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Edward Elgar’s Sonata in G major for Organ, op. 28 demonstrates a pattern of symphonic influence and derivation in much of the work’s compositional material. Discussion of the Sonata with respect to symphonic form and orchestration, comparison with nineteenth-century works including Brahms’s Second Symphony, and revelation of a Pianola transcription of the Sonata will show that Elgar used the Sonata in G major for Organ, op. 28 to develop his compositional acuity in symphonic form. This work is an integral example of Elgar’s compositional prowess—a vision fully realized in his First and Second Symphonies.
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Introduction

Edward Elgar’s Sonata for Organ, Op. 28 is a unique example of a large-scale work for organ that should be viewed as a “symphony for organ” and as an important step towards Elgar’s symphonic composition.¹ Elgar said of the symphonic form: “I hold that the Symphony without a programme is the highest development of art.”² Elgar taught himself to compose symphonically through many musical endeavors that led finally to his Sonata in G (referred to as his “Sonata”), his last four-movement work before his Symphonies no. 1 and 2.

Elgar’s understanding of the word “symphony” meant, for him, large-scale, four-movement works built on small motives, thematic development, and finely-tuned use of orchestral color. This dissertation discusses symphonic elements that shape the Sonata’s identity as abstract symphonic music and not as a specifically organistic work.

Elgar’s Sonata for Organ, Op. 28 will be positioned as a significant example of Elgar’s mature style, a work with primarily symphonic identity. Study of the Sonata coincides with the new edition of Christopher Kent’s extensive *Elgar Research Guide* (2012), and with a renewed twenty-first-century interest in Elgar scholarship. This timely reassessment of the Sonata as a “symphonic” composition for the orchestral organ will demonstrate Elgar’s conscious cultivation of the symphonic-form sonata with specific orchestral contours. It is important to be able to view Elgar’s Sonata in the symphonic instrumental genre (although it also falls into the “organ sonata” genre) because the symphonic lens impacts expectations about each movement’s function, formal organization, and organ registration.

---

¹ Edward Elgar, Sonata in G for Organ, op. 28, (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1896).
In order to understand the events that led up to this composition, it is crucial to set Elgar apart from the unexamined stereotypes usually sustained by Elgar scholarship. For this reason, Chapter 1 introduces an amended view of Elgar’s background. He was not primarily an insecure, working-class, self-made musician with imperialist affinities, as is commonly thought, but was a more idealistic product of his times and deeply supported by a vast network of personal influences and institutions.

In Chapter 2, a brief overview of English organ music in late Victorian England will locate the work in its larger historical context. Discussion of Elgar’s symphonic precursors to the Sonata will precede a structural analysis of the work and insight into Elgar’s compositional strategies. Exploration of the symphonic gestures and orchestration present in the work will emphasize its symphonic affinities.

Chapter 3 will examine the Sonata as symphonic by comparison with the orchestral idiom present in Brahms’s Second Symphony and similar nineteenth-century works specifically known by Elgar. A Pianola transcription of the work will provide evidence of the universality of Elgar’s artistic goals for the Sonata and explain the collective/polyphonic aesthetic of his musical expression. The existence of four orchestral and wind band transcriptions will show the ease with which musical ideas transfer between the organ and the collective music setting, another confirmation of Elgar’s orchestral inner voice. The Sonata in G will thus be discovered as representative of his life-long affinity for symphonic expression.
Chapter 1

Chapter 1 will present a brief synopsis of the “Renaissance” of musical culture in England that took place between 1830 and 1895. The succeeding description of Elgar’s education will reveal the resources that supported his growth toward symphonic-style composition within this musical culture.

English Musical Renaissance

While England has always been known for its strong literary culture, its musical tradition was less developed. Elgar’s England had only just emerged from the seventeenth-century, post-Commonwealth banishment of music. After the Commonwealth, “English music” consisted mostly of a constant stream of Continental (often German) musicians who passed through London, and culminated with Händel, who perfected a lofty musical vernacular of populist and sacred themes. Musical culture entered a period of quiet after Handel’s death even though there was a subsequent rallying again around the Leipzig-based, Felix Mendelssohn, in the 1830’s when he visited England. Mendelssohn fraternized with Prince Albert (a fellow German) and Queen Victoria, and both men shared a hobby of organ playing. Mendelssohn’s popularity in England derived from his elegant, non-effusive brand of Romanticism – for which conservative England had a stylistic sympathy. After his death, there was a sense that England needed another English “Mendelssohn,” and a musical education system fit for training future English “Mendelssohns.”

