the new apologia was entitled, are a study in contrasts. While the former was almost entirely given over to substance—Ives’s thoughts on the transcendentalists—the latter was focused on manner, the technical nitty-gritty of assembling a coherent musical language that incorporated quarter tones. . . . He seems to have recognized that the people who were greeting his music with the most enthusiasm were not much interested in the American literary past.⁷

Rather than reference Concord’s transcendentalist poets, Ives related a story about his father’s invention of a “quarter-tone machine” while Ives was a boy.⁸ Whether or not it

⁴ Ronald V. Wiecki, “Two Musical Idealists—Charles Ives and E. Robert Schmitz: A Friendship Reconsidered,” *American Music* 10, no. 1 (Spring 1992): 1.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁶ Reprinted in Charles E. Ives, “Some ‘Quarter-Tone’ Impressions,” in *Essays Before a Sonata and Other Writings*, ed. Howard Boatwright (New York: W. W. Norton, 1962), 107-119.

⁷ David C. Paul, *Charles Ives in the Mirror: American Histories of an Iconic Composer* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2013), 29.

⁸ Ives, “Some ‘Quarter-Tone’ Impressions,” 111.

was Ives's purpose, the story portrayed his father, George Ives, as having had an interest in microtonal music that predated Ferruccio Busoni's *Sketch of a New Esthetic of Music* and other twentieth-century thoughts on microtones. Ives's subsequent writings continued the pattern of crediting his father with anticipating a variety twentieth-century ideas and innovations.

Apart from a single performance of Ives's Second Violin Sonata in 1924, the premiere of *Three Quarter-Tone Pieces* in 1925 was the first public performance of any of Ives's music since the premiere of *The Celestial Country* in 1902—the performance that concluded Ives's career as a church organist.⁹ Although the Franco-American Musical Society concert received little critical attention, Ives's public persona began to develop according to his most recent and adventurous pieces and the biographical stories Ives and his advocates told. The trend continued with the premiere of his Fourth Symphony two years later.

When Eugene Goossens premiered the first two movements of Ives's Fourth Symphony in 1927, he did so under the auspices of Pro Musica, Schmitz's recently renamed society, which had Ives on its board of directors. Like *Three Quarter-Tone Pieces*, the second movement of Ives's symphony made use of microtones. However, rather than write his own apologia for the piece, Ives allowed Henry Bellamann to write the program notes and publish an accompanying article in the society's journal. Again, Ives's father played a significant role in the music's explication. "Charles Ives grew up with a conviction gained from his father," Bellamann wrote, "that only a fraction of the means of musical expression had been utilized. Unusual chord structures, exotic scales, polytonality, atonality, harmonic rhythms and the like were familiar matters to him long

⁹ Wiecki, "Two Musical Idealists—Charles Ives and E. Robert Schmitz," 5.

before they appeared as bugaboos in musical aesthetics.”¹⁰ In his review of the piece, *New York Herald Tribune* critic Lawrence Gilman wrote little about the actual music. Instead, he repeated the most sensational details of Bellamann’s biographical account of Ives: “Mr. Bellamann, in his admirable program notes, tells us that Mr. Ives was employing what are now known as typically ‘modernistic’ devices a good many years ago; and this is easy to believe, for his writing in this symphony has a sureness of touch which is not that of a neophyte learning an unfamiliar technique.”¹¹ Because Ives’s music came to light in such an unusual chronology—his Fourth Symphony was the first of his symphonies to be publically performed—critics eagerly perpetuated stories that portrayed Ives as a pioneer without ever questioning the accuracy of or motivations behind the stories.

By the time Henry Cowell met Ives in 1928, the narrative of Ives as an innovator was established. Nonetheless, Cowell significantly advanced Ives’s cause by consistently comparing Ives’s innovations with those of Arnold Schoenberg and Igor Stravinsky, whom, Cowell claimed, Ives had anticipated. In 1932, Cowell wrote that Ives “created many materials, usually credited to Schönberg and Strawinski, and used them in his early works.” Cowell added, “Ives employed them many years before these European masters.”¹² In Cowell’s judgment, the early dates on Ives’s music added to its aesthetic value, and, therefore, the comparison between Ives and his European contemporaries

¹⁰ Henry Bellamann, “The Music of Charles Ives,” *Pro Musical Quarterly* (March 27, 1927): 16. Bellamann also wrote the program notes for the Fourth Symphony’s premiere.

¹¹ Lawrence Gilman, “Music: A New Opera, a New Symphony, and a New Debussy Fragment” (1927), in *Charles Ives and His World*, ed. J. Peter Burkholder (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 295-96.

¹² Henry Cowell, “Charles Ives” (1932), in *Charles Ives and His World*, ed. J. Peter Burkholder (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 368-69.

functioned as a defense of Ives's music. Cowell concluded the article by repeating his claim with an even greater degree of specificity. "To sum up," Cowell wrote, "Some of Ives' materials he originated and used during the period from about 1900 to 1910; Stravinski and Schönberg became world-famous because they originated similar material during the period between 1909 and 1918."¹³ Subsequent critics endlessly repeated Cowell's chronology, and apart from Elliott Carter, no one questioned its veracity until Maynard Solomon in 1987.

When John Kirkpatrick premiered the "Concord" Sonata in 1939, Lawrence Gilman's rave review in the *New York Herald Tribune* propounded the most exaggerated version of Cowell's narrative. Following Cowell's blueprint, Gilman praised Ives by claiming the composer's innovations preceded those of Schoenberg and Stravinsky:

Before he was twenty-five, [Ives] had begun those audacious experiments in the organization of sound and the development of scales and counter point and rhythms which, for those who have studied their outcome in his later works, makes the typical utterances of Schönberg sound like Haydn sonatas. And we are to bear in mind that when Ives was evolving this incredible ultra-modernism of the American 'nineties, Schönberg, then in his early twenties, had not yet ventured even upon the adolescent Wagnerism of the "Verklärte Nacht"; and the youthful Stravinsky was playing marbles in Oranienbaum.¹⁴

In his section on Ives in *The Oxford History of Western Music*, Richard Taruskin points out that although Gilman's review added to the fever pitch surrounding Ives's "Concord" Sonata in 1939, it made Ives vulnerable to future criticism. Taruskin writes, "Unwittingly, Gilman had set the terms of Ives's assimilation not to the esthetics of transcendentalism or any other expressive tendency, but to that of modernism, the neo-

¹³ Ibid., 372.

¹⁴ Lawrence Gilman, "Music: A Masterpiece of American Music Heard Here for the First Time" (1939), in *Charles Ives and His World*, ed. J. Peter Burkholder (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 318.

Hegelian historiographical legacy of the New German School, which chiefly values artists in proportion to their technical and formal innovations.” Taruskin ominously concludes that Gilman’s portrayal of Ives “made for trouble, and his serious devaluing, later; for it turned the Ives boom into a bubble that might easily be pricked.”¹⁵ Solomon’s article did the pricking.

In addition to reclaiming Ives’s originality in the face of Solomon’s questioning, recent Ives scholarship has labored to restore his integrity and to construct a balanced perspective of the composer. And yet, only at a peculiar time in history was a composer’s integrity tied to the dates of their compositions, and only in the modern mind could a piece’s date justify its value.

Museum Pieces

As Richard Taruskin indicates, Lawrence Gilman wrote his review of the “Concord” Sonata according to aesthetic assumptions that grew out of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel’s historiography. Although Hegel wrote extensively on aesthetics, it was his interpretation of history and subsequent interpretations of his philosophy of history that contributed to the twentieth-century’s demand for innovation. As demonstrated by Henry Cowell, Elliott Carter, and Maynard Solomon, innovation as an aesthetic criterion is ultimately a matter of dating—locating a piece in history and in comparison to other works. Again, Franz Brendel’s music criticism and historiography proved a crucial link between Hegel’s philosophy of history and modernist criticism; Brendel’s call for musical innovation grew out of Hegel’s account of what Hegel called the “World Spirit.”

¹⁵ Richard Taruskin, *The Oxford History of Western Music*, vol. 4 (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 263.

Hegel's account of the World Spirit's progress through time doubled as a narrative of world history.¹⁶ Hegel explained that the World Spirit assumed different forms at different times, and these different forms included the art, literature, and music of the world's cultures. He wrote:

World history is the expression of the divine and absolute process of the Spirit in its highest forms, of the progression whereby it discovers its true nature and becomes conscious itself. The specific forms it assumes at each of these stages are the national spirits of world history, with all the determinate characteristics of their ethical life, their constitutions, their art, their religion, and their knowledge.¹⁷

In Hegel's account of the World Spirit, the different forms the Spirit assumed developed from one stage of history to the next. Thus, Brendel interpreted innovation—or the development of new forms—as a necessary part of each stage of music history.¹⁸ Because history functioned as a means of evaluating pieces of music, Brendel used innovation as an evaluative criterion.

Brendel was disinclined to prescribe a new method of composition. Instead, he advocated in vague terms that composers write music “appropriate to the time.”¹⁹ Such music necessarily advanced beyond previous musical forms, which were no longer suitable, but Brendel was open to different possibilities. In the same year as the Revolutions of 1848, Brendel outlined a general formula for new music in an article in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* titled “Der Fortschritt” (“Progress”). In his article, Brendel

¹⁶ For Hegel's description of the World Spirit, see Chapter 2, “Hegelian Historicism.”

¹⁷ Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History: Introduction, Reason in History*, trans. H. B. Nisbet (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 65.

¹⁸ Karen M. Stevenson, “The Music Criticism of Franz Brendel” (PhD diss., Northwestern University, 1994), 77.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

explained four essential components of musical progress: first, all progress was in sympathy with one's own time; second, progress furthered the forms of previous times; third, musical forms demanded development; and, finally, music criticism was necessary for musical development.²⁰ In Brendel's estimation, the music of the New German School fulfilled each requirement, with his own writing participating in the progress. He wrote, "Criticism now has the task to participate in the course of events; it holds its own independent position in relation to art."²¹ As a critic, Brendel overestimated his own role in composition, but his emphasis on innovation was assumed as axiomatic in subsequent musical discourse.

When Brendel wrote that music should be in sympathy with its time, he differentiated the past from the present. More so than ever before, composers of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries felt compelled to compete with the past. This competition included composers outside of Brendel's New German School; Johannes Brahms once told a biographer that he "continually [heard] a giant marching behind him," indicating Beethoven's presence.²² At times, Brahms's awareness of Beethoven's shadow hampered his freedom to compose, but, ultimately, critics commended Brahms for advancing the tradition of which Beethoven was a part.

Decades later, Arnold Schoenberg reiterated Brendel's mandate that composers continually develop earlier forms. Schoenberg claimed that tonal structures had

²⁰ Franz Brendel, "Fragen der Zeit IV. Der Fortschritt," *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 29, no. 37 (November 4, 1848): 213-17. Summarized in Sanna Pederson, "Enlightened and Romantic German Music Criticism, 1800-1850" (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1995), 206-07.

²¹ Brendel, "Fragen der Zeit IV. Der Fortschritt," 215-16. Translation in Pederson, "Enlightened and Romantic German Music Criticism," 207.

²² "Er immer einen Riesen (Beethoven) hinter sich marschieren hört." Max Kalbeck, *Johannes Brahms*, vol. 1 (Vienna: Wiener Verlag, 1904), 171-72.

exhausted all possibilities, but rather than dispose of the past, he preserved and continued it. He identified and then employed Brahms's developing variation as a way of structuring his twelve-tone music. The aesthetic he assumed was so ingrained, he was hardly aware of its source; thus, Schoenberg explained his innovations as "obeying an inner compulsion."²³ Even as recent as the 1960s, John Cage described his innovations as "doing something which it [was] necessary to do."²⁴ As a former student of Schoenberg, Cage subscribed to the aesthetic of originality—new music demanded new forms. In Cage's mind, his innovations functioned as a justification of his experiments.

Brendel's writings contributed to an intellectual climate that demanded innovation. Although it is difficult to trace the impact of Brendel's criticism, writings such as his *History of Music in Italy, Germany, and France from the Earliest Christian Times to the Present* and his editorials in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* contributed to the self-awareness of modern composers.²⁵ J. Peter Burkholder explains that following Brahms's generation, composers no longer wrote for audiences, but, instead, wrote what he calls "museum pieces"—compositions that conversed with history. "The essential problem for a composer," Burkholder writes, "became not how to write music to please a specific audience in the present—which had been the problem facing composers since the

²³ "I am obeying an inner compulsion, which is stronger than any upbringing: I am obeying the formative process which, being the one natural to me, is stronger than my artistic education." Willi Reich, *Schoenberg: A Critical Biography*, trans. Leo Black (London: Longman, 1971), 49.

²⁴ "I'm devoted to the principle of originality. Not originality in the egoistic sense, but originality in the sense of doing something which it is necessary to do." John Cage, "Interview with Roger Reynolds, 1962," in *Contemporary Composers on Contemporary Music*, ed. Elliott Schwartz and Barney Childs, Expanded. ed. (New York: Da Capo, 1998), 343.

²⁵ See Franz Brendel, *Geschichte der Musik in Italien, Deutschland und Frankreich. Von den ersten christlichen Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart* (Leipzig: Bruno Hinze, 1852).

beginning of Western music—but rather how to win space in the museum, hung on the wall next to the ‘classics,’ with an expectation of permanent display.”²⁶ For many modernist critics and composers, the surest way into the museum was to do something that had never been done. If Charles Ives’s experiments predated those of Arnold Schoenberg and Igor Stravinsky, critics reasoned he belonged in the museum alongside them; Jean Sibelius, on the other hand, deserved no place because of his ostensibly old-fashioned music, which eschewed innovation.

Sibelius the Progressive

In contrast to Charles Ives, whose recent reception history has been characterized by challenges and revisions to his reputation as an innovator, Jean Sibelius has long been considered a reactionary composer. But recent scholars have attempted to revise earlier assumptions and highlight Sibelius’s more progressive techniques. As with Ives, Sibelius composed from a historicist perspective. In the midst of his career, Sibelius recognized that his innovations lagged behind those of younger composers, a realization that caused him to lapse into despondency. For the remainder of his life, Sibelius resigned himself to conservatism. As with Schoenberg’s reassessment of Brahms, the current trend of reimagining Sibelius as a progressive composer requires a redefinition of the term “progressive.”

Between 1910 and 1911, Sibelius composed his Fourth Symphony. Although he described the piece as a “protest against present-day music,” the symphony was his most

²⁶ J. Peter Burkholder, “Museum Pieces: The Historicist Mainstream in Music of the Last Hundred Years,” *Journal of Musicology* 2, no. 2 (Spring 1983): 118. See also Lydia Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

modern composition to that point.²⁷ James Hepokoski suggests that Sibelius was not only protesting the music of his Central-European contemporaries, but he was also contending with them.²⁸ He was challenging their brand of modernism and might have succeeded had his timing not been so poor.

Sibelius premiered his Fourth Symphony in Helsinki in 1911, the same year that Richard Strauss premiered the classically-oriented *Der Rosenkavalier* and Gustav Mahler prematurely passed away; these two events symbolically anointed Arnold Schoenberg and his followers Germany's modernist authorities. In France, Igor Stravinsky premiered *Petrushka*, which symbolized his usurping of Claude Debussy's modernist mantle.²⁹ In a short span of time, the idea of a "modern" composer assumed a new meaning on the European continent. Sibelius was older than Schoenberg and Stravinsky, and he recognized that even his most harmonically-ambitious compositions paled in comparison to their newest innovations. On November 10, 1911, while in Paris, Sibelius wrote his wife Aino a letter in despair: "Let's let the world go its own way. If you, my dear, my love, want things as I do, let's not allow anything to drag us away from the path on which we know we must go. I mean the direction of my art. Let's leave the competition to others. But let's grasp our art with a tremendous grip."³⁰ Hepokoski asserts that Sibelius's letter "marks the moment when Sibelius abandoned his dreams of contending further as a

²⁷ Erik Tawaststjerna, *Sibelius*, vol. 2, 1904-1914, trans. Robert Layton (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 172.