The fact that English musicians in the nineteenth century who wished to study music at a high level often trained in Germany at the Leipzig Conservatorium (founded by Mendelssohn himself) illustrated the bleak reality of musical education in England.
No English musical training existed at the same level, perpetuating a dearth of accomplished English musicians and composers. By the 1880’s, after some success in founding a Royal Academy for Music, Prince Albert suggested that England build a center of music “to which English musicians may resort with confidence.”³ This was envisioned in an effort to create an “English” music and to finally counter the commonly-held belief in the Austro-German classical music world that the English were music-less.⁴

By the 1890’s, some few composers had emerged as possible candidates to represent “Englishness,” including Arthur Sullivan, Charles Stanford and Hubert Parry, each of whom took a leadership role in the newly-formed London music academies. However, their compositions did not seize the national consciousness as Elgar’s would come to do in the following years. Ironically, Elgar was only recognized as the quintessentially “English” composer, capturing, as was thought, a stereotypically humorous and wistful sensibility, after he was first recognized in Germany by German conductors, publishers, and music critics as someone whose musical expression deserved careful attention. Indeed, after Hans Richter premiered Elgar’s “Enigma” Variations (in Düsseldorf in 1899) Elgar’s work received immediate attention in England. In fact, Elgar’s Sonata for Organ garnered positive German attention, although because of unresolved scholarly issues it has yet to be fully recognized as an important symphonically-designed work in the same style as “Enigma” Variations and his First and Second Symphonies.

The following section describes an unlikely candidate for the new English “Mendelssohn,” a prospect who, contrary to the privileged profile of the composer who

⁴ This sentiment was typified by Brahms’s famous comment, “The English are a people without music.”
Prince Albert imagined would lead the rise in English music, was a self-taught provincial boy.

**Elgar’s Background**

Edward Elgar was born in 1857 to a musical family in Broadheath, a quiet English village outside the bustling market town of Worcester. Worcester was (and is) two and a half hours northwest by train from London, a geographical and intellectual distance that might have hindered a less motivated young man from pursuing a career in music. While he never studied formally in London, Elgar’s early training, self-directed musical studies and his family, friends and colleagues provided him with an eclectic but rich exposure to all of the experiences he needed to establish his musical identity as a composer. The origins of Elgar’s family, religion, education, and musical resources provide an important context for the inception of his Sonata for Organ, Op. 28. Despite Elgar’s often-expressed feeling that he was an outsider in English musical life (an opinion perhaps over-emphasized in twentieth-century scholarship), he had access to all the educational and performance opportunities needed to develop an ear for and facility in composing symphonic forms. His natural inventiveness and constant curiosity shine through the diffidence that is usually superimposed on Elgar’s career.

**Scholarship pertaining to Elgar’s Education**

Elgar’s education has been well-covered through sketch studies like Richard Braddy’s, who traces the emergence of Elgar’s signature musical ideas in the musician’s early sketches. His education can also be traced through review of the books Elgar read, the concerts he attended and in which he performed, and in overview of the general musical culture of the Worcester Elgar knew as a young man. The following sections are
also informed by Anderson, De-la-Noy, Moore, Quinn, original letters, press cuttings, and manuscripts at the Elgar Birthplace Museum, the University of Birmingham Archive, Goldsmith University Library, King’s College London Library, the Royal College of Music Archive, and the British Library.