²⁸ James Hepokoski, *Sibelius: Symphony No. 5*, Cambridge Music Handbooks (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 15.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Quoted in *ibid*, 16.

‘progressive.’”³¹ Four years later, in 1915, Sibelius completed and premiered the first version of his Fifth Symphony. If his letter to Aino marked the moment he stopped contending as a modernist, the Fifth Symphony was his *Der Rosenkavalier*.

In England and the United States, Sibelius’s harmonic conservatism won him favor with audiences, but in Central Europe—particularly in Germany, where Sibelius had most hoped for success—he was largely ignored. Although critics in the English-speaking world frequently described Sibelius as an innovative composer, in reality, English and American audiences admired his traditionalism.³² In 1976, Theodor Adorno published an anecdote about an encounter he had with the English critic Ernest Newman years earlier; he wrote:

More than thirty years ago I once asked Ernest Newman, the initiator of Sibelius’s fame, 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 esthetic formlessness for the voice of nature. Newman, from whose urbane all-around skepticism someone bred in the German tradition 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.³³

As the century advanced, Schoenberg’s and Stravinsky’s reputations grew on account of their innovations. In contrast, Sibelius’s commercial success in the English-speaking world was seen as suspect, a result of his conservatism.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Specifically, Cecil Gray and Constant Lambert described Sibelius as a progressive composer: “[Sibelius] can be as daring and original in his procedures as any one when it happens to suite his aesthetic purpose.” Cecil Gray, *Sibelius* (London: Oxford University Press, 1931), 27, and “[Sibelius] is one of the very few composers whose innovations have affected the structure rather than the façade of music.” Constant Lambert, “The Symphonies of Sibelius,” *Dominant 2* (May/June 1929): 17.

³³ Theodor W. Adorno, *Introduction to the Sociology of Music*, trans. E. B. Ashton (New York: Seabury, 1986): 172-73.

Tim Howell's scholarship is representative of the recent scholarly revision to Sibelius's reception. In 1989, he completed a dissertation titled "Jean Sibelius: Progressive Techniques in the Symphonies and Tone-Poems."³⁴ Howell expanded the term "progressive" to include more than harmonic innovations; he argued that although Sibelius wrote in a Romantic harmonic language, his formal constructions were decidedly forward-looking. To cement this view, Howell condensed his argument into an essay titled "Sibelius the Progressive," which was published in 2001. The title of his essay is intentional: as Schoenberg redefined the term "progressive" to include Brahms, Howell seeks to broaden the term to include Sibelius. Howell acknowledges the irony in the title, writing, "Schoenberg the composer was setting the standard against which others, including Sibelius, were to be measured—and found wanting."³⁵ However, Howell asserts that because both Brahms and Sibelius were dismissed during their lives as anachronistic, Sibelius, like Brahms, needs to be reconsidered in light of later musical trends.

Howell argues that Sibelius's greatest contribution to subsequent composition was his innovative approach to time and perception. In his analysis, Howell meticulously traces Sibelius's development of motivic materials in *Tapiola*; he explains that Sibelius's use of ostinatos, repetition, and even monotony alters the listener's temporal perception.³⁶ These innovations, Howell claims, situate Sibelius historically, and their influence justifies Howell's title "Sibelius the Progressive." He writes:

³⁴ See Tim Howell, *Jean Sibelius: Progressive Techniques in the Symphonies and Tone-Poems*, Outstanding Dissertations in Music from British Universities (New York: Garland, 1989).

³⁵ Tim Howell, "Sibelius the Progressive," in *Sibelius Studies*, ed. Timothy L. Jackson and Veijo Murtomäki (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 35.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 53.

Sibelius control of musical time scale is perhaps the single most progressive aspect of his compositional technique. . . .The workings of *Tapiola* have had direct influence on later twentieth-century composers, perhaps, ultimately finding something of a corollary in the minimalist aesthetic. That is not to suggest that Sibelius's music is, in any direct sense, an example of minimalist composition, though it may help place his achievements, in terms of the manipulation of time perception, within an historical continuum; that was, after all, part of Schoenberg's notion of a 'progressive' composer.³⁷

Howell concludes his essay by enumerating a list of contemporary composers that have employed Sibelius's innovations in time and perception.

Throughout his reception history, conceptions of Sibelius have been particularly dependent on compositional trends independent of the composer. While Schoenberg's atonality was in vogue, Sibelius was considered old fashioned; since recent composers have embraced his innovations, he can now be rebranded "progressive." But innovation as an evaluative criterion fails to take into account the success or failure of Sibelius's music as living and breathing works of art. Instead, innovation reduces each piece of music to a historical object; it is relevant based on its timing and the music it influenced rather than its effect on contemporary audiences. The modernist criteria of influence and innovation are closely related; both criteria replace the response of an audience with the arguments of musicologists. The same can be said of structure as a mode of evaluation.

³⁷ Ibid., 55.

CHAPTER 4

STRUCTURE

When Charles Ives mailed out the first edition of the “Concord” Sonata in January of 1921, the unsolicited score bewildered most of its recipients. The piece comprised four movements, but little else resembled the nineteenth-century piano pieces with which critics compared it based on the “sonata” designation. Ives’s daring harmonic language, the required “strip of board 14 ¾ inches long,” and the seemingly-misplaced viola and flute parts confounded conventions, but reviewers found the lack of discernable form and the inexplicable musical borrowings its most perplexing attributes. On March 9, 1921, the composer Charles Wakefield Cadman wrote Ives a personal letter in which he ridiculed the sonata as “a disordered sea of sound and form.”¹

Five publications reviewed the “Concord” Sonata the year it was first distributed, and at least four responded with similar derision.² The critic for *Musical America* called the piece “the most startling conglomeration of meaningless notes we have ever seen.”³ *Music & Letters* contended, “No doubt there must be misprints in this music.”⁴ Even Henry Bellamann’s ambivalent review in *The Double Dealer*—the first review that

¹ Cadman’s letter is reprinted in Charles E. Ives, *Selected Correspondence of Charles Ives*, ed. Tom C. Owens (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 57.

² The five publications were *Musical America*, the *Musical Courier*, the *Rocky Mountain News* (Denver), the *Double Dealer* (New Orleans), and *Music & Letters*. All five are reprinted in J. Peter Burkholder, ed., *Charles Ives and His World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 278-88.

³ A. Walter Kramer, “A Pseudo-Literary Sonata!!!” (1921), in *Charles Ives and His World*, ed. J. Peter Burkholder (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 278.

⁴ Ernest Walker, “Review of *Second Pianoforte Sonata, ‘Concord, Mass., 1840-1860’* and *Essays Before a Sonata*” (1921), in *Charles Ives and His World*, ed. J. Peter Burkholder (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 287.

recognized Ives's sincerity—concluded, “There is no unity of idea in the sense that one part grows out of another.”⁵ Although Ives's gambit of distributing the score by mail earned only scattered public assessment in 1921, later generations of commentators repeated the negative conclusions of the “Concord” Sonata's first critics. Luminaries from Aaron Copland to Marc Blitzstein to Elliott Carter criticized Ives's music for what they perceived as a lack of structure and for gratuitous musical borrowings. In response, Ives apologists defended Ives's artistry in specious terms—they maintained that he used extra-musical programs rather than musical logic to organize his pieces. Unwittingly, Ives's mid-century defenders distorted Ives's biography and aesthetic in order to validate his music.

Jean Sibelius's similar, but equally idiosyncratic symphonic structures also confounded critics. Unsurprisingly, Theodor Adorno wrote one of the most scathing critiques of Sibelius's approach to form. Because of his advocacy for musical progress, it is ironic that Adorno mistook Sibelius's formal innovations for formal ineptitudes, but much like the composers he promoted, Adorno espoused harmonic innovations rather than structural or timbral ones. He referred to Sibelius's Fourth Symphony as an “unshapely and trivial sequence of notes” and the Fifth Symphony as “an incomprehensible whole made up of the most trivial details.”⁶ Fundamentally, Adorno

⁵ Henry Bellamann, “Reviews: ‘Concord, Mass., 1840-1860’ (A Piano Sonata by Charles E. Ives)” (1921), in *Charles Ives and His World*, ed. J. Peter Burkholder (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 282.

⁶ Theodor W. Adorno, “Gloss on Sibelius” (1938), in *Jean Sibelius and His World*, ed. Daniel M. Grimley, trans. Susan H. Gillespie (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011), 333 and 335.

concluded that Sibelius's formal failure was due to a "lack of technical ability."⁷

Although his language rings of hyperbole, Adorno's pronouncements forced critics to choose sides; some agreed with his assessment while others scrambled to counter his claims. Thus, Adorno lured Sibelius's detractors and defenders into a debate on the modernist qualities of Sibelius's symphonic structures, a discourse that continues today.

The most striking parallel in the literature on Ives and Sibelius emerges out of the composers' like-minded approaches to structure, the common criticisms their constructions have elicited, and the similar terms with which contemporary musicologists analyze their forms. For nearly a century, critics and scholars have evaluated Ives's and Sibelius's music according to an eighteenth-century biological metaphor—the criterion of "organicism."

Cumulative Form in Ives's Music

In order to outline the shifting perceptions of Charles Ives's musical structures, it is instructive to trace Elliott Carter's evolving opinions of the "Concord" Sonata. Over the course of fifty years, Carter both criticized and praised Ives's approach to form; his personal relationship with Ives and his European training gave him insight into conflicting conceptions of Ives's music among musicians and scholars. But the first critique he wrote of the "Concord" Sonata after John Kirkpatrick premiered the piece in 1939 and the confusion Carter expressed at Ives's ambiguous forms and borrowed tunes only reiterated earlier criticisms by fellow Nadia Boulanger alumni.

⁷ Ibid., 334.

A “Disturbing Lack of Musical and Stylistic Continuity”

By the early 1930s, *Modern Music*, a journal sponsored by the League of Composers, regularly published articles on Charles Ives’s music. Marc Blitzstein—who studied in France with Boulanger in the 1920s—mentioned Ives in its pages in March of 1932, and later that year, Henry Cowell—who studied in the United States—wrote a short Ives biography for *Modern Music*.⁸ In contrast to Cowell’s adulatory tribute, Blitzstein perfunctorily dismissed Ives as a composer of little interest in his review of Ives’s *Set for Theater or Chamber Orchestra*, which premiered in New York on February 16, 1932. Blitzstein’s several-sentence review seized upon two incipient tropes as the foundation of his criticism—Ives’s unskilled craftsmanship and his reliance on lowbrow tunes. Blitzstein determined that Ives “seldom [had] sufficient craft. . . due to his almost deliberate dependence upon the spirit of minstrelsy.”⁹ Much of the subsequent discourse on Ives would follow either Blitzstein’s or Cowell’s template—rejecting Ives offhand or lionizing him as one of America’s most important composers.

As in the case of the “Concord” Sonata, when Ives distributed *114 Songs* in the early 1920s, only a few critics publicly recognized his effort or reviewed the music. But the success of Ives’s songs in 1932 at the First Festival of Contemporary American Music at Yaddo, Saratoga Springs, New York prompted a reexamination.¹⁰ Two years later, Aaron Copland, who organized the Yaddo Festival, published a review of *114 Songs* in

⁸ Henry Cowell, “American Composers IX: Charles Ives,” *Modern Music* 10, no. 1 (November-December, 1932): 24-32. This was Cowell’s third article in *Modern Music* on Ives.

⁹ Marc Blitzstein, “Premieres and Experiments—1932,” in *Charles Ives and His World*, ed. J. Peter Burkholder (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 305.

¹⁰ See Frank R. Rossiter, *Charles Ives and His America* (New York: Liveright, 1975), 235.

Modern Music. Copland thoughtfully considered the music, and his critique refrained from making the hasty assumptions of previous reviewers. He found much to praise in the pieces, but he ultimately faulted Ives's reliance on vernacular tunes. Although Copland assumed the tunes themselves were valuable, he criticized Ives's treatment of their melodic material, writing, "[Ives's] method in several of these songs is to evoke the mood of the past at the beginning with the aid of rather complex harmonies and then to give the popular music in unadulterated form. This mixture of styles is not a happy one; it results in making them the least successful of those [songs] thus far considered."¹¹ Copland's aesthetic assumptions, which he inherited from Boulanger, valued homogeneity of form and structural organicism and contradicted the assumptions of Cowell, whose advocacy celebrated Ives's use of borrowed tunes.¹²

The contrast between Boulanger's pupils and homegrown, American modernists set the stage for Elliott Carter's 1939 assessment of the "Concord" Sonata. Carter knew Ives when Carter was a young man, and although he knew portions of the "Concord" Sonata before he left to study in Europe, Carter later explained that his studies disillusioned him of Ives's music. He outlined two reasons for his change of heart:

After I had completed strict musical studies here and abroad, I saw these works in a different light. ...My doubts were of two kinds. First, there seemed to be very large amounts of undifferentiated confusion, especially in the orchestral works, during which many conflicting things happen at once without apparent concern either for the total effect or for the distinguishability of various levels. ...Even

¹¹ Aaron Copland, "One Hundred and Fourteen Songs" (1934), in *Charles Ives and His World*, ed. J. Peter Burkholder (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 311. This was the same review in which Copland lamented Ives's lack of public performances. See Chapter 2, "Ives as an American Composer."

¹² See Chapter 2, "Ives as an American Composer," and David C. Paul, "From American Ethnographer to Cold War Icon: Charles Ives Through the Eyes of Henry and Sidney Cowell," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 59, no. 2 (Summer 2006): 339-457.

more disturbing to me than was his frequent reliance on musical quotations for their literary effect.”¹³

In his 1939 review of the “Concord” Sonata titled “The Case of Mr. Ives,” Carter specifically attacked the purported confusion and quotations in the piece. Carter complained that Ives wrote “contrapuntal development sections that lead nowhere” and “constant harmonic movement which do not clarify the form.” He called Ives’s use of borrowed tunes “possibly charming, but certainly trivial” and concluded that they only contributed to what he called the sonata’s “lack of logic.” In summation, Carter found the piece “formally weak.”¹⁴ Looking back in 1969, Carter explained that although he had admired elements of Ives’s technique, he disapproved of “the disturbing lack of musical and stylistic continuity” in Ives’s music.¹⁵

Carter’s review, like Blitzstein’s and Copland’s criticisms, contained at least an element of self-promotion. All three composers were trained to write in a Neoclassical style that projected logic and structural coherence, and their writings say less about the success or failure of Ives’s music than of their own approaches to composition. In fact, Copland’s criticism of *114 Songs* and Carter’s criticism of the “Concord” Sonata belie Ives’s success with audiences at Yaddo and John Kirkpatrick’s critical triumph with

¹³ Elliott Carter, “Shop Talk by and American Composer” (1960), in *Contemporary Composers on Contemporary Music*, ed. Elliott Schwartz and Barney Childs (New York: Da Capo, 1998), 270-71.

¹⁴ Elliott Carter, “The Case of Mr. Ives” (1939), in *Collected Essays and Lectures, 1937-1995*, ed. Jonathan W. Bernard (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1997), 89.

¹⁵ When Vivian Perlis interviewed Elliott Carter in 1969, he explained, “I have always been fascinated by the polyrhythmic aspects of Ives’s music, as well as its multiple layering, but perplexed at times by the disturbing lack of musical and stylistic continuity, caused largely by the constant use of musical quotations in many works.” Vivian Perlis, *Charles Ives Remembered: An Oral History* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974), 145. David Thurmaier investigates Carter’s borrowings from Ives in David Thurmaier, “‘A Disturbing Lack of Musical and Stylistic Continuity’? Elliott Carter, Charles Ives, and Musical Borrowing,” *Current Musicology*, no. 96 (Fall 2013): 97-124.

Ives's sonata in January of 1939, which earned an encore one month later. But the friction between European ideologies and American musical expressions animated Boulanger's students' appraisals. The critic Olin Downes hinted at the tension in 1927 when he reviewed Eugene Goossens's premiere of Ives's Fourth Symphony, which shared a concert bill with pieces by the French composer Darius Milhaud. Downes wrote of Ives's piece, "This music is not nearly as compact, as finished in workmanship, as smart in tone, as that of Mr. Milhaud, but it rings truer, it seems to have something more genuine behind it."¹⁶ To defend Ives's music from critics who alleged a lack of structure and sophistication, Ives's advocates followed Downes's example and appealed to abstract attributes rather than traditional notions of "workmanship"—in Ives's terms, they emphasized substance over manner.

Transcendental Unity

In the themes of both the "Concord" Sonata and *Essays Before a Sonata*, Ives linked the piece with Concord's transcendentalist philosophers; he described the music as "an attempt to present (one person's) impression of the spirit of transcendentalism."¹⁷ But as a way of interpreting Ives's eccentricities, later critics interpreted the piece as an *expression* of transcendentalism rather than as merely an *impression* of the philosophy; J. Peter Burkholder points out that "somehow Ives's sense of creating an impression has

¹⁶ Olin Downes, "Music: Pro-Musica Society" (1927), in *Charles Ives and His World*, ed. J. Peter Burkholder (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 294.

¹⁷ Charles E. Ives, *Essays Before a Sonata, and Other Writings*, ed. Howard Boatwright (New York: W. W. Norton, 1962), xxv.

become... a sense of creating an equivalent.”¹⁸ Because transcendentalism prioritized spiritual realities over physical realities, it functioned as a useful analogy for defending Ives’s music, which professed to prioritize “substance”—or spiritual truths—over “manner”—the means by which spiritual truths were expressed.¹⁹ In response to accusations of formal weaknesses, Ives’s proponents explained that his music was organized according to spiritual principles rather than musical ones; in their conception, Ives was a musical transcendentalist.

After Henry Bellamann published his review of the “Concord” Sonata in 1921, he and Ives corresponded and eventually met; the conversations that Bellamann shared with Ives drastically altered the terms with which Bellamann described Ives’s music. In 1933, Bellamann wrote an essay titled “Charles Ives: The Man and His Music” for the *Musical Quarterly*, which was part biography and part apologia. Two ideas in his essay established a foundation on which subsequent generations of critics and scholars would discuss Ives’s musical structures.

First, Bellamann challenged audiences to approach Ives’s music on Ives’s terms:

One must understand how this music is posited and meet it on its own ground—a truism, after all, for any kind of art. It is posited simply enough as a musical equivalent of the spiritual values of transcendental philosophy and human experience; and sometimes it is an amazingly picturesque setting forth of the flavors and colors of New England life and history, couched in the tense idiom of a bleak New England thinking. Whether one accepts this or not as a possible musical and workable aesthetic, there it is: the aesthetic of Charles Ives.²⁰

¹⁸ J. Peter Burkholder, *Charles Ives: The Ideas Behind the Music* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985), 121.

¹⁹ For Ives’s definition of these terms, see Ives, *Essays Before a Sonata*, 75.

²⁰ Henry Bellamann, “Charles Ives: The Man and His Music,” *Musical Quarterly* 19, no. 1 (January 1933): 50.

According to Bellamann, the key to understanding Ives's music was Ives's philosophy. Bellamann argued that rather than organizing his music with traditional tonic and dominant relationships or exposition, development, and recapitulation sequences, Ives organized his music with transcendental ideas and memories of personal experiences. Philosophy, experience, and nostalgia are more abstract than traditional musical forms, which presumably accounted for Bellamann's earlier mistaken conclusion that "there [was] no unity of idea" in the "Concord" Sonata.²¹

The second idea Bellamann introduced in his essay concerned Ives's use of borrowed tunes. Bellamann noticed that Ives often reserved the only complete statement of a tune for the end of a piece or movement; in a reverse of traditional structures, Ives developed themes prior to their exposition. Bellamann noted, "Sometimes development seems to begin at once after the introduction, ...the development leads into the theme which, not infrequently, is stated in its entirety only at the end."²² Ives repeatedly used this procedure in his mature compositions, but Bellamann was the first to recognize it. Almost without fail, Ives borrowed the principal themes in these structures from preexisting tunes.

As a defense of Ives's craftsmanship, the two ideas in Bellamann's essay—transcendental unity and a theme's development preceding its exposition—functioned in tandem. For example, in Ives's Fourth Symphony the reconstruction of the hymn tune "Nearer, My God, to Thee" depicts a spiritual journey that begins with questioning and

²¹ Bellamann, "Reviews: 'Concord, Mass., 1840-1860'," 282.

²² Bellamann, "Charles Ives," 49.

ends in the presence of the Divine.²³ Bellamann wrote the program notes for the piece. He concluded that Ives's homogeneous extra-musical programs accounted for his musical heterogeneity: Ives accomplished organicism through transcendentalism.²⁴

Subsequent musicians and scholars latched on to one, or both, of these ideas. Through the 1940s, Elliott Carter remained skeptical of Ives's technique and development of borrowed tunes, but he accepted the image of Ives as a transcendentalist. Ives's philosophy seemed a viable rationale for his stylistic incongruities. In 1944, Carter wrote in *Modern Music*:

Ives is always in quest of the transcendental. On the surface of his work, the infinite complexity of nature, the rapidly changing moods of forest and plain, the web of counterbalancing forces appear confused and dissociated. But Ives' involved texture, while mirroring this superficial confusion, at the same time attempts to show the larger harmony of rhythm behind the natural process.²⁵

Carter concluded that Ives's results were "almost random," but he recognized a spiritual logic.²⁶ Only five years after his renunciation of Ives, Carter's conception of the composer's music began to shift as more critics wrote about and analyzed it.

²³ See J. Peter Burkholder, *All Made of Tunes: Charles Ives and the Uses of Musical Borrowing* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), 402-06.

²⁴ Most likely, Ives ghostwrote Bellamann's program notes. The program compares Ives's structures with Schoenberg's structures: "Mr. Ives's music, it must be remembered, rests upon the secure foundation of a sound musical education. It is actually far more logical than Schoenberg, and equally uncompromising. It is of New England—the New England of a granitic Puritanism—and reflects a strangely introspective and profoundly philosophic temperament in its extreme unsensuousness and in its closely knit and irrefutable logic." Henry Bellamann, "Program Notes," Pro Musica Concert, January 29, 1927, Charles Ives Papers, Mss. 14, folder 2, box 50, Irving S. Gilmore Library, Yale University, New Haven, CT.

²⁵ Elliott Carter, "Ives Today: His Vision and Challenge" (1944), in *Charles Ives and His World*, ed. J. Peter Burkholder (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 391.

²⁶ Carter briefly compared Ives and Alexander Scriabin: "For [Ives] the natural world reflects the spiritual, and so is of great concern. Hence the divergence between the patterned music of [Scriabin] and the free, almost random music of Ives." *Ibid.*

When Henry and Sidney Cowell published the first book-length Ives biography in 1955, they broadened Henry Bellamann's explanation and interpreted Ives's entire life as an expression of transcendentalism.²⁷ The Cowells split their book into two parts: Sidney wrote the first half detailing Ives's family, education, and professional life, and Henry wrote the second half analyzing Ives's use of melody, harmony, and form. In their account, transcendentalism functioned as an organizing principle in both sections—in Ives's life and his music.

The biographical section explained Ives's music as an extension of his manner of living. The Cowells recognized that Ives's musical structures departed from traditional patterns, but they also recognized that he lived an unusual life for a composer as an American who sold insurance for his livelihood. Accordingly, his beliefs and experiences clarified his unusual musical patterning:

[Ives] pondered the relations of things, testing out music by life and life by music, and building abstract musical structures like concrete events. This makes his particular kind of program music, in which the flow of musical relationships derives from the patterns of activity he saw around him. The music therefore records not a *thing* that happens but the *way* things happen. . . . Ives's music moves in many directions at once and is built on many levels, in the way that experience comes to mind.²⁸

Throughout their biography, the Cowells highlighted the parallels between Ives's life and his composing and between Ives's philosophy and his musical structures. They reasoned that Ives's philosophy served as more than a justification for his idiosyncrasies; his philosophy functioned as a repudiation of traditional European forms. “[Ives] was convinced,” they wrote, “that fertility of idea and the release of fresh energy were more

²⁷ Burkholder, *Charles Ives*, 21.

²⁸ Henry Cowell and Sidney Cowell, *Charles Ives and His Music* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955), 6-7.

important to the music of his day than the painstaking refinement of a tradition that seemed threadbare to him.”²⁹ This connection was simply a continuation of Henry Cowell’s several decades of advocacy on behalf of Ives in which he consistently praised Ives’s innovations. By explaining Ives’s philosophy as a new means of organizing his music, the Cowells could promote Ives as an innovator and a highly-skilled craftsman. In the second section of their book, Henry outlined in specific terms how Ives structured pieces according to transcendentalist philosophies.

Following Bellamann’s example, Cowell’s theoretical analysis examined the structures through which Ives developed borrowed tunes. His analysis further refined Bellamann’s notion of a tune’s development preceding its complete statement and, likewise, linked Ives’s inverse musical constructions with his personal philosophies. Cowell wrote, “A complete musical statement, in all its clarity and simplicity, like any absolute truth, is an ultimate, not a beginning. Ives reserves it, therefore, for the culmination of a work.”³⁰ Cowell also noted that in many pieces—such as the “Concord” Sonata—Ives developed two themes simultaneously, one which would ultimately serve as the main theme and another as a secondary theme.³¹ But Cowell made a crucial point that later Ives scholars would corroborate: Ives’s methodical development of borrowed tunes demonstrated such a level of artistry that his music could stand on its own without external programs:

Snatches of hymns, minstrel songs, college songs, fiddle tunes, and so on, sewn through the fabric of his music, are never left as quotations only; certain fragments soon develop a life of their own, and some aspect of their musical

²⁹ Ibid., 13.

³⁰ Ibid., 142.

³¹ Ibid., 174.

structure is always made the basis of the piece's subsequent behavior, so that ultimately the music stands independent of any literary or other extra-musical connection.³²

Cowell's study contradicted both positive and negative assessments by previous critics, but it would be another thirty years before musicologists would substantiate Cowell's interpretation. Nonetheless, another shift in the perception of Ives's craftsmanship was underway.

Despite Cowell's analysis, appeals to transcendentalism as a justification of Ives's stylistic heterogeneity continued to function as a defense of Ives's music in the years leading up to his centenary. In 1960, John Kirkpatrick published the first catalog of Ives's musical manuscripts and attempted brief analyses. He wrote of Ives's musical borrowings, "Some instances are certainly for nostalgic evocation, . . . but most are probably due to a transcendentalist's faith in the validity of tradition or popular expressions to voice his own thoughts."³³ Despite his extensive labor on Ives's behalf, Kirkpatrick recognized only extra-musical significance in Ives's borrowings. Similarly, in 1964, Wilfrid Mellers suggested that "[Ives's] attempt to discover unity within chaos [was] in essence a transcendental act."³⁴ The first edition of H. Wiley Hitchcock's book *Music in the United States: A Historical Introduction*—published in 1969—acknowledged the difficulties in analyzing Ives's forms and interpreting his musical

³² Ibid., 147.

³³ John Kirkpatrick, *A Temporary Mimeographed Catalogue of the Music Manuscripts and Related Materials of Charles Edward Ives (1874-1954)* (New Haven, CT: Library of the Yale School of Music, 1960), viii. See also John Kirkpatrick, "Ives, Transcendentalist in Music," typescript for talk given October 26, 1961, John Kirkpatrick Papers, Mss. 56, folder 568, box 61, Irving S. Gilmore Music Library, Yale University, New Haven, CT.

³⁴ Wilfrid Mellers, *Music in a New Found Land: Themes and Developments in the History of American Music* (London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1964), 45.

borrowings. Hitchcock ultimately reasoned that Ives arranged his music as Ralph Waldo Emerson arranged his prose, and he referenced Ives's own *Essays Before a Sonata* as evidence: "As thoughts surge to his mind," Ives wrote, and Hitchcock quoted, "[Emerson] fills the heavens with them, crowds them in, if necessary, but seldom arranges them along the ground first."³⁵

In 1970, Audrey Davidson wrote the most explicit transcendental defense of Ives's stylistic pluralism in her essay "Transcendental Unity in the Works of Charles Ives." She concluded that the problem was not a lack of organicism in Ives's music, but rather a misunderstanding of his unifying principles. Davidson wrote, "It is necessary to redefine unity in Ivesian terms," and she suggested four abstract criteria: "(1) Unity as found in nature, (2) unity created by the wedding of dualism (specifically those of substance and manner), (3) unity created by flashes of revelation, and finally, (4) unity which allows perfect freedom to exist within it."³⁶ Davidson refrained from questioning the validity of structural unity as an evaluative criterion; instead, she assumed it was a basic musical criterion and went to great lengths to defend Ives's music accordingly.

But these transcendental explanations were unsuccessful in persuading unsympathetic critics weaned on Germanic musical structures. In 1979, despite plausible arguments to the contrary, Gerald Abraham wrote in *The Concise Oxford History of*

³⁵ Ives, *Essays Before a Sonata*, 25. Quoted in H. Wiley Hitchcock, *Music in the United States: A Historical Introduction* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1969), 149-52. See also David C. Paul, *Charles Ives in the Mirror: American Histories of an Iconic Composer* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2013), 166-67.

³⁶ Audrey Davidson, "Transcendental Unity in the Works of Charles Ives," *American Quarterly* 22, no. 1 (Spring 1970): 38.

Music that Ives's music was a "bizarre unintegrated mixture of daring sophistication and homespun crudity."³⁷ Thus, Ives's music earned no further comment from Abraham.

"An Extraordinarily Accomplished and Skilled Composer"

Ives's centenary initiated a dramatic increase in musicological inquiry into Ives's compositional structures. Imitating Henry Cowell's approach, many scholars rebutted earlier critics of Ives's musical forms with musical explanations rather than extra-musical justifications.³⁸ Their research forced Elliott Carter to reconsider previous inferences he had made about Ives's music. In 1971, Carter said, "In the *Concord Sonata*, his music seems like the work of an extraordinarily accomplished and skilled composer, particularly the 'Emerson' movement, where all the motivic material is so highly

³⁷ Gerald Abraham, *The Concise Oxford History of Music* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 824.

³⁸ See Sydney Robinson Charles, "The Use of Borrowed Material in Ives' Second Symphony," *The Music Review* 28 (May 1967): 102-11; Gordon Cyr, "Intervallic Structural Elements in Ives's Fourth Symphony," *Perspective of New Music* 9, no. 2 (Spring/Summer 1971): 291-303; Clayton Henderson, "Structural Importance of Borrowed Music in the Works of Charles Ives: A Preliminary Assessment," in *Report of the Eleventh Congress of the International Musicological Society Held at Copenhagen, 1972*, ed. Henrik Glahn, Soren Sorensen, and Peter Ryom (Copenhagen, Wilhelm Hansen, 1974), 437-46; Larry Starr, "Style and Substance: 'Ann Street' by Charles Ives," *Perspective of New Music* 15, no. 2 (Spring-Summer 1977): 23-33; Larry Starr, "The Early Styles of Charles Ives," *19th-Century Music* 7, no. 1 (Summer 1983): 71-80; Lora L. Gingerich, "A Technique for Melodic Motivic Analysis in the Music of Charles Ives," *Music Theory Spectrum* 8 (Spring 1986): 75-93; J. Philip Lambert, "Interval Cycles and Compositional Resources in the Music of Charles Ives," *Music Theory Spectrum* 12, no. 1 (Spring 1990): 43-82; J. Philip Lambert, "Aggregate Structures in the Music of Charles Ives," *Journal of Music Theory* 34, no. 1 (1990): 29-55; Larry Starr, *A Union of Diversities: Style in the Music of Charles Ives* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1992); and J. Philip Lambert, *The Music of Charles Ives* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997). Lloyd Whitesell, however, disagrees with the preceding scholars; see Lloyd Whitesell, "Reckless Form, Uncertain Audiences: Responding to Ives," *American Music* 12, no. 3 (Autumn 1994): 304-19.

organized and so closely interconnected, as are the harmonic materials.”³⁹ The change in Carter’s tone evinced a dramatic change in critical perceptions of Ives’s musical structures, but Carter remained suspicious of Ives’s borrowings⁴⁰ The last holdout of criticism of Ives’s structures would only concede his position when post-centennial Ives research discerned the inextricable link between Ives’s formal constructions and his borrowed tunes.