**Family and Religion**

Elgar’s family united musical and literary interests with unusual, for his culture, religious underpinnings. Elgar’s father, William Henry Elgar, known for his combined genteel good humor but occasionally gruff demeanor was apprenticed as a piano tuner at Coventry & Hollier in London and became a skilled piano tuner for the wealthy in Worcester. He was also an excellent keyboard improviser and one of his patrons even offered to sponsor his further musical education “to be come the finest player in London.” Though Elgar’s father declined this opportunity because of performance anxiety, he did study with a student of one of Beethoven’s pupils, Ferdinand Ries, under whom he learned Handel arrangements, Corelli sonatas, and works by English composers. Though a Protestant, he became known later for his extemporaneous keyboard skill at St. George’s Catholic Church of Worcester (where he was organist from 1846 to 1885), eventually earning great acclaim for his choral conducting. From 1859 onward, W.H. Elgar kept a music shop in Worcester, where his family lived after they moved from an idyllic life in the countryside. In addition to piano tuning services, W.H. Elgar offered sheet music and pianos. From his father, Elgar acquired an innate musical sensitivity, easy facility with instruments, and a playful artistic sensibility.

Elgar’s mother, Ann, never received formal schooling but had a great affinity for

---

language. She eventually converted to Catholicism through exposure to the faith when, every Sunday, she accompanied W.H. Elgar to St. George’s, where her husband was organist. This conversion confounded her already religiously-skeptical husband, but she found the Jesuit tradition intellectually stimulating and proceeded to raise her children in her new religion. This stunning decision on her part had two effects major on Elgar. Firstly, he viewed the world and humanity from a very idealistic perspective, one which his mother’s unusual religious choice encouraged. Secondly, it meant that the Elgar family was suddenly perceived as religious outsiders since in England at this time religious activities outside of the Anglican tradition were widely stigmatized. While religion was one important theme introduced early to Elgar’s life, Ann’s religious idealism led to other interests, including art, literature, nature, culture and her own artistic pursuits, painting and intricate hand-work. A focus on the beauty of nature and early exposure to literature and language established Elgar’s interest in a wide range of subjects and fostered a lifelong curiosity in the world surrounding him, allowing him to absorb what he needed to know, especially about music.

Later, Elgar explored such hobbies as chemistry, cycling, golf, and cryptology. This latter hobby included including crossword puzzles and was a popular interest at this time, along with this lifelong crossword puzzle habit. Elgar’s sense of humor was fed by writing letters in code to friends, where he wove hidden countermelodies through works such as Händel’s Messiah, and hid multiple layers of meaning in his 1899 “Enigma”

---

7 This inherited idealism prevailed overall, despite many examples of occasional pessimism about his own life.
8 This religious tension was a subject of concern for Elgar throughout his life, although his excellence in composition integrated him into English musical life. Despite this religious tension, after his death, in 1935 he was memorialized at Anglican Worcester Cathedral, a notable acknowledgement of his cultural contributions to the larger Worcester community – and to England.
Variations. The musical references to Elgar’s 1893 *The Black Knight* in the 1895 Sonata for Organ are another example of this musical inventiveness (discussed in chapter 2).

**Elgar’s Musical Resources: Formal Education and Musical Self-Direction**

To achieve his lifelong symphonic goals, made possible in part by his Sonata for Organ, Elgar needed to know about fundamental music theory (harmony, counterpoint, melody) and composition (form, style, orchestration, idiomatic writing), performance (instrumental conventions and limitations). These musical materials were each made available to him (some easily, other more hard-won) during his formative years, as the following sections will show.

When Elgar was ready to attend school, his parochial education up to the age of sixteen was practical, with emphasis on business in the final school years. After exiting secondary school, Elgar trained briefly in the legal profession before deciding to pursue music. It is worth noting that this early experience with commerce proved useful later as he marketed his own compositions among publishing companies and negotiated contracts. Elgar was more successful than many musicians of his time in that he eventually maintained several streams of income through performing, teaching, conducting, composition and commercial endorsements (including elite cigars [!] and the Pianola, among ventures). However, these opportunities were yet to come in following decades.

Elgar’s musical education was surprisingly full for one who finished his formal education with only secondary school and a legal apprenticeship, at the end of which he

---

9 He was given a Catholic education. He first attended school with his sisters (Miss Walsh’s Middle Class School for Girls) then a manor schoolhouse—Spetchley Park—and finally completed his education at Littleton House, where “Young gentlemen are prepared for Commercial pursuits by Mr. Reeve.” Anderson, *Elgar*, 4.
requested a change of profession. While his family could not afford either the university or Leipzig Conservatorium training common among other promising musicians from the provinces, his family’s high value of music and important ideas meant that his parents did not object to Elgar’s choosing music as a career. His father’s music shop became the young Elgar’s music library, his family and friends at St. George’s and Worcester Cathedral became his orchestral colleagues and test audiences for the compositions (which began to emerge from Elgar’s spare time) apart from orchestra playing, concert-going, teaching, and occasional conducting. Elgar eventually came to understand much of whatever he might have not known by forgoing more formal training in music, so much so that he was able to correct the Cambridge/Oxford music exam which he helped a blind musician friend, William Wolstenholme, attempt in 1883.