J. Peter Burkholder began publishing articles and books on Ives in the 1980s. His first book, *Charles Ives: The Ideas Behind the Music*, problematizes descriptions of Ives as a transcendentalist.⁴¹ Ultimately, he concludes that Ives did, in fact, adhere to transcendentalist ideas, but suggests that Ives drew on other sources of inspiration as well.⁴² Accordingly, appeals on Ives’s behalf to transcendental unity are misleading and miss the virtuosity of Ives’s compositional technique. Burkholder posits that Ives’s most significant model was nineteenth-century European music, and his next book builds on this foundation.

In 1995, Burkholder published *All Made of Tunes: Charles Ives and the Uses of Musical Borrowing*. His stated thesis is to explain how Ives used borrowed tunes to

³⁹ Allen Edwards, *Flawed Words and Stubborn Sounds: A Conversation with Elliott Carter* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1971), 63.

⁴⁰ In 1969, Carter complained of a “disturbing lack of musical and stylistic continuity” in Ives’s music; in 1971, he described it as “the work of an extraordinarily accomplished and skilled composer.” Without context, the two descriptions are incompatible. Both interviews with Carter reveal a more nuanced opinion than a single sentence is capable of summarizing; however, the two quotes are juxtaposed to show Carter’s ambivalence, which was representative of many critics and scholars. Perlis, *Charles Ives Remembered*, 145, and Edwards, *Flawed Words and Stubborn Sounds*, 63.

⁴¹ J. Peter Burkholder, “Ives and Transcendentalism: A Second Look,” in *Charles Ives: The Ideas Behind the Music* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985), 20-32.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 31.

create structural unity. Burkholder outlines fourteen compositional procedures with which Ives constructed pieces from borrowed tunes, and Burkholder coins the terms “cumulative form” and “cumulative setting” to describe the most significant of these procedures.⁴³ He defines cumulative form as “a thematic, non-repetitive form in which the principal theme is presented, not at the beginning as in traditional forms, but near the end, and is preceded, not followed, by its development.”⁴⁴ A cumulative setting is a variant of cumulative form constructed of a borrowed tune: “In a cumulative setting, the borrowed or paraphrased theme is first heard in fragments, often varied; is gradually assembled and clarified; and appears in full for the first time near the end of the movement.”⁴⁵ Burkholder’s description amplifies and systematizes the same structural descriptions that Bellamann and Cowell published while Ives was still alive. The meticulousness of Burkholder’s scholarship matches and illuminates Ives’s painstaking dedication to composition.

Burkholder’s scholarship is representative of a larger body of Ives literature that ultimately changed the narrative of Ives’s compositional prowess over the past two decades. Although Ives was once labeled an amateur, Burkholder contends that he is now “as much a part of the European tradition of art music as [are] Mahler, Debussy, Schoenberg, Bartók, Stravinsky, Berg, and the other progressive composers of the

⁴³ Burkholder, *All Made of Tunes*, 3-4.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 137. Burkholder suggests that in Ives’s oeuvre only the “Concord” Sonata can be accurately called a “cumulative form.” Other pieces that employ the same structure borrow their themes from preexisting material and are, therefore, “cumulative settings.” *Ibid.*, 195.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 138.

time.”⁴⁶ Elliott Carter’s about-face is representative of the wider musical establishment’s change of heart and illustrates Ives’s transition from the periphery to the center of the collective musical consciousness. In 1996, Geoffrey Block summarized Ives’s canonization and Carter’s conversion as synonymous: “Carter altered his original view of the *Concord Sonata*,” and, thus, “admitted Ives into the pantheon of ‘organic’ composers in the Beethoven tradition.”⁴⁷

Teleological Genesis in Sibelius’s Symphonies

As early as 1910, Jean Sibelius lamented in a letter to his German publisher that critics misunderstood his symphonies’ structures. In his correspondence with Robert Lienau, Sibelius wrote, “People seem not to notice the architectonically solid form my compositions have. Probably they believe that I just wrote them down that way.”⁴⁸ Sibelius’s insecurities, which grew for the remainder of his life, stemmed from the nationalistic and specifically Finnish descriptions that German, English, and American critics emphasized in their writings while neglecting to remark on form. Particularly in England, critics used nationalistic and romantic descriptors to contrast Sibelius’s music with the progressive modernism of the Central European avant-garde.⁴⁹ Sibelius’s anxiety over the recognition of his symphonic structures foreshadowed an enduring debate that

⁴⁶ J. Peter Burkholder, “Ives and the Nineteenth-Century European Tradition,” in *Charles Ives and the Classical Tradition*, ed. Geoffrey Block and J. Peter Burkholder (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996), 11.

⁴⁷ Geoffrey Block, *Ives: Concord Sonata*, Cambridge Music Handbooks (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 15.

⁴⁸ Letter to Robert Lienau, May 16, 1910. Quoted in Tomi Mäkelä, *Jean Sibelius*, trans. Steven Lindberg (Rochester, NY: Boydell, 2011), 265.

⁴⁹ See Chapter 2, “Sibelius as a Finnish Composer.”

has pervaded his reception history. Subsequent critics and scholars have frequently discussed the issue of form in his symphonies. Their deliberations about structure have sought not only to elucidate Sibelius's music, but, more significantly, to evaluate him as a composer.

Coalescing Fragments or a Language Metaphor

At the height of the Sibelius Cult of the 1930s, Cecil Gray's writings established two different vocabularies for discussing Sibelius's formal innovations. In 1931, Gray published a biography titled *Sibelius*, which introduced the concept of "coalescing fragments," an idea that played a particularly important role in Sibelius scholarship of the 1940s and 1950s.⁵⁰ In 1935, Gray refined and extended the concept in his analyses of the composer's symphonies in *Sibelius: The Symphonies*. One year later, Gray wrote an essay titled *Predicaments or Music and the Future: An Essay in Constructive Criticism*.⁵¹ In this third publication, Gray introduced a linguistic metaphor that subsequent critics frequently used when comparing and contrasting Sibelius with his Central-European contemporaries.⁵² Ultimately, both of Gray's modes of interpreting Sibelius's forms attempted to anoint the composer as Beethoven's successor and to promote Sibelius's music as the paragon of twentieth-century composition; both arguments kept in line with the objectives of the wider Sibelius Cult.

⁵⁰ Cecil Gray, *Sibelius* (London: Oxford University Press, 1931), 135.

⁵¹ See *ibid.*; Cecil Gray, *Sibelius: The Symphonies* (London: Oxford University Press, H. Milford, 1935); and Cecil Gray, *Predicaments or Music and the Future: An Essay in Constructive Criticism* (London: Oxford University Press, H. Milford, 1936.)

⁵² Laura Gray first called Cecil Gray's explanation a "language metaphor" in Laura Jean Gray, "'The Symphonic Problem': Sibelius Reception in England Prior to 1950" (PhD diss., Yale University, 1997), 83-87.

Gray's 1931 biography argued two points about coalescing fragments in Sibelius's symphonic structures: first, Sibelius derived his approach from Beethoven's technique of developing motives, and, second, Sibelius's symphonies exhibited the same structural organicism as Beethoven's symphonies. In fact, when Gray explained the concept of coalescing fragments, he referred to Beethoven as Sibelius's exclusive predecessor:

Whereas in the symphony of Sibelius's predecessor the thematic material is generally introduced in an exposition, taken to pieces, dissected, and analysed in a development section, and put together again in a recapitulation, Sibelius in the first movement of the Second Symphony inverts the process, introducing 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.⁵³

Sibelius's inversion of sonata-allegro form preceded Charles Ives's similar constructions, but more importantly, Gray's description of Sibelius's formal structures carefully located Sibelius not only within a particular historical narrative, but also as a part of the *telos* toward which that particular narrative progressed. And although he was cautious not to directly equate Sibelius with Beethoven, Gray argued that Sibelius's transformations of Beethoven's nineteenth-century forms justified Sibelius's place in the narrative. Gray elaborated:

I am far from suggesting that Sibelius is a mind of the same calibre as Beethoven; the resemblance is one of method and style rather than mentality, but constitutes none the less a significant indication of the growing tendency on the part of modern composers—for Sibelius is only one of a steadily increasing number—to return, after the period of spiritual inflation and depreciation of artistic values through which we have already recently been passing, to the gold standard of musical art.⁵⁴

⁵³ Gray, *Sibelius*, 134-35.

⁵⁴ Cecil Gray, "Music: Sibelius," *Nation & Athenaeum*, December 4, 1926.

Gray's concept of coalescing fragments reverberated through his contemporaries' writings about Sibelius, and many followers of the Sibelius Cult assumed without question the link between Beethoven's and Sibelius's symphonic structures.⁵⁵

Nonetheless, in 1936, Gray invoked an alternative analogy for describing Sibelius's approach to form, the aims of which reiterated the intentions of his earlier analyses. Laura Gray calls his analogy a "language metaphor."⁵⁶ The comparison to language served two functions: first, it denounced contemporary composers who had completely abandoned tonality, and, second, it connected Sibelius back to Beethoven. To the first point, Cecil Gray wrote, "It is still just as possible as it ever was to say something absolutely new, vital, and original, without having to invent a new syntax, a new vocabulary, a new language, in order to do so." To connect Sibelius to Beethoven, Gray continued:

Although [Sibelius's] musical language is in large part and in essence that of Beethoven, he does not hesitate on occasion, when it suits his expressive purpose, to make use of the most daring and recondite neologisms which, however, he always succeeds in naturalizing, so to speak, and integrating into the body of accepted musical speech.⁵⁷

Although Gray's language metaphor proved too vague and imprecise to function as an analytical model, subsequent critics used similar terms to describe and defend Sibelius's symphonic structures.

In November of 1936—the same year that Gray introduced his language metaphor—George Dyson published an article on Sibelius in the *Musical Times*.

⁵⁵ Laura Gray, "Sibelius and England," in *The Sibelius Companion*, ed. Glenda Dawn Goss (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996), 300.

⁵⁶ Gray, "The Symphonic Problem," 83.

⁵⁷ Gray, *Predicaments or Music and the Future*, 279.

Revealing Gray's influence, Dyson suggested that Sibelius spoke the same language as Beethoven, but concluded that Sibelius used a familiar vocabulary in new ways.

"[Sibelius] is not modern, in the narrower sense of that term," Dyson wrote, "His vocabulary is mainly that of our classical traditions. Yet he can be angular and dissonant in a way that is all the more striking by virtue of its comparative rarity."⁵⁸ Dyson claimed that Sibelius's ability to manipulate familiar materials into novel forms elevated his music above contemporaneous atonal constructions, redefining musical modernism in order to preserve a link with the past.⁵⁹

Because they lacked specificity or careful analysis, Gray's description of coalescing fragments and his language metaphor did little to promote Sibelius's music outside of the English-speaking world. Theodore Adorno's infamous essay specifically rebutted Gray's claims, and a series of subsequent critics repeated Adorno's condemnation, shaping the narrative in Central Europe.

Like Gray, Adorno recognized the melodic fragments that Sibelius presented at the beginning of his pieces, but Adorno was critical of Sibelius's ability to develop meager motives into complete musical structures. Additionally, he was skeptical of the motives themselves. He described Sibelius's approach, sarcastically saying, "A few 'themes' are set out...not even harmonically worked out; instead, they are unison with organ pedal points, flat harmonies, and whatever else the five lines of the musical staff have to offer as means of avoiding logical chord progressions."⁶⁰ The year after Adorno first published his criticism, the composer Lazare Saminsky restated Adorno's

⁵⁸ George Dyson, "Sibelius," *Musical Times* 77, no. 1125 (November 1936), 987.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 988.

⁶⁰ Adorno, "Gloss on Sibelius," 333.

conclusions in *Music of Our Day: Essentials and Prophecies*, a book he published in the United States. Saminsky agreed that Sibelius's symphonies demonstrated no logical harmonic progression, and he described Sibelius's melodic fragments as motives "without a future."⁶¹

But Adorno was unsatisfied merely countering Gray's conclusion that Sibelius's construction of coalescing fragments linked him with Beethoven. Adorno also rejected any suggestion that it was reasonable or desirable for composers to continue writing in Beethoven's harmonic language, arguing that such a language was ethically irresponsible:

That it is possible to compose in a way that is fundamentally old-fashioned, yet completely new: that is the triumph that conformism, looking to Sibelius, begins to celebrate. ... His success is equivalent to longing for the world to be healed of its sufferings and contradictions, for a 'renewal' that lets us keep what we possess. ... It sounds absurd because the attempt to express something new using the old, decayed means is itself absurd. What is expressed is nothing at all.⁶²

Adorno accepted neither the explication of coalescing fragments nor Gray's language metaphor as a logical defense of Sibelius's symphonic structures because they were tied to tonal harmonic structures. In light of his conclusions, Adorno labeled Sibelius's symphonies "incomprehensible" and ultimately dismissed them as "trivial."⁶³

Despite Adorno's arguments to the contrary, Sibelius enthusiasts of the 1940s and 1950s continued to employ Cecil Gray's modes of interpreting Sibelius's structures. David Cherniavsky wrote the most famous and influential of these explanations in a 1942 article in *Music & Letters* that analyzed Sibelius's scores and expanded Gray's idea of

⁶¹ Lazare Saminsky, *Music of Our Day: Essentials and Prophecies*, new enlarged ed. (New York: Thomas Y. Cromwell, 1939), 193.

⁶² Adorno, "Gloss on Sibelius," 335-36.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 335.

coalescing fragments. Cherniavsky's article replaced Gray's earlier designation with the organic term "germ motives." Although, his research built on Gray's analysis, he insisted, "There is one feature in the symphonies of Sibelius which so far seems to have been rather unduly neglected. This is the employment of germ motives from which themes throughout the symphony are evolved, and which thus imparts a sense of unity to the whole work."⁶⁴ Reiterating Gray's analysis, Cherniavsky identified Sibelius's Second Symphony as the first composition to make use of the technique.⁶⁵ Next, he added newfound examples of similar motivic development in Sibelius's Fourth, Sixth, and Seventh Symphonies and his String Quartet.

Predictably, Cherniavsky described Sibelius's development of germ motives as originating from Beethoven's symphonies. He explained that Beethoven used melodic and sometimes rhythmic motives to unify individual movements and multi-movement pieces. Beethoven's purported genius—according to Cherniavsky—was his ability to balance unity and variety, a balance composers after Beethoven were unable to imitate.⁶⁶ Thus, Cherniavsky discerned that "it was left to Sibelius to develop the really organic manner of imparting unity originated by Beethoven" through "the use of germ motives."⁶⁷ Sibelius's supposed debt to Beethoven and the inability of intermediary composers to further develop Beethoven's technique allowed Cherniavsky to posit

⁶⁴ David Cherniavsky, "The Use of Germ Motives by Sibelius," *Music & Letters* 23 (1942): 1. In a 1947 essay, Cherniavsky used the term "thematic germs" instead of "germ motives." David Cherniavsky, "Special Characteristics of Sibelius's Style," in *The Music of Sibelius*, ed. Gerald Abraham (New York: Norton, 1947), 141.

⁶⁵ Cherniavsky, "The Use of Germ Motives by Sibelius," 2.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 2.

Sibelius's formal innovations as having circumvented late-nineteenth-century formal developments. Therefore, in his conclusion, Cherniavsky painted Sibelius's structures as the only improvement on Beethoven's: "This way of achieving unity by the use of germ motives is surely Sibelius's greatest contribution to form, for it has accompanied, if not actually produced, five of his greatest works." By emphasizing the importance of structure in Sibelius's symphonies, Cherniavsky challenged earlier literature on the composer that valued him according to more ambiguous qualities such as the Finnishness of his music. More significantly, though they arrived at contradictory conclusions, both Adorno and Cherniavsky evaluated Sibelius's music and his significance by assessing his formal structures.

In the early 1940s, a new incarnation of Cecil Gray's language metaphor appeared. Neville Cardus had written flattering reviews of Sibelius's music throughout the 1930s, often in florid language. But in his 1944 book *Ten Composers*, Cardus attempted to explain Sibelius's use of form in laypeople's terms. He explained, "Sibelius is puzzling at first not because of the language he uses but by his way of musical thinking. He is often elliptical; he leaves out unnecessary clauses; he composes mainly in nouns and verbs, with eloquent dashes of silence."⁶⁸ As with previous uses of the analogy, Cardus balanced tradition and innovation; he suggested that although Sibelius's syntax was novel, his language was familiar.

In the 1950s, two contradictory trends coincided. First, Cecil Gray's concept of coalescing fragments, which Cherniavsky had further developed, saturated the writings of

⁶⁸ Neville Cardus, *Ten Composers* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1944), 157.

mid-century Sibelius devotees.⁶⁹ Glenda Dawn Goss describes his theory as “much in vogue among Sibelius enthusiasts around the middle of the century.”⁷⁰ In response, however, Gray’s analysis of Sibelius’s symphonic structures came under intense musicological scrutiny for the first time. Sibelius’s celebrity had been in decline in the English-speaking world since the early 1940s, though the decline had less to with Adorno’s criticisms than with the unprecedented and ultimately unsustainable success he enjoyed in the 1930s. But in 1957, Harold Truscott issued a direct challenge to Gray’s idea of coalescing fragments.

Truscott’s article, “A Sibelian Fallacy,” specifically countered Gray’s analysis by claiming that Gray had neglected to take harmony into consideration.⁷¹ Truscott argued that in tonal idioms harmony constituted the most significant aspect of form; therefore, he rejected both Gray’s coalescing fragments theory and Cherniavsky’s description of germ motives. In 1962, M. Stuart Collins wrote an even more vicious rebuttal titled “Germ Motives and Guff.” Collins not only contradicted Gray’s and Cherniavsky’s conclusions, but he contended that their poor analyses were responsible for Sibelius’s declining reputation.⁷² Laura Gray, however, disagrees with Truscott’s final point, and, in contrast, writes that Truscott’s and Collins’s “challenge to the prevailing conceptions of Sibelius’s

⁶⁹ See Julian Herbage, “Jean Sibelius” in *The Symphony*, ed. Ralph Hill (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1949), 326-58; Wilfrid Mellers, “Sibelius and the Modern Mind,” *Music Survey* 1 (1949): 180-84; Wilfrid Mellers, “Sibelius at Ninety: A Reevaluation,” *The Listener* (December 1955): 969; and Wilfrid Mellers, “Delius, Sibelius, and Nature,” in *Romanticism and the 20th Century (from 1800)* (London, Rockliff, 1957), 123-34.

⁷⁰ Glenda Dawn Goss, *Jean Sibelius: A Guide to Research* (New York: Garland, 1998), 307.

⁷¹ Harold Truscott, “A Sibelian Fallacy,” *Chesterian* 32 (1957): 34.

⁷² See Collins, M. Stuart, “Germ Motives and Guff,” *Music Review* 23 (1962): 238-43.

music coincided with a sharp decline in his popularity in England, only temporarily offset by the centenary celebration in 1965.”⁷³ Either way—whether it was the positive or the negative appraisals—structural analyses of Sibelius’s symphonies contributed to his critical fall from grace.

Rotational Form

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, musicologists began to reconsider Sibelius’s symphonies and their structures, and they concluded that his approach to form was more thoughtful and complex than previously assumed.⁷⁴ In 1993, James Hepokoski published the most meticulous and illuminating explanation of Sibelius’s approach to form in his book *Sibelius: Symphony No. 5*. Although Hepokoski’s book centers on Sibelius’s Fifth Symphony, the constructions he identifies are traceable in many of Sibelius’s mature works. Hepokoski’s most significant contribution is his identification of “rotational form,” which he defines, writing:

Strictly considered, a rotational structure is more of a process than an architectural formula. In such a process Sibelius initially presents a relatively straightforward ‘referential statement’ of contrasting ideas. ...The referential statement may either cadence or recycle back through a transition to a second broad rotation....Each subsequent rotation may be heard as an intensified, meditative reflection on the material of the referential statement.⁷⁵

⁷³ Gray, “Sibelius in England,” 301.

⁷⁴ See Tim Howell, *Jean Sibelius: Progressive Techniques in the Symphonies and Tone-Poems*, Outstanding Dissertations in Music from British Universities (New York: Garland, 1989.); Veijo Murtomäki, *Symphonic Unity: The Development of Formal Thinking in the Symphonies of Sibelius*, trans. Henry Bacon (Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 1993); and Lorenz Luyken, ‘...aus dem Nichtigen eine Welt schaffen...’: *Studien zur Dramaturgie im symphonischen Spätwerk von Jean Sibelius* (Kassel: Bosse, 1995). Tomi Mäkelä addresses the significance of these contributions to Sibelius studies in Mäkelä, *Jean Sibelius*, 271.

⁷⁵ James Hepokoski, *Sibelius: Symphony No. 5*, Cambridge Music Handbooks (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 25.

Within these rotations, Hepokoski locates the motives that earlier Sibelius scholars called fragments, germs, or kernels. Next, Hepokoski combines rotational form with motivic development in a pattern he calls “teleological genesis.” He explains, “In its classical pattern a mere motivic gesture or hint is planted unobtrusively in an early rotation; it then grows in later rotations and is ultimately fully unfurled—as the *telos*—in the final one.”⁷⁶ As evidence of Sibelius’s intentions, Hepokoski quotes Sibelius’s diary from 1912; Sibelius wrote, “Musical thoughts—the motives, that is—are the things that must create the form and stabilize my path. ... I should like to compare the [Fifth] Symphony to a river. It is born from various rivulets that seek each other and in this way the river proceeds wide and powerful toward the sea.”⁷⁷ By identifying thematic fragments within the early cycles of Sibelius rotational forms and then tracing their development toward a climatic statement, Hepokoski’s research provides the analytical model that mid-century Sibelius scholars were unable to produce. In Hepokoski’s model, rotational form and teleological genesis are discrete, but their combination in pieces such as Sibelius’s Fifth Symphony make for intellectually stimulating and musically satisfying results.

In 2011, Tomi Mäkelä summarized the shift that Hepokoski’s research represented in Sibelius scholarship, writing, “Sibelius’ topicality in the twenty-first century is only enhanced by an attempt to present him as not necessarily a symphonist à la Beethoven but rather as an alternative modernist who composed discursively and gave new meaning to the term ‘symphony’, rather than just warming up to the old meaning.”⁷⁸

⁷⁶ Ibid., 26.

⁷⁷ Quoted in *ibid.*, 21.

⁷⁸ Mäkelä, *Jean Sibelius*, 266.

Unlike the writings of England's Sibelius Cult in the 1930, contemporary Sibelius scholarship no longer needs to link the composer with Beethoven.

Burkholder and Hepokoski

The reception histories of Charles Ives and Jean Sibelius briefly intersected in the research of J. Peter Burkholder and James Hepokoski. Although Ives and Sibelius were likely unaware of each other's formal innovations, Burkholder and Hepokoski recognized the similarities in the composers' constructions and were aware of the similar intentions of each other's research.⁷⁹ Prior to the publication of their respective analyses, Burkholder and Hepokoski compared their findings, discussed the terms "cumulative form" and "teleological genesis," and concluded that Ives and Sibelius indeed employed similar formal procedures.⁸⁰ Burkholder muses in a footnote that "the two composers provide an interesting comparison."⁸¹ Most importantly, the similar terms with which Burkholder and Hepokoski elucidate Ives's and Sibelius's structures have removed the stigma of amateurism that was once applied to their large-scale forms.

⁷⁹ Burkholder and Hepokoski explained the terms "cumulative form" and "teleological genesis" in the following: Hepokoski, *Sibelius*; James Hepokoski, "Temps Perdu: Revolutionary or Reactionary? James Hepokoski Delves into a Fundamental Paradox at the Heart of Charles Ives' Musical Style," *Musical Times* 135, no. 1822 (December 1994): 746-51; Burkholder, *All Made of Tunes*; Burkholder, "Ives and the Nineteenth-Century European Tradition," in *Charles Ives and the Classical Tradition* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996), 11-33; Hepokoski, "The Essence of Sibelius: Creation Myths and Rotational Cycles in *Luonnotar*," in *The Sibelius Companion*, ed. Glenda Dawn Goss (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1996), 121-46; and Hepokoski, "Rotations, Sketches, and the Sixth Symphony," in *Sibelius Studies*, ed. Timothy L. Jackson and Veijo Murotmäki (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 322-51.

⁸⁰ "I am grateful to Professor Burkholder both for generously sharing portions of his book with me and undertaking several enlightening conversations regarding the present essay." Hepokoski, "Temps Perdu," 751. "James Hepokoski shared his work on teleological genesis in Sibelius and Ives prior to publication and engaged me in several stimulating and useful exchanges on cumulative form and its significance." Burkholder, *All Made of Tunes*, ix.

⁸¹ Burkholder, *All Made of Tunes*, 465.

A Biological Metaphor

Critics and scholars have evaluated Charles Ives and Jean Sibelius as composers by their musical structures throughout their reception histories. Occasionally, analysts have used the term “organicism,” but more often they have written of the “unity” and “disunity” or the “homogeneity” and “heterogeneity” of Ives’s and Sibelius’s music. Ives was one of the few who questioned such criteria. “That a symphony, sonata, or jig,” he wrote, “that all nice music should end where it started, on the Doh key, is no more a natural law than that all men should die in the same town and street number in which they were born.”⁸² Despite Ives’s objections, even his most loyal advocates have assumed structural unity as an essential evaluative criterion, and at different times, they have defended the unity in his pieces with different tactics. John McGinness summarizes the evolution of their analyses, writing, “The polemical nationalistic stance put forward by Cowell that traditional (European-based) criticism could not adequately address the (American) complexities of Ives’s music, has been replaced by the polemical aesthetic stance that it can.”⁸³ Sibelius’s advocates have followed a similar path, invariably defending the composer’s musical structures, though sometimes in suspect terms.

But as Ives questioned the usefulness of an inherited tradition, so should critics who analyze his music. To locate the origin of structure as a modernist evaluative criterion, Taruskin points to a note Arnold Schoenberg attached to a tone row in the manuscript of his *Wind Quintet*, op. 26. In reference to the row, Schoenberg wrote, “I

⁸² Charles E. Ives, *Memos*, ed. John Kirkpatrick (New York: W. W. Norton, 1972), 196.

⁸³ John McGinness, “Essay: Has Modernist Criticism Failed Charles Ives?” *Music Theory Spectrum* 28, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 101.

believe Goethe would have been quite pleased with me.”⁸⁴ The note and the piece correspond to the invention of serialism—a system of composition Schoenberg devised to merge his ambitious harmonic innovations with strict, unified structures. Schoenberg’s reference was to Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s botanical writings, which conflated science with art and contributed to the concept of “organicism” in musical composition. David Montgomery writes, “From a modern standpoint [Goethe’s] conclusions must often be taken with a kindly indulgence. Nevertheless, during his lifetime various aspects of Goethe’s vision of global organicism were taken seriously and shared by intellectuals in many countries.”⁸⁵ Schoenberg’s note demonstrates that even in the early twentieth century, intellectuals took Goethe’s botanical writings seriously. As with G. W. F. Hegel and historicism, Goethe’s writings were not the exclusive provenance of the idea of organicism, but were, instead, representative of a common eighteenth-century philosophical idea that still exerts influence. Although the literature on Ives and Sibelius has only occasionally referenced Goethe’s biological metaphor, critics and scholars have consistently measured Ives and Sibelius according to modernist conceptions of structural unity—the twentieth-century’s iteration of Goethe’s theories.

⁸⁴ Richard Taruskin, “The Poietic Fallacy,” *Musical Times* 145, no. 1886 (Spring 2004): 24. “Ich glaube Goethe müsste ganz zufrieden mit mir sein.” Reinhold Brinkmann, “Correspondence,” trans. Olga Termini, *Journal of the Arnold Schoenberg Institute* 1, no. 3 (June 1977): 181.

⁸⁵ David L. Montgomery, “The Myth of Organicism: From Bad Science to Great Art,” *Musical Quarterly* 76, no. 1 (Spring 1992): 18.

Goethe's Italian Journey

In 1786, Goethe traveled to Italy and Sicily. Among other things, he intended to study the local flora during his stay presuming that Italy was where all life had begun.⁸⁶ The diary entries from his travels show the slow maturation of an idea he called the Primal Plant (*Urpflanze*), from which his theory of organicism emerged.

Early in his travels, Goethe wrote in his diary, "Here, face-to-face with this variety of plants that are new to me, the idea that it might be possible to derive all plant forms from one form becomes more and more exciting."⁸⁷ The discovery of a Primal Plant was a common ambition in European intellectual circles of the time, and the plant life of Italy stimulated Goethe's imagination. One year later, while in Palermo, he repeated the idea in similar language: "Face to face with so many new and renewed forms, my old fancy occurred to me again: Might I not discover the Primal Plant among this multitude? There must be one!"⁸⁸ Goethe continued his search for the Primal Plant, but three days after the previous entry, he recorded a novel observation. "I noticed the difference between the lower and upper leaves of a young fennel," he wrote, "It is always the same organ, but it evolved from simplicity to multiplicity."⁸⁹ Within a single plant,

⁸⁶ Montgomery calls Goethe's assumption about life's place of origin "a classicist's prejudice, if ever there was one." *Ibid.*, 20

⁸⁷ Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Die italienische Reise, Gedenkausgabe der Werke, Briefe und Gespräche* 11, ed. Ernst Beutler (Zürich: Artemis, 1949), 65. Translation in Gary W. Don, "Goethe, Boretz, and the 'Sensuous Idea,'" *Perspective of New Music* 34, no. 1 (Winter 1996): 125.

⁸⁸ Goethe, *Die italienische Reise*, 291. Translation in Gary W. Don, "Music and Goethe's Theories of Growth" (PhD diss., University of Washington, 1991), 2.

⁸⁹ Goethe, *Die italienische Reise*, 296. Translation in Don, "Music and Goethe's Theories of Growth," 3.

Goethe recognized both unity and variety. Although the fennel was not the plant for which he searched, its evolution from simplicity to complexity intrigued Goethe.

On May 17, 1787, while in Naples, Goethe wrote Johann Gottfried von Herder a letter in which he modified his earlier aspirations: “The Primal Plant is going to be the most wonderful creation in the world, for which Nature herself shall envy me. With this model and the key to it, one could go on endlessly inventing plants and know that, if they do not exist, they *could*.”⁹⁰ Whereas in his previous diary entries Goethe wrote of “discovering” the Primal Plant, in his correspondence with Herder he spoke of “creating” it. Goethe’s definition of the Primal Plant continued to evolve throughout his life.⁹¹ When he eventually accepted that no Primal Plant existed, his conception entered “into the realm of pure ideas.”⁹² As a pure idea—or as a metaphor—Goethe’s theory of organicism infiltrated a number of non-biological disciplines.

For music theory and analysis in particular, Goethe’s theorizing seemed a practical model. David Montgomery explains its value to nineteenth-century theorists, writing:

Organicism is a cohesive element. The simple, compact prototype seemed a perfect device for insuring thematic unity among movements, thus preserving and promoting the logic and rhetoric of large forms in the nineteenth-century tradition. Furthermore, with its implications of immediate and continuous variational development, the simple prototype seemed to point the way to the future of music in symphonic proportions.⁹³

⁹⁰ Goethe, *Die italienische Reise*, 413-14. Translation in Don, “Music and Goethe’s Theories of Growth,” 3-4.