After leaving his legal apprenticeship in Worcester, Elgar surrounded himself with varied musical resources—from instrumental playing to music study to composition. His first composition at age ten dated from the year after his younger, musically-talented brother’s death and by the time Elgar reached his teens, he already played violin, bassoon, piano, organ and had studied music theory. Elgar worked in his father’s music shop where he familiarized himself with such works as Mozart Masses, Beethoven piano sonatas, and piano reductions of symphonies. His musical tutelage was further enriched with textbooks on harmony, counterpoint, orchestration, thoroughbass, acoustics, and form. At the age of twenty-one, he undertook a measure-by-measure study of Mozart’s

10 Arthur Sullivan and Basil Harwood (and Elgar’s one-time fiancée, Helen Weaver), among others, furthered their musical educations in Leipzig.
11 Wolstenholme eventually became known in his own right for organ virtuosity and compositions.
12 Written in 1867, Elgar’s first composition was called “Broadheath Humoreske.”
13 These books included Stainer and Barrett’s Dictionary of Musical Terms, Stainer’s Composition and A Treatise on Harmony, Cherubini’s Counterpoint, Reicha’s Orchestral Primer, Mozart’s Thoroughbass
Symphony No. 40 in G minor and produced his own exposition modeled on Mozart’s first movement.\(^\text{14}\) Of this exercise he later said, “I did this on my own initiative, as I was groping in the dark after light, but looking back after thirty years I don’t know any discipline from which I learned so much.”\(^\text{15}\) Part of what fascinated Elgar about this symphony was how the small classical-sized orchestral forces still created enough “variety and contrast … to hold the attention for thirty minutes.”\(^\text{16}\) This very exercise must have been of further help with the Sonata since the organ can sustain only three voices at a time, sometimes four, usually contrasting two voices simultaneously. In other instances, he arranged music for different ensembles by Corelli, Handel, Haydn, Weber, Beethoven, Schumann, and Wagner, no doubt absorbing the compositional elements of those composers through this kind of interaction with their scores.\(^\text{17}\)

Elgar had kept sketchbooks for his musical ideas since he was a small boy, and these sketchbooks contained the kernels of the musical style that he developed, including themes that he used again and again throughout his life. His use of materials grew to include a certain pentatonic modal flavor, countermelodies over or under counterpoint, expanded harmonies, characteristic rhythms, sequential progressions not only by step but by thirds, rising and falling sequences of leaps, appoggiaturas, and unprepared suspensions.\(^\text{18}\) These elements characterize much of the Sonata’s primary themes and melodic motion.

---


During his twenties Elgar continued to explore his musical identity through music performance, transcription and composition. While his London teacher, Adolphe Pollitzer, had told Elgar in 1877 that he was not destined for a solo career due to his insufficient violin tone, by 1881, at age twenty-four, Elgar’s proficiency on the violin was such that he passed examinations with honors at London’s Royal Academy of Music, in both violin and general musical knowledge. This meant that although a solo career was out of his grasp, Elgar was accomplished enough on violin to be promoted to the first violins in the Three Choirs Festival Orchestra.\textsuperscript{19} This first-hand performance experience gave him an excellent ear for idiomatic string writing and first-hand experience with many kinds of orchestration, an orchestral affinity that is also evident in of his Sonata for Organ. Pollitzer also recognized Elgar’s musical talents and introduced him to August Manns of the Chystal Palace Concerts, an introduction which allowed Elgar to attend orchestral rehearsals there.\textsuperscript{20}

Elgar’s organ proficiency was strong enough that in 1885 he took over his father’s organist position at St. George’s Catholic Church, although he felt that this was not an ultimate professional direction for him and was happy to cede the position after he married. Nonetheless, his friendships with organists and penchant for orchestral use of the organ attest to his actual esteem of the instrument.\textsuperscript{21}