⁹¹ Don, “Goethe, Boretz, and the ‘Sensuous Idea,’” 128.

⁹² Montgomery, “The Myth of Organicism,” 21.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 59.

The influence of Goethe's organicism can be traced in the writings of nineteenth-century theorists such as Moritz Hauptmann and Adolf Bernhard Marx, but it also extended into the twentieth-century dispute between Heinrich Schenker and Arnold Schoenberg.⁹⁴ In fact, throughout the twentieth century, the concept of organicism—and, correspondingly, structural unity—pervaded critical, theoretical, and musicological discourse.⁹⁵

A Real Composer

As Schoenberg wrestled with his abandonment of tonality, he realized his need of new structures with which to organize his post-tonal compositions. It was in this context that Schoenberg imagined the invention of his twelve-tone technique earning Goethe's approval. Richard Taruskin writes, "The beauty of a 12-note row... was that by furnishing a sort of quarry from which all the musical events in a composition would be hewn, it served as a sort of automatic *Grundgestalt*, absolutely insuring the sort of demonstrable organic unity on which Goethean—that is, Schoenbergian—notions of artistic quality depended."⁹⁶ Despite serialism's unsettling dissonances, Schoenberg ensured that no critic could question its structural unity.

⁹⁴ Don, "Music and Goethe's Theories of Growth," 38.

⁹⁵ Janet Levy writes, "Organicism and its related models, nature and biology, are not only pervasive; they are invasive in that they affect many other prevalent covert values—for example, such positive ones as 'economy/economical,' 'exhaustion of motive,' 'natural and idiomatic' (as in figuration or scoring), 'concentration' (as in late or mature works as opposed to early ones). Further, the entire constellation of organicist vocabulary itself tends to be used as objective description, from talk of 'flowering from seed' and 'goal-directed processes,' to 'gradual transformation,' 'fluidity,' and so on..." Janet M. Levy, "Covert and Casual Values in Recent Writings about Music," *Journal of Musicology* 5, no. 1 (Winter 1987): 4.

⁹⁶ Taruskin, "The Poietic Fallacy," 25.

While Schoenberg was living in the United States, he published an essay titled “Folkloristic Symphonies” in which he reformulated Goethe’s biological metaphor in his own words. In the essay, Schoenberg used organicism as a criterion to differentiate “real composers” from amateurs:

A real composer does not compose merely one or more themes, but a whole piece. In an apple tree’s blossoms, even in the bud, the whole future apple is present in all its details—they have only to mature, to grow, to become an apple, the apple tree, and its power of reproduction. Similarly, a real composers’ musical conception, like the physical, is one single act, comprising the totality of the product. The form in its outline, characteristic of tempo, dynamics, moods of the main and subordinate ideas, their relation, derivation, their contrasts and deviations—all these are there at once, though in embryonic state. The ultimate formulation of the melodies, themes, rhythms and many details will subsequently develop through the generating power of the germs.⁹⁷

Schoenberg’s reference to generating “germs” obviously recalls the terms with which David Cherniavsky explained the form of Jean Sibelius’s symphonies. But more subtly, Schoenberg’s prose is reminiscent of Elliott Carter’s criticism of Charles Ives’s “Concord” Sonata and Theodor Adorno’s language in his “Gloss on Sibelius.” In their writings, Carter and Adorno, like Schoenberg, used structural unity as a means of distinguishing “real” composers from those of whom they disapproved.

However powerful the use of the metaphor, there is a circular argument in their criticism. Schoenberg’s serialism functioned not only as a system of composition, but also as a system of analysis, and while that analysis could be applied to his serialism, it was irrelevant to other musics. The same is true of all inherited assumptions about structure: they are useful for evaluating the music they describe. Joseph Kerman explains

⁹⁷ Arnold Schoenberg, “Folkloristic Symphonies” (1947), in *Style and Idea: Selected Writings of Arnold Schoenberg: 60th Anniversary Edition*, ed. Leonard Stein, trans. Leo Black (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010), 165.

the limitations of structural analysis as an evaluative criterion, writing, “From the standpoint of the ruling ideology, analysis exists for the purpose of demonstrating organicism, and organicism exists for the purpose of validating a certain body of works of art.”⁹⁸ The body of works of art to which Kerman refers is the German tradition—the same tradition that devised structural analysis as an evaluative criterion. Too often the ability of Ives’s and Sibelius’s advocates to explain the composers’ music within Goethe’s theory of organicism has determined whether or not they have allowed Ives and Sibelius entry into the German tradition.

⁹⁸ Joseph Kerman, “How We Got into Analysis, and How to Get Out,” *Critical Inquiry* 7, no. 2 (Winter 1980): 315.

EPILOGUE

Although there is little doubt that modernist criticism has played a significant role in the reception histories of Charles Ives and Jean Sibelius, the validity of influence, innovation, and structure as contemporary evaluative criteria is less certain. In light of their inability to evaluate musics apart from those of the Common-Practice in Central and Western Europe, an even more significant question emerges: if not influence, innovation, and structure, what constitutes useful evaluative criteria for twenty-first century musicologists studying twentieth-century music? Rather than venture an answer, I am eager to acknowledge the ultimate subjectivity of all aesthetic judgments.

In 1999, Leo Treitler issued a challenge to twenty-first-century musicologists, writing, “Now that we have lost our *naïveté* and know that we do not establish history merely by means of objective research and the rules of reason, but that we create it, we need to be aware of the interests that lead us to create it in particular ways.”¹ The same can be said not only of our historiographies, but also of our aesthetic judgments. We have lost our *naïveté*. We have lost the pretense of objectivity. And because musicologists necessarily make value judgments, we must be aware of the biases we bring.

Issues of influence, innovation, and structure constitute three of most significant conversations in recent Ives literature. J. Peter Burkholder’s writings are representative of a body of literature that challenges earlier narratives that omitted the influence of European Romanticism on Ives. In contrast to Henry Cowell’s biographical writings, Burkholder argues that Ives belongs in the same genealogy as his European contemporaries. There was a time in recent history when Ives needed a European

¹ Leo Treitler, “The Historiography of Music: Issues of Past and Present,” in *Rethinking Music*, ed. Nicholas Cook and Mark Everist (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 356.

pedigree in order to retain his canonicity; however, that is no longer the case. Instead, the tension between the images of Ives presented by Cowell and by Burkholder only increases our capacity for understanding a complicated composer; Ives's music needs neither narrative to retain its significance.

Maynard Solomon initiated the recent discourse on Ives's innovations, and, seemingly, all scholarship on Ives since has had to navigate the issues of Ives's datings and innovations that Solomon raised. Gayle Sherwood Magee's revised chronology—one of the most significant outcomes of Solomon's article—has opened new avenues of research. For example, Ives's development as a composer and the significance of different genres in different periods of his life can be reevaluated.² But the value of Ives's music remains unchanged whether or not he was “the great American innovator.”³

Finally, recent musicologists have demonstrated the high level of craftsmanship with which Ives structured his music. Again, Burkholder's scholarship is representative. But Burkholder's book *All Made of Tunes: Charles Ives and the Uses of Musical Borrowing* is important not because it validates Ives's musical structures, but because it illuminates Ives's structures. In fact, the recent discourse on each influence, innovation, and structure has significantly expanded our understanding of Ives and his music, but the

² Gayle Sherwood Magee used her revised chronology of Ives's choral works to propose two choral periods in his oeuvre. Gayle Sherwood, “Redating Ives's Choral Sources,” in *Ives Studies*, ed. Philip Lambert (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 84-94.

³ Burkholder says that it was Henry Cowell who originally created the image of Ives “the great American innovator.” J. Peter Burkholder, “Charles Ives and His Fathers: A Response to Maynard Solomon,” *Institute for Studies in American Music Newsletter* 18, no. 1 (November 1988): 10-11.

same discourse has failed to “prove the worthiness of Ives’s music.”⁴ Again, validation of Ives’s music is outside of the capacity of influence, innovation, and structure as evaluative criteria.

Similarly, Richard Taruskin’s three tenets of modernist criticism are three of the most significant issues in Sibelius scholarship. The claims of composers from Magnus Lindberg to Julian Anderson have encouraged musicologists to question the narratives that portrayed Sibelius as an exclusively Finnish composer and to reexamine his influence on spectralist and minimalist composers. Alex Ross’s treatment of Sibelius in his critically-acclaimed book *The Rest is Noise: Listening to the Twentieth Century* disseminates their reevaluations of Sibelius to a wider audience.⁵ But influence, which Taruskin calls a “neutral” criterion, is similarly subject to the constructions of historians.⁶ As demonstrated by early Sibelius enthusiasts in England, narratives of influence can be contorted to make questionable value judgments.

Tim Howell’s recent rebranding of the composer as “Sibelius the Progressive” adds new categories with which to describe Sibelius’s innovations; specifically, Howell discusses Sibelius’s innovative approach to timescale. Similarly, James Hepokoski’s scholarship explains Sibelius’s innovative approach to structure. The growing body of

⁴ I borrow the phrase from John McGinness, who writes, “The burgeoning business of the Ives revival had been in full swing since the centennial of the 1970s, the main occupation of which has been to prove the worthiness of Ives’s music, to remove the stigma of its ‘outsider’ status.” John McGinness, “Essay: Has Modernist Criticism Failed Charles Ives?” *Music Theory Spectrum* 28, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 99.

⁵ See Alex Ross, “Apparition from the Woods: The Loneliness of Jean Sibelius,” in *The Rest is Noise: Listening to the Twentieth Century* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007), 157-77.

⁶ Richard Taruskin, “The Poietic Fallacy,” *The Musical Times* 145, no. 1886 (Spring 2004): 11.

Sibelius literature demystifies Sibelius's music As with Burkholder's scholarship on Ives, Howell's and Hepokoski's scholarship increases our understanding of Sibelius's music, but fails to prove the worthiness of Sibelius's music.

My purpose in this thesis is not to criticize the scholarship of the musicologists mentioned above. Instead, my purpose is to demonstrate the limitations of influence, innovation, and structure as evaluative criteria. As a mode of evaluation, modernist criticism is limited to Common-Practice music from Central and Western Europe. It was conceived in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as a means of validating Central-European works of art, which were already considered masterpieces. In his 1980 article "How We Got into Analysis, and How to Get Out," Joseph Kerman pointed out that using theoretical analysis to make value judgments is simply begging the question. Although he restricted his critique to structural analyses, his argument can be extended to include studies of influence and innovation as well. "This branch of criticism," Kerman wrote, "takes the masterpiece status of its subject matter as a *donnée*. ...Aesthetic judgment is concentrated tacitly on the initial choice of material to be analyzed."⁷ Schoenberg's music ranks high according to modernist criticism because it was conceived to meet that criticism's requirements. But the music of Ives and Sibelius is more problematic, as Ives and Sibelius scholars have long recognized. Although John McGinness criticizes Burkholder's scholarship for working within the constraints of influence, innovation, and structure, Burkholder happily acknowledges the limitations of structural analysis when he writes of Ives's Fourth Symphony, "We literally cannot understand this music completely. There is too much in it, too many things to grasp all at

⁷ Joseph Kerman, "How We Got into Analysis, and How to Get Out," *Critical Inquiry* 7, no. 2 (Winter 1980): 313.

once. That is its point, for it represents events that cannot be fully comprehended or described, only experienced.”⁸

So I end this thesis with a question and a challenge, which I borrow from Kerman. He critiqued of the criterion of structural “organicism,” but the term can easily be replaced with McGinness’s “Modernist Criticism.” Kerman wrote, “For however heavily we may weight the criterion of organicism in dealing with the masterpieces of German instrumental music, we know that it is less important for other music that we value.” Kerman concluded, “Cannot a criticism be developed that will explain, validate, or just plain illuminate these other musical traditions?”⁹ Because modernist criticism is intended to validate a specific tradition of Central-European “masterpieces,” we must find new ways to assess the delightful peculiarities of Charles E. Ives’s and Jean Sibelius’s music.

⁸ J. Peter Burkholder, *All Made of Tunes: Charles Ives and the Uses of Musical Borrowing* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), 409.

⁹ Kerman, “How We Got into Analysis, and How to Get Out,” 320.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abraham, Gerald, ed. *The Music of Sibelius*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1947.
- . *The Concise Oxford History of Music*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Adorno, Theodor W. *Introduction to the Sociology of Music*. Translated by E. B. Ashton. New York: Seabury, 1976.
- . "On the Problem of Musical Analysis." Translated by Max Paddison. *Musical Analysis* 1, no. 2 (July 1982): 169-87.
- . *Philosophy of Modern Music*. Translated by Anne G. Mitchell and Wesley V. Blomster. New York: Continuum, 1994.
- . *Essays on Music*. Edited by Richard Leppert. Translated by Susan H. Gillespie. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Allen, Warren Dwight. *Philosophies of Music History*. New York: American Book, 1939.
- Auner, Joseph. "Proclaiming the Mainstream: Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern." In *The Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century Music*, edited by Nicholas Cook and Anthony Pople, 228-59. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Austin, William W. *Music in the 20th Century*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1966.
- . "Ives and Histories." In *Bericht über den internationalen musikwissenschaftlichen Kongress Bonn 1970*, edited by Carl Dahlhaus, Hans Joachim Marx, Magda Marx-Weber, and Günther Massenkeil, 299-303. Kassel, Germany: Bärenreiter, 1971.
- Barnett, Andrew. *Sibelius*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Baron, Carol K. "Dating Ives's Music: Facts and Fictions." *Perspectives of New Music* 28, no. 1 (Winter 1990): 20-56.
- . "Father Knew (and filled me up with) Bach': Bach and Ives—Affinities in Lines and Spaces." In *Bach Perspectives 5: Bach in America*, edited by Stephen A. Crist, 151-77. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003.
- Bellmann, Henry. "Notes on the New Aesthetic of Poetry and Music." *Musical Quarterly* 9, no. 2 (April 1923): 260-70.

- "Program Notes." Pro Musica Concert, January 29, 1927. Charles Ives Papers. Mss. 14, folder 2, box 50. Irving S. Gilmore Library, Yale University, New Haven, CT.
- "The Music of Charles Ives." *Pro Musica Quarterly* (March 27, 1927): 16-22.
- "Charles Ives: The Man and His Music." *Musical Quarterly* 19, no. 1 (January 1933): 45-58.
- Block, Geoffrey. *Charles Ives: A Bio-Bibliography*. Bio-Bibliographies in Music 14. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1988.
- *Ives: Concord Sonata*. Cambridge Music Handbooks. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Block, Geoffrey and J. Peter Burkholder, eds. *Charles Ives and the Classical Tradition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Blum, Fred. *Jean Sibelius: An International Bibliography on the Occasion of the Centennial Celebrations, 1965*. Detroit: Information Service, 1965.
- Boatwright, Howard. "Ives' Quarter-Tone Impressions." *Perspectives of New Music* 3, no. 2 (Spring-Summer 1965): 22-31.
- Bonds, Mark Evan. "Idealism and the Aesthetics of Instrumental Music at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 50, no. 2/3 (Summer-Autumn 1997): 387-420.
- Brendel, Franz. "Zur Einleitung." *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 22, no. 1 and 2 (January 1, 1845): 1-12.
- "Robert Schumann mit Rücksicht auf Mendelssohn-Bartholdy und die Entwicklung der modernen Tonkunst überhaupt." *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 22, no. 15 (February 19, 1845): 63-67.
- "Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft der Oper. Dritter Artikel. Zukunft." *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 24, no. 15 (February 19, 1846): 57-60.
- "Fragen der Zeit. II. Die Ereignisse der Gegenwart in ihrem Einfluß auf die Gestaltung der Kunst." *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 28, no. 33 (April 22, 1848): 191-96.

- "Fragen der Zeit. IV. Der Fortschritt." *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 29, no. 37 (November 4, 1848): 213-17.
- "Die Stufenfolge der Künste im Fortgang der Weltgeschichte." *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 31, no. 5 (July 15, 1849): 21-24.
- "Zum neuen Jahre." *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 34, no. 1 (January 3, 1851): 1-7.
- *Geschichte der Musik in Italien, Deutschland und Frankreich: von den ersten christlichen Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*. Leipzig: Bruno Hinze, 1852.
- "Ein Ausflug nach Weimar." *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 36, no. 4 (January 23, 1852): 37-47.
- "Die bisherige Sonderkunst und das Kunstwerk der Zukunft." *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 38, no. 10 (March 4, 1853): 101-05.
- *Die Musik der Gegenwart, und die Gesamtkunst der Zukunft*. Leipzig: Bruno Hinze, 1854.
- "Franz Liszt in Leipzig." *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 46, no. 10 (March 6, 1857): 101-05.
- "Die Aesthetik der Tonkunst." *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 46, no. 18 (May 1, 1857): 185-86.
- "Zeitgemäße Betrachtungen." *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 49, no. 2 (July 9, 1858): 19-20.
- "F. Liszt's symphonische Dichtungen." *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 49, no. 9 (August 27, 1858): 85-88.
- *Franz Liszt als Symphoniker*. Leipzig: C. Merseberger, 1859.
- *Grundzüge der Geschichte der Musik*. Leipzig: Heinrich Matthes (R. O. Schurmann), 1861.
- *Geschichte der Musik in Italien, Deutschland und Frankreich: von den ersten christlichen Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*. 4th ed. Leipzig: Heinrich Matthes (E. O. Schurmann), 1867.
- Brinkmann, Reinhold. "Correspondence." Translated by Olga Termini. *Journal of the Arnold Schoenberg Institute* 1, no. 3 (June 1977): 181-85.
- Broyles, Michael. *Mavericks and Other Traditions in American Music*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004.

- Budiansky, Stephen. *Mad Music: Charles Ives, the Nostalgic Rebel*. Lebanon, NH: ForeEdge, 2014.
- Bujić, Bojan, ed. *Music in European Thought 1851-1921*. Cambridge Readings in the Literature of Music. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Bukoff, Ronald Nick. "Charles Ives, a History and Bibliography of Criticism (1920-1939), and Ives' Influence (to 1947) on Bernard Herrmann, Elie Siegmeister, and Robert Palmer." PhD diss., Cornell University, 1988.
- Bullock, Philip Ross, ed. *The Correspondence of Jean Sibelius and Rosa Newmarch, 1906-1939*. Rochester, NY: Boydell, 2011.
- Burk, James Mack. *A Charles Ives Omnibus*. Edited by Michael J. Budds. *Monographs and Bibliographies in American Music* 18. Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon, 2008.
- Burkholder, J. Peter. "The Evolution of Charles Ives's Music: Aesthetics, Quotation, Technique." PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1983.
- "Museum Pieces: The Historicist Mainstream in Music of the Last Hundred Years." *Journal of Musicology* 2, no. 2 (Spring 1983): 115-34.
- *Charles Ives: The Ideas Behind the Music*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985.
- "'Quotation' and Emulation: Charles Ives's Uses of His Models." *Musical Quarterly* 71, no. 1 (1985): 1-26.
- "'Quotation' and Paraphrase in Ives's Second Symphony." *19th-Century Music* 11, no. 1 (Summer 1987): 3-25.
- "Charles Ives and His Fathers: A Response to Maynard Solomon." *Institute for Studies in American Music Newsletter* 18, no. 1 (November 1988): 8-11.
- "The Critique of Tonality in the Early Experimental Music of Charles Ives." *Music Theory Spectrum* 12, no. 2 (Autumn 1990): 203-223.
- *All Made of Tunes: Charles Ives and the Uses of Musical Borrowing*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.
- *A History of Western Music*. 9th ed. New York: W. W. Norton, 2014.
- Burkholder, J. Peter, ed. *Charles Ives and His World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.

- Burnham, Scott. "The Role of Sonata Form in A. B. Marx's Theory of Form." *Journal of Music Theory* 33, no. 2 (Autumn 1989): 247-71.
- Busoni, Ferruccio. *Sketch of a New Esthetic of Music*. Translated Theodor Baker. New York: G. Schirmer, 1911.
- Cardus, Neville. *Ten Composers*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1944.
- Carter, Elliott. *Collected Essays and Lectures, 1937-1995*. Edited by Jonathan W. Bernard. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1997.
- Clark, Suzannah and Alexander Rehding, eds. *Music Theory and Natural Order from the Renaissance to the Early Twentieth Century*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Charles, Sydney Robinson. "The Use of Borrowed Material in Ives' Second Symphony." *Music Review* 28, no. 2 (May 1967): 102-11.
- Chase, Gilbert. *America's Music: From the Pilgrims to the Present*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955.
- Cherlin, Michael. "Hauptmann and Schenker: Two Adaptations of Hegelian Dialectics." *Theory and Practice* 13 (1988): 115-31.
- Cherniavsky, David. "The Use of Germ Motives by Sibelius." *Music & Letters* 23, no. 1 (1942): 1-9.
- Collins, M. Stuart. "Germ Motives and Guff." *Music Review* 23 (1962): 238-43.
- Cook, Nicholas and Mark Everist, eds. *Rethinking Music*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Cowell, Henry. "American Composers IX: Charles Ives." *Modern Music* 10, no. 1 (November-December 1932): 24-32.
- Cowell, Henry, ed. *American Composers on American Music*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1933.
- Cowell, Henry and Sidney Cowell. *Charles Ives and His Music*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.
- Cox, Frank. "Musical Progress? New Music and Perils of Progressivist Historicism." In *The Foundations of Contemporary Composition, New Music and Aesthetics in the 21st Century* 3, edited by Claus-Steffen Mahnkopf, 11-34. Hofheim, Germany: Wolke, 2004.

- Crocker, Richard L. *A History of Musical Style*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1966.
- Crunden, Robert M. "Review Essay: On Charles Ives." *Modernism/Modernity* 4, no. 3 (September 1997): 154-59.
- Cyr, Gordon. "Intervallic Structural Elements in Ives's Fourth Symphony." *Perspective of New Music* 9, no. 2 (1971): 291-303.
- Dahlhaus, Carl. *Analysis and Value Judgment*. Translated by Siegmund Levarie. New York: Pendragon, 1983.
- . *Foundations of Music History*. Translated by J. B. Robinson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- . *Schoenberg and the New Music: Essays by Carl Dahlhaus*. Translated by Derrick Puffett and Alfred Clayton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Davidson, Audrey. "Transcendental Unity in the Works of Charles Ives." *American Quarterly* 22, no. 1 (Spring 1970): 35-44.
- Davis, Ronald L. "MacDowell and Ives." In *A History of Music in American Life*, vol. 2, *The Gilded Years, 1865-1920*, 108-38. Huntington, NY: Robert Krieger, 1980.
- Don, Gary W. "Goethe and Schenker." *In Theory Only* 10, no. 8 (1988): 1-14.
- . "Music and Goethe's Theories of Growth." PhD diss., University of Washington, 1991.
- . "Goethe, Boretz, and the 'Sensuous Idea.'" *Perspectives of New Music* 34, no. 1 (Winter 1996): 124-39.
- Downes, Olin. *Sibelius the Symphonist*. New York: The Philharmonic-Symphony Society of New York, 1956.
- Dyson, George. "Sibelius." *Musical Times* 77, no. 1125 (November 1936): 987-89.
- Edgar, Andrew. "Adorno and Musical Analysis." *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 57, no. 4 (Autumn 1999), 439-49.
- Edwards, Allen. *Flawed Words and Stubborn Sounds: A Conversation with Elliott Carter*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1971.
- Feder, Stuart. *Charles Ives, "My Father's Song": A Psychoanalytic Biography*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.

- . "Homesick in America: The Nostalgia of Antonin Dvorrák and Charles Ives," in *Dvořák in America, 1892-95*, edited by John C. Tibbetts, 175-92. Portland, OR: Amadeus, 1993.
- Gann, Kyle. *American Music in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Schirmer, 1997.
- Gibbens, John Jeffrey. "Debussy's Impact on Ives: An Assessment." DMA diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1985.
- Gingerich, Lora L. "Processes of Motivic Transformation in the Keyboard and Chamber Music of Charles E. Ives." PhD diss., Yale University, 1986.
- . "A Technique for Melodic Motivic Analysis in the Music of Charles Ives." *Music Theory Spectrum* 8 (Spring 1986): 75-93.
- Gleissner, Ruth-Maria. "Der unpolitische Komponist als Politikum: die Rezeption von Jean Sibelius im NS-Staat." PhD diss., Heidelberg University, 2001.
- Goehr, Lydia. *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Die italienische Reise, Gedenkausgabe der Werke, Briefe und Gespräche* 11. Edited by Ernst Beutler. Zürich: Artemis, 1949.
- . *Goethe's Botanical Writings*. Translated by Bertha Mueller. Introduction by Charles J. Engard. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1952.
- Goss, Glenda Dawn. *Jean Sibelius and Olin Downes: Music, Friendship, Criticism*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1994.
- . *Jean Sibelius: A Guide to Research*. New York: Garland, 1998.
- . *Sibelius: A Composer's Life and the Awakening of Finland*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- Goss, Glenda Dawn, ed. *The Sibelius Companion*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1996.
- Graubart, Michael. "Fallacies and Confusions." *Musical Times* 145, no. 1888 (Autumn 2004): 19-24.
- Gray, Cecil. *A Survey of Contemporary Music*. London: Oxford University Press, H. Milford, 1924.
- . *Sibelius*. London: Oxford University Press, 1931.
- . *Sibelius: The Symphonies*. London: Oxford University Press, H. Milford, 1935.

- . *Predicaments or Music and the Future: An Essay in Constructive Criticism*. London: Oxford University Press, H. Milford, 1936.
- Gray, Laura Jean. “‘The Symphonic Problem’: Sibelius Reception in England Prior to 1950.” PhD diss., Yale University, 1997.
- Grimley, Daniel M., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Sibelius*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . *Jean Sibelius and His World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011.
- Grout, Donald Jay. *A History of Western Music*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1960.
- Grout, Donald Jay and Claude V. Palisca. *A History of Western Music*. 3rd. ed. New York: W. W. Norton, 1980.
- . *A History of Western Music*. 6th ed. New York, W. W. Norton, 2001.
- Gur, Golan. “Schoenberg and the Ideology of Progress in Twentieth-Century Music Thinking.” *Search: Journal for New Music and Culture* 5 (Summer 2009): 1-11.
- . “The Spectre of the End: Musical Avant-Gardism and the Philosophical Turn.” *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music* 42, no. 2 (December 2011): 267-84.
- . “Music and ‘Weltanschauung’: Franz Brendel and the Claims of Universal History.” *Music & Letters* 93, no. 3 (August 2012): 350-73.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Aesthetics: Lecture on Fine Art*. 2 vols. Translated by T. M. Knox. Oxford: Clarendon, 1975.
- . *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History: Introduction, Reason in History*. Translated by H. B. Nisbet. Introduction by Duncan Forbes. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Henderson, Clayton, “Structural Importance of Borrowed Music in the Works of Charles Ives: A Preliminary Assessment.” In *Report of the Eleventh Congress of the International Musicological Society Held at Copenhagen, 1972*, ed. Henrik Glahn, Soren Sorensen, and Peter Ryom, 437-46. Copenhagen: Wilhelm Hansen, 1974.
- Helms, Hans G. “Der Komponist Charles Ives: Leben, Werk und Einfluß auf die heutige Generation.” *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 125, no. 10 (October 1964): 425-33.
- . “Über statistisches Komponieren bei Charles Ives.” *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 127, no. 3 (March 1966): 90-93.

- Hepokoski, James. *Sibelius: Symphony No. 5*. Cambridge Music Handbooks. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . "Temps Perdu: Revolutionary or Reactionary? James Hepokoski Delves into a Fundamental Paradox at the Heart of Charles Ives' Musical Style." *Musical Times* 135, no. 1822 (December 1994): 746-51.
- Herbage, Julian. "Jean Sibelius." In *The Symphony*, edited by Ralph Hill, 326-58. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1949.
- Herz, Gerhard. "Toward a New Image of Bach." *Bach* 1, no. 4 (October 1970): 9-27.
- Hitchcock, H. Wiley. *Music in the United States: A Historical Introduction*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- . *Ives*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Hitchcock, H. Wiley and Noel Zahler. "Just What *Is* Ives's Unanswered Question?" *Notes*, Second Series 44, no. 3 (March 1988): 437-43.
- Hitchcock, H. Wiley and Vivian Perlis, eds. *An Ives Celebration: Papers and Panels of the Charles Ives Centennial Festival-Conference*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977.
- Howell, Tim. *Jean Sibelius: Progressive Techniques in the Symphonies and Tone-Poems*. Outstanding Dissertations in Music from British Universities. New York: Garland, 1989.
- . *After Sibelius: Studies in Finnish Music*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006.
- Huttunen, Matti, Kari Kilpeläinen, and Veijo Murtomäki, eds. *Sibelius Forum II: Proceedings from the Third International Jean Sibelius Conference, Helsinki, December 7-10, 2000*. Helsinki: Sibelius Academy, Department of Composition and Music Theory, 2003.
- Ives, Charles E. *Essays Before a Sonata, and Other Writings*. Edited by Howard Boatwright. New York: W. W. Norton, 1962.
- . *Memos*. Edited by John Kirkpatrick. New York: W. W. Norton, 1972.
- . *Selected Correspondence of Charles Ives*. Edited by Tom C. Owens. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- Jackson, Timothy L. "Thierfelder's 1935 Open Letter to Sibelius and Adorno's Critique—Some Preliminary Observations." In *Säteitä 2010: Sävellyksen ja*

- musiikinteorian osaston vuosikirja 2*, edited by Veijo Murtomäki, 19-42. Helsinki: Aalto-Print, 2010.
- Jackson, Timothy L. and Veijo Murtomäki, eds. *Sibelius Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Jackson, Timothy L., Veijo Murtomäki, Colin Davis, and Timo Virtanen, eds. *Sibelius in the Old and the New World: Aspects of His Music, Its Interpretation, and Reception*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2010.
- Jacobson, Bernard. "The 'In' Composers: Mahler, Ives, Nielsen, Sibelius, Vivaldi, Berlioz—Are They Permanent Classics or Just Temporary Fads?" *High Fidelity/Musical America* 19, no. 7 (July 1969): 54-47.
- Johnson, Harold E. *Jean Sibelius*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959.
- Kalbeck, Max. *Johannes Brahms*, vol. 1. Vienna: Weiner, 1904.
- Kerman, Joseph. "How We Got into Analysis, and How to Get Out." *Critical Inquiry* 7, no. 2 (Winter 1980): 311-31.
- . *Contemplating Music: Challenges to Musicology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Kirkpatrick, John. *A Temporary Mimeographed Catalogue of the Music Manuscripts and Related Materials of Charles Edward Ives (1874-1954)*. New Haven, CT: Library of the Yale School of Music, 1960.
- . "Ives, Transcendentalist in Music." Typescript for talk given October 26, 1961. John Kirkpatrick Papers. Mss. 56, folder 568, box 61. Irving S. Gilmore Music Library, Yale University. New Haven, CT.
- Korsyn, Kevin. *Decentering Music: A Critique of Contemporary Musical Research*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Kropfinger, Klaus. *Wagner and Beethoven: Richard Wagner's Reception of Beethoven*. Translated by Peter Palmer. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Krukowski, Lucian. "Hegel, 'Progress,' and the Avant-Garde." *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 44, no. 3 (Spring 1986): 279-90.
- Lambert, Constant. "The Symphonies of Sibelius." *Dominant* 2 (May/June 1929): 14-27.
- . *Music Ho!: A Study of Music in Decline*. London: Faber and Faber, 1934.