Other musical resources which contributed to his development as a musician

\textsuperscript{19} De-la-Noy, Elgar: The Man, 38.
\textsuperscript{20} Moore, Elgar: a creative life, 79.
\textsuperscript{21} At one time or another, Elgar collaborated with Hugh Blair of Worcester Cathedral, and was a longtime friend of Herbert Brewer (Gloucester Cathedral), George Sinclair (Hereford Cathedral), and Charles Swinnerton-Heap (Birmingham).
included his innate perfect pitch and his proximity by train to London and its concerts at St. James Hall and the Crystal Palace; Elgar often taught lessons all day, traveled to London in the afternoon to hear an orchestra rehearsal and most of the evening concert before catching the last train back to Worcester. Further opportunities for performance and composition became available to Elgar because of his reputation as an excellent musical leader – first, as a concertmaster and accompanist, later, as a conductor. For example, Elgar performed as concertmaster at the renowned Three Choirs Festival in Worcester, Gloucester, and Hereford, and was eventually commissioned to write several choral works for that institution. These varied experiences supported Elgar’s pursuit of the ideal of symphonic expression.

**Career Development**

With these experiences in performance (violin, bassoon, piano and organ), composition, and teaching, and varied friendships, Elgar had a professional and musical anchor, but could not advance rapidly because he was unknown. However, in 1884, his work, *Sevillana*, an orchestral “Spanish” character piece, was premiered with the Worcester Philharmonic Society in early May and shortly thereafter at the Crystal Palace in London. The work introduced memorable melodies and Elgar’s characteristically contrasting of themes in G minor and G major. These keys were to resurface as favorites throughout his life, and notably in *The Black Knight*, which begins in G major, and the Sonata for Organ, also in G major and G minor.

While work with models is an important part of self-education, another element required for intellectual and personal growth is receiving immediate feedback. Regular

---

22 Edward Elgar, Bavarian holiday journal entry, 19 August 1894, EE / 1 / 1 / 2, University of Birmingham Archive. Elgar notated on a treble staff a series of bell pitches: C, D, F#, Bb. Elgar was also known to favor the keys of G major and G minor in many of his works.
criticism would have sped Elgar to progress more quickly as a young composition student. Even so, this aspect of education was not completely lacking in Elgar’s development. In the 1880’s, Elgar showed some works to Adolph Pollitzer and Charles Stockley of the Birmingham concert series, and later came to trust Joseph Bennett, a music critic from the *Daily Telegraph*. Newspaper reviews of his early works also provided important feedback as well as publicity, since each following composition addressed the previous formal issues mentioned by critics. For instance, Elgar’s first commission, the orchestral overture *Froissart*, was praised for its orchestral inventiveness, but was also taken to task for having tinkered with the sonata structure beyond recognition. After this, Elgar’s next large compositional attempt in the full form, the Sonata for Organ Op. 28, includes movements that adhere more precisely to sonata form.

Elgar also built his career on a network of finely-cultivated relationships, a necessity due in part to his lack of academic pedigree. The previously-mentioned organists Hugh Blair and Charles Swinnerton-Heap each played a role in how his Sonata for Organ came to be composed. Blair had commissioned *The Black Knight*, precursor to the Sonata for Organ, for Worcester Cathedral in 1893, and had also commissioned an “organ voluntary” in 1895. Elgar paid thematic homage to *The Black Knight* in his extensive “organ voluntary,” the Sonata for Organ, while dedicating the work to Charles Swinnerton-Heap. Swinnerton-Heap was a reknowned conductor and organist in

---

23 Chris Bennett, Elgar Birthplace Museum Supervisor, email interview with the author, 14 April 2013.
24 After his marriage in 1889, Elgar received regular comments from his wife Alice, who was known to have suggested musical changes to his works. Also, in the later 1890’s he met August Jaeger, who became his editor at Novello’s, and who provided further critique.
25 See Chapter 2.
26 Contrary to scholarly opinion, *The Black Knight* is not an example of sonata form, even though it is a work in four movements with some cyclic elements. The first movement contains three sections, much like sonata form, but there is no clear subordinate theme.
Birmingham, who had also studied at the Leipzig Conservatorium. With this dedication, Elgar extended the Sonata’s audience to Birmingham, where Swinnerton-Heap performed two movements at a concert in 1896. Swinnerton-Heap may have initially suggested that the Sonata would be well-received in Germany, promoting the idea of German publication to Elgar.27