- Lambert, J. Philip. "Compositional Procedures in the Experimental Works of Charles Ives." PhD diss., Eastman School of Music, 1987.
- "Communications." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 42, no. 1 (Spring 1989): 204-09.
- "Interval Cycles as Compositional Resources in the Music of Charles Ives." *Music Theory Spectrum* 12, no. 1 (Spring 1990): 43-82.
- "Aggregate Structures in the Music of Charles Ives." *Journal of Music Theory* 34, no. 1 (1990): 29-55.
- *The Music of Charles Ives. Composers of the 20th Century*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Lambert, Philip, ed. *Ives Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Lambourn, David. "Grainger and Ives." *Studies in Music* 20 (1986): 46-61.
- Layton, Robert. *Sibelius*. New York: Schirmer, 1993.
- Leibowitz, René. *Sibelius, le plus mauvais compositeur du monde*. Liège: Éditions Dynamo, 1955.
- *Schoenberg and His School: The Contemporary Stage of the Language of Music*. Translated by Dika Newlin. New York: Da Capo, 1970.
- Levy, Janet M. "Covert and Casual Values in Recent Writings about Music" *Journal of Musicology* 5, no. 1 (Winter 1987): 3-27.
- Luyken, Lorenz. '...aus dem Nichtigen eine Welt schaffen...': *Studien zur Dramaturgie im symphonischen Spätwerk von Jean Sibelius*. Kassel: Bosse, 1995.
- Mäkelä, Tomi. *Jean Sibelius*. Translated by Steven Lindberg. Rochester, NY: Boydell, 2011.
- Magee, Gayle Sherwood: *see also* Sherwood, Gayle.
- Magee, Gayle Sherwood. *Charles Ives Reconsidered*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008.
- *Charles Ives: A Research and Information Guide*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Magee, Glenn Alexander. *The Hegel Dictionary*. New York: Continuum, 2010.

- Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. *Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei*. London: Office der Bildungs-Gesellschaft für Arbeiter, 1848.
- Massey, Drew. "The Problem of Ives's Revisions, 1973-1987." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 60, no. 3 (Fall 2007): 599-645.
- . *John Kirkpatrick, American Music, and the Printed Page*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2013.
- McDonald, Matthew. *Breaking Time's Arrow: Experiment and Expression in the Music of Charles Ives*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2014.
- McGinness, John. "Essay: Has Modernist Criticism Failed Charles Ives?" *Music Theory Spectrum* 28, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 99-109.
- Mellers, Wilfrid. "Sibelius and the Modern Mind." *Music Survey* 1 (1949): 180-84.
- . "Sibelius at Ninety: A Revaluation." *Listener* (December 1955): 969.
- . *Romanticism and the 20th Century, from 1800*. London: Rockliff, 1957.
- . *Music in a New Found Land: Themes and Developments in the History of American Music*. London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1964.
- Meyer, Leonard B. *Music, the Arts, and Ideas: Patterns and Predictions in Twentieth-Century Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- Meyer, Michael. *The Politics of Music in the Third Reich*. New York: Peter Lang, 1991.
- Montgomery, David L. "The Myth of Organicism: From Bad Science to Great Art." *Musical Quarterly* 76, no. 1 (Spring 1992): 17-66.
- Morgan, Robert P. "Rewriting Music History: Second Thoughts on Ives and Varèse." *Musical Newsletter* 3, no. 1 (January 1973): 3-12.
- . "Ives and Mahler: Mutual Responses at the End of an Era." *19th-Century Music* 2, no. 1 (July 1978): 72-81.
- . *Twentieth-Century Music: A History of Musical Style in Modern Europe and America*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1991.
- Molino, Jean. "Musical Fact and the Semiology of Music." Translated by J. A. Underwood. Introduction by Craig Ayrey. *Music Analysis* 9, no. 2 (July 1990): 105-56.

- Murtomäki, Veijo. *Symphonic Unity: The Development of Formal Thinking in the Symphonies of Sibelius*. Translated by Henry Bacon. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 1993.
- "Sibelius Caught in a Political Vortex." *Finnish Music Quarterly*, no. 4 (2002): 38-45.
- Murtomäki, Veijo, Kari Kilpeläinen, and Riso Väisänen, eds. *Proceedings from the Second International Jean Sibelius Conference, Helsinki November 25-29, 1995*. Helsinki: Sibelius Academy, Department of Composition and Music Theory, 1998.
- Neff, Severine. "Schoenberg and Goethe: Organicism and Analysis." In *Music Theory and the Exploration of the Past*, edited by Christopher Hatch and David W. Bernstein, 409-33. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Newmarch, Rosa. *Jean Sibelius*. Boston: C. C. Birchard, 1939.
- Nicholls, David. *American Experimental Music, 1890-1940*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Niemann, Walter. *Jean Sibelius*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1917.
- Oja, Carol J. *Making Music Modern: New York in the 1920s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Oramo, Ilkka. "Sibelius, le plus mauvais compositeur du monde." *Boréales, revue du centre de recherches inter-nordiques* 54, no. 57 (1993): 51-58.
- "Beyond Nationalism." In *Music and Nationalism in 20th-Century Great Britain and Finland*, edited by Tomi Mäkelä, 35-43. Hamburg: Von Bockel, 1997.
- "Zur Rezeption der Musik von Jean Sibelius (1865-1957) in der deutschen Fachliteratur seit 1945." In *Zur Neuorientierung der finnisch-deutschen Kulturbeziehungen nach 1945*, edited by Waltraud Bastman-Bühner and Martin Putz, 119-128. Helsinki: AUE-Stiftung, 2000.
- "Sibelius, Bartók, and the 'Anxiety of Influence' in Post World War II Finnish Music." *Studia Musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 47, no. 3-4 (September 2006): 467-79.
- "The Sibelius Problem." *Performances Magazine* (October 2007): 19-20.
- "Helmuth Thierfelder's Open Letter to Jean Sibelius 1935." *Musiikki* 41, no. 3-4 (2011): 69-87.

- Owens, Thomas Clark. "Charles Ives and His American Context: Images of 'Americanness' in the Arts." PhD diss., Yale University, 1999.
- Paddison, Max. *Adorno's Aesthetic of Music*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Paul, David C. "Converging Paths to the Canon: Charles Ives, Gustav Mahler, and American Culture." PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2006.
- . "From American Ethnographer to Cold War Icon: Charles Ives Through the Eyes of Henry and Sidney Cowell." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 59, no. 2 (Summer 2006): 339-457.
- . *Charles Ives in the Mirror: American Histories of an Iconic Composer*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2013.
- Pederson, Sanna. "Enlightened and Romantic German Music Criticism, 1800-1850." PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1995.
- . "Romantic Music Under Siege in 1848." In *Music Theory in the Age of Romanticism*, edited by Ian Bent, 57-76. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Perlis, Vivian. *Charles Ives Remembered: An Oral History*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974.
- Perry, Jeffrey. "Music, Evolution and the Ladder of Progress." *Music Theory Online* 6, no. 5 (November 2000). Accessed October 31, 2015.
<http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.00.6.5/mto.00.6.5.perry.html>.
- Perry, Rosalie Sandra. *Charles Ives and the American Mind*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1974.
- Popper, Karl R. *The Poverty of Historicism*. London: Routledge, 1964.
- Rehding, Alexander. "Wagner, Liszt, Berlioz and the 'New German School'." In *Nationalism Versus Cosmopolitanism in German Thought and Culture, 1789-1914*, edited by Mary Anne Perkins and Martin Liebscher, 159-87. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 2006.
- Reich, Willi. *Schoenberg: A Critical Biography*. Translated by Leo Black. London: Longman, 1971.
- Reti, Rudolph. *The Thematic Process in Music*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1978.

- Ross, Alex. *The Rest is Noise: Listening to the Twentieth Century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007.
- Rossiter, Frank R. "Charles Ives and American Culture: The Process of Development, 1874-1921." PhD diss., Princeton University, 1970.
- . *Charles Ives and His America*. New York: Liveright, 1975.
- Rufer, Josef. *The Works of Arnold Schoenberg: A Catalogue of His Compositions, Writings, and Paintings*. Translated by Dika Newlin. London: Faber and Faber, 1962.
- Saminsky, Lazare. "Sibelius, A Mind Two-Dimensional." In *Music of Our Day: Essentials and Prophecies*, 193-204. New enlarged ed. New York: Thomas Y. Cromwell, 1939.
- Schiff, David. "The Many Faces of Ives." *The Atlantic* 279, no. 1 (January 1997): 84-87.
- Schmalfeldt, Janet. "Form as the Process of Becoming: The Beethoven-Hegelian Tradition and the 'Tempest' Sonata." *Beethoven Forum* 4 (1995): 37-71.
- Schmidt, James. "Unbottled Manuscripts: On the Curious Relationship of Theodor Adorno and Virgil Thomson." *Persistent Enlightenment* (blog), April 22, 2015. Accessed January 9, 2016.
<https://persistentenlightenment.wordpress.com/2015/04/22/unbottled-manuscripts-on-the-curious-relationship-of-theodor-adorno-and-virgil-thomson/>.
- . "Adorno Considers a Career Change: The Curious Relationship between Theodor Adorno and Virgil Thomson (Conclusion)." *Persistent Enlightenment* (blog), May 21, 2015. Accessed January 12, 2016.
https://persistentenlightenment.wordpress.com/2015/05/21/adorno_thomson_conclusion/.
- Schoenberg, Arnold. *Theory of Harmony: 100th Anniversary Edition*. Translated by Roy E. Carter. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010.
- . *Style and Idea: Selected Writings of Arnold Schoenberg: 60th Anniversary Edition*. Edited by Leonard Stein. Translated by Leo Black. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010.
- Schwartz, Elliott and Barney Childs, eds. *Contemporary Composers on Contemporary Music*. Expanded ed. New York: Da Capo, 1998.
- Servière, Antonin. "Sibelius and Contemporary Music: Reinterpretation or Legacy?" Paper presented for NPS Television, NRC Handelsblad, Amsterdam, October 6, 2007.

- . "Notes from Abroad: No Longer the Worst Composer in France." *Finnish Music Quarterly*, no. 1 (2010): 50-51.
- Shawn, Allen. *Arnold Schoenberg's Journey*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002.
- Sherwood, Gayle: *see also* Magee, Gayle Sherwood.
- Sherwood, Gayle. "Questions and Veracities: Reassessing the Chronology of Ives's Choral Works." *Musical Quarterly* 78, no. 3 (Autumn 1994): 429-47.
- . "The Choral Works of Charles Ives: Chronology, Style, Reception." PhD diss., Yale University, 1995.
- Sinclair, James. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Music of Charles Ives*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Sirén, Vesa. "Theodor Adorno vs. Jean Sibelius: Seconds Out for the Final Round?" *Finnish Music Quarterly*, no. 4 (2002): 46-55.
- Slonimsky, Nicolas. *Lexicon of Musical Invective: Critical Assaults on Composers Since Beethoven's Time*. New York: Coleman-Ross, 1953.
- Smith, Barry. *Peter Warlock, The Life of Philip Heseltine*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Solie, Ruth A. "The Living Work: Organicism and Musical Analysis." *19th-Century Music* 4, no. 2 (Autumn 1980): 147-56.
- Solomon, Maynard. "Charles Ives: Some Questions of Veracity." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 40, no. 3 (Autumn 1987): 443-70.
- Starr, Larry. "Style and Substance: 'Ann Street' by Charles Ives." *Perspective of New Music* 15, no. 2 (Spring-Summer 1977): 23-33.
- . "The Early Styles of Charles Ives." *19th-Century Music* 7, no. 1 (Summer 1983): 71-80.
- . *A Union of Diversities: Styles in the Music of Charles Ives*. New York: Schirmer Books, 1992.
- . "Ives, Gershwin, and Copland: Reflections on the Strange Histories of American Art Music." *American Music* 12, no. 2 (Summer 1994): 167-86.
- Stern, Karen. "Notes in Passing." *Adirondack Life* 20, no. 2 (1989): 48-51.

- Stevenson, Karen M. "The Music Criticism of Franz Brendel." PhD diss., Northwestern University, 1994.
- Swafford, Jan. *Charles Ives: A Life with Music*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1996.
- Tarasti, Eero, ed. *Proceedings from the First International Jean Sibelius Conference, Helsinki, August 1990*. Helsinki: Sibelius Academy, Department of Composition and Music Theory, 1990.
- Taruskin, Richard. "The Poietic Fallacy." *Musical Times* 145, no. 1886 (Spring 2004): 7-34.
- . *The Oxford History of Western Music*. 6 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Tawaststjerna, Erik. *Sibelius*, vol. 1, 1865-1905. Translated by Robert Layton. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.
- . *Jean Sibelius*, vol. 2, 1904-1914. Translated by Robert Layton. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.
- . *Jean Sibelius*, vol. 3, 1914-1957. Translated by Robert Layton. London: Faber and Faber, 1997.
- . "Über Adornos Sibelius-Kritik." In *Adorno und die Musik*, edited by Otto Kolleritsch, 112-24. Graz: Universal-Edition, 1979.
- Thierfelder, Helmuth. "An Jean Sibelius. Finnlands großem Sohne zum 70. Geburtstag." *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* 62, no. 49 (1935): 759.
- Thomson, Virgil. "The Ives Case." *New York Review of Books* 14, no. 10 (May 21, 1970): 9-11.
- . *Virgil Thomson: A Reader: Selected Writings 1924-1984*. Edited by Richard Kostelanetz. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Thomson, William. *Schoenberg's Error*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991.
- . "Music as Organic Evolution: Schoenberg's Mythic Springboard into the Future." *College Music Symposium* 33/34 (1993/1994): 191-211.
- Thurmaier, David. "'A Disturbing Lack of Musical and Stylistic Continuity'? Elliott Carter, Charles Ives, and Musical Borrowing." *Current Musicology*, no. 96 (Fall 2013): 97-124.

- Titus, Barbara. "Conceptualizing Music: Friedrich Theodor Vischer and Hegelian Currents in German Music Criticism, 1848-1887." PhD diss., St. Anne's College, Oxford, 2005.
- Todd, R. Larry, ed. *Schumann and His World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Törne, Bengt de. *Sibelius: A Close-Up*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1938.
- Treitler, Leo. "On Historical Criticism." *Musical Quarterly* 53, no. 2 (April 1967): 188-205.
- . "The Present as History." *Perspectives of New Music* 7, no. 2 (Spring-Summer 1969), 1-58.
- . *Music and the Historical Imagination*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Truscott, Harold. "A Sibelian Fallacy." *Chesterian* 32 (1957): 34-43.
- Vihinen, Antti. "Theodor W. Adorno's Criticisms of Sibelius: The Political Dimension." PhD diss., University of Helsinki, 2001.
- Vischer, Friedrich Theodor. *Aesthetik oder Wissenschaft des Schönen*. 9 vols. Reutlingen: Carl Mäcken, 1846-1858.
- Wagner, Richard. *Die Kunst und die Revolution*. Leipzig: Otto Wigand, 1849.
- . *Das Kunstwerk der Zukunft*. Leipzig: Otto Wigand, 1850.
- Wellek, René. *A History of Modern Criticism: 1750-1950*, vol. 2, *The Romantic Age*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1955.
- Wiecki, Ronald V. "Two Musical Idealists—Charles Ives and E. Robert Schmitz: A Friendship Reconsidered." *American Music* 10, no. 1 (Spring 1992): 1-19.
- Williamson, John. "Progress, Modernity and the Concept of an Avant-Garde." In *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth-Century Music*, edited by Jim Samson, 287-317. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Whitesell, Lloyd. "Reckless Form, Uncertain Audiences: Responding to Ives." *American Music* 12, no. 3 (Autumn 1994): 304-19.

VITA

Andrew Howard Stout was born in Westminster, Colorado on July 17, 1985. In 2008, he received a Bachelor of Arts in Music Theory from Northwest Nazarene University, and in 2011, he received a Master of Music in Piano Performance from Boise State University, where he studied with Del Parkinson. From 2013-2014, Mr. Stout taught English in Mokpo, South Korea. He will receive a Master of Music in Musicology from the University of Missouri-Kansas City in 2016.