**Personal Development**

Having decided to focus his attention mainly toward composition, while still using his other musical skills to earn a living, Elgar was well-occupied, but not yet financially stable. After romantically pursuing several women without success, in 1886 Elgar met Caroline Alice Roberts through piano lessons. She was older by nine years, a highly-educated daughter of a major war hero, a woman with a modestly successful writing career, and one who became interested in him and shared his more cultivated interests. Despite her family’s disapproval, they soon married and Alice converted to Catholicism. Aided by her inheritance, she supported his career by protecting his time so that he could compose, copying out parts, and being a constant soundboard for new musical ideas. Elgar now had a faithful champion of his work, one who calmed his nerves and was able to assist with the organizational aspect of the compositional work that he found challenging, not having been trained in the logical-sequential compositional models of his peers. He wrote to his friend Dr. Buck in October 1889,

> And now (after all our talks about the mystery of living), I must tell you how happy I am in my new life and what a dear, loving companion I have & how sweet everything seems & how understandable existence seems to have grown…I think all the difficult problems are now solved and—well I don’t worry myself about ‘em now!28

---

Significantly, the year 1889 marks a time when he began to compose the first large-scale works of his career, encouraged, no doubt, by his wife.\textsuperscript{29} Elgar’s increased compositional momentum allowed him to focus on honing his craft in further ways. A part of this process involved deeper study of German musical expression in order to sustain the content of these longer works. During Elgar’s six vacations to Bavaria with Alice (summers of 1892-1895, 1897, and 1902), he spent his time attending the opera (mostly Wagner), the symphony, and cathedral organ concerts, walking in alpine meadows, hearing bells in the distance, and practicing German with villagers. Alice was already fluent and Elgar became more conversant. The music he heard made a huge impression and the language contacts proved invaluable later in securing German publishers and securing composition premieres with German conductors. In the case of the publication of the Sonata for Organ, the Leipzig-based publisher Breitkopf & Härtel finally took the work, and Elgar’s German-speaking network, as well as his English Leipzig associates, including Charles Swinnerton-Heap, must have made the connection possible.\textsuperscript{30}

**Conclusion**

Since Elgar felt that the epitome of musical achievement and contribution was composition in symphonic form, he studied these works with the goal of composing his own symphony. This was a rarefied goal for a provincial young adult whose connections were comparatively limited, whose religious tradition was in the minority, and who did not study in Germany, as was the tradition for similarly ambitious musicians. However, by the 1890’s, Elgar had been exposed to all the resources he needed to become a

\textsuperscript{29} Further, Elgar’s first work was published in 1884 with *Sevillana*, but the scale and number of works published increased substantially after 1888.

\textsuperscript{30} Quinn, “The pilgrimage to Leipzig and its effects on the English organ sonata,” 76.
promising composer. Elgar’s story is one, then, of triumph over great odds. That he even wrote music at all—much less well-respected music—and especially in the case of this organ sonata, was a profound achievement.

After the following literature review, chapter two will present the musical summary of several early works directly preceding the Sonata for Organ to show how Elgar’s compositional ideas improved in formal coherence. By 1895 the Sonata incorporated all of the formal devices and musical language that typified his mature symphonic works.

**Literature Review**

This paper positions Elgar’s Sonata for Organ, Op. 28 as an early-but-significant example of Elgar’s mature style with a symphonic identity that comes from a life-long idealization of symphonic composition. Study of the Sonata coincides with the new edition of Christopher Kent’s extensive *Elgar Research Guide* (2012), and a renewed twenty-first-century interest in Elgar scholarship. This timely reassessment of the Sonata as a “symphonic” composition for the orchestral organ will demonstrate Elgar’s conscious cultivation of the symphonic-scale sonata and character movements with specific orchestral contours. It is important to be able to view Elgar’s Sonata in the symphonic instrumental genre, although it also falls into the “organ sonata” genre, because the symphonic lens impacts both expectations about formal structure, thematic contents, and practical organ registrations by the performer.

Scholarly literature on Elgar’s Sonata can be divided into four categories of discussion. The first group of scholars agrees that the Sonata is symphonic in nature and
provides some evidence of its orchestral influences. These include Fanselau, Kent, Anderson, Gassmann, and Quinn. The second group acknowledges that the Sonata is a precursor to what they see as Elgar’s truly symphonic works but provide little to no exploration of what makes the work “symphonic.” These include McVeagh, Moore, Kennedy, and Parrott. The third group, including Newman and Harper-Scott, categorizes the work only as an “organ sonata” and the fourth group does not cover the Sonata at all. Instead, these scholars focus on some aspect of compositional evidence of Elgar’s symphonic style. Braddy, Gassmann (2002), and Rushton fall into this final category.

Studies of the Sonata that illustrate the trends in scholarship surrounding it are Fanselau, Kent, Quinn, Gassmann, McVeagh and Rushton. Of the Elgar sketchbook and manuscript studies (Fanselau, Kent, Anderson, Braddy), the Fanselau chapter on the Sonata is the standard against which the rest of the Sonata scholarship should be measured because of its thorough treatment of the compositional aspects of the topic and overall respect for the composition. While the dissertation is in German, it is the earliest

---


careful treatment of the Sonata.

Fanselau compares Elgar’s sketches to the published version of the work, provides analysis of formal elements, critical review, and registration possibilities, among other sections. In addition, Fanselau provides a German perspective on the organ sonata. He argues that very few composers had been able to successfully transfer sonata form to the organ prior to Elgar, including Rheinberger, and that while some suggest that symphonic “development” is not possible on the organ, Elgar’s Sonata proves that it can be done. These are important views since Elgar’s Sonata was published first in Germany and received well there. That English critics were more circumspect in their reading of the work shows more about England’s level of musical development at the time than about the challenges of the work. In contrast, the Sonata appeared to German reviewers as a standard, high-quality work with technical requirements comparable to works by Max Reger, a German contemporary of Elgar.

Other works that provide substantial support for the symphonic argument include Kent, who presents a thorough analysis of the draft sketches of the work. Quinn also reveals a logical historical background for the inception of the Sonata, invoking the influence of Mendelssohn and the Leipzig Conservatorium education on nineteenth-century English organ music. Gassmann provides the framework for a discussion of the Austro-German compositional influences on Elgar, introducing potential compositional models for most of Elgar’s major orchestral works, except, the Sonata for Organ. Kennedy, McVeagh, and Newman provide more descriptive coverage of the work in summary form. McVeagh mentions the contrapuntal development as a new

---

compositional resource as well as the featured dramatic character changes and the method employed of transforming and combining themes as new elements in Elgar’s music. She, too, mentions, without discussing the further implications, that this work came to be “seen as a forerunner of his two symphonies,” especially in the orchestration of Gordon Jacob. Moore and Anderson discuss the construction of the work, each giving a description of the themes and form. Moore’s treatment of the Finale shows its compositional strengths, where other scholars tend to rate it less strongly in terms of thematic interest.

However, throughout each of these, small pieces of somewhat trivial information appear to have been sourced from the same place, occasionally indicating the same misreading of information, a minor scholarly carelessness. For example, a small detail, but one which recurs, is the idea that the whole organ sonata was started on 10 April 1895, with the second movement, the formerly named “Intermezzo.” Instead, the information seems to originate from Kent, who suggests that while the Intermezzo may not have been initially intended for the Sonata, it was indeed started on 10 April 1895. Another issue that is in debate among several scholars will be discussed further in chapter 2—that of the formal classification of the finale movement (whether it is in sonata form or rondo form).

A curious omission of the Sonata occurs in Hardwick’s *British Organ Music of the Twentieth Century*. Hardwick includes Basil Harwood’s 1886 Sonata no. 1 and 1892 Sonata no. 2—neither of which are twentieth-century works, as the book title indicates. Instead of Elgar, the author also features such lesser-known contemporaries of

---

37 Ibid. 25; Edward Elgar, Sonata in G for Organ, op. 28, orchestrated by Gordon Jacob, c. 1946, unpublished, available from Fentone Orchestral, Ltd., through De Haske, Netherlands.
Elgar such as William Wolstenholme, William Faulkes, and Alfred Hollins. In addition to omitting a rationale for neglecting the Elgar work, Hardwick also misstates the date of the Sonata as 1894, as well as perpetuates the idea that Elgar wrote no more organ music in the twentieth century. Inaccurate information such as this is common when searching for information on Elgar’s Sonata and indicates an inadvertent but collective carelessness about the work. Potential reasons for this will be explored next.

An Issue of Scholarly Bias

One problem with Sonata research can be observed in the grouping of scholars who discuss the Sonata into two categories of academic background: organist-scholars and generalist scholars. Scholars who make more than passing reference to the Sonata’s role in Elgar’s compositions are almost always organist-scholars like Kent, Quinn, and Fanselau (Newman as an exception), rarely generalist scholars like Parrott (though he trained in organ with Henry Ley), Kennedy, Moore, McVeagh, Rushton and Harper-Scott. A specific scholarly bias emerges when considering why this work, and other organ works, are not featured more often in general music scholarship. In conversation with two of these generalist scholars, they indicated that they “did not particularly like the organ.” Having spent time in England in 2012 and spoken with many other researchers, I observed a similar widespread pessimism about the pipe organ in academic circles. This attitude silently implies that Elgar’s Sonata is not worthy of attention, thus ignoring its value as an early example of Elgar’s mature musical style and compositional ingenuity.

What may be an underlying issue is the current view of the pipe organ, an instrument that, for all of its brilliant secular concert repertoire, can never be divorced
from its centuries’-long association with organized religious practice. Speaking to the current neglect of the organ in music scholarship, David Yearsley, Professor of Musicology at Cornell University and organist, wrote in 2012,

The great distance the organ has drifted from the mainstream can quickly be gauged by leafing through seminal publications from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; in many of these books the organ is a vast topic unto itself...

Secularization, the displacement of the organ as the West’s most complex technology, and other forces of modernity have conjoined increasingly to ignore this compendium of art and science, theory and practice, one endowed with the richest and longest repertory of any instrument. The organ also confronts many urgent themes of interest to musical scholarship and musical culture, among them the changing value of the symbols of European art music, the dynamic relationship between musical technology and the human body, and the mysterious connection between the player and the audience, even when the player is hidden from view behind his or her massive instrument.39

These factors of secularization, the interest in digital technologies rather than mechanical, and so on, are all relevant modern thought-trends when considering the reception of a work for pipe organ. Further, given the post-Enlightenment sense that organized religion can close the mind, it is understandable that the modern scholar is not keen to align him or herself closely with this overtly religious association.

However, Elgar was not unfamiliar with the precariousness and ultimate utility of being associated with an outside view, since, in his case, he was a Catholic in Protestant England. As Rachel Cowgill writes, "in the sphere of religious music Elgar had to become adept at negotiating Protestant sensibilities,"40 in order to interact with the English establishment culture. We might parody this idea thusly: in the sphere of organ music, scholars must become adept at negotiating secularist sensibilities. To spend time doing so may be professionally costly, but to ignore the need to do so sacrifices historical

reality to a current *Zeitgeist*, a prevailing assumption that the practice of religion is a passing historical phase. This “sanitized” view of Elgar scholarship, *sans* organ sonata, is a hidden bias in much of current Elgar research—and musicology in general. The bias inadvertently imposes the secular filter of avoidance on this Sonata, a work that reflects the complex religious currents of its time and represses noteworthy music written for the pipe organ. Of course, the larger result of an unwillingness to engage with religious themes in conversation is that it silences and devalues legitimate discussion. The deliberate negotiation of both secular and religious biases is relevant to human experience. Avoidance of this conversation is what actually closes minds.

In the case of one of the first large works that demonstrates all of Elgar’s mature compositional tendencies, it is foolish to continue to ignore the Sonata for Organ in mainstream scholarship. This scholarly bias, if recognized, can begin to be corrected by submitting the work—and other works for organ—to more careful review. Because little attention has been given to the Sonata in Elgar scholarship, gaps in research include substantial discussion of possible outside symphonic models used for the Sonata, how the organ writing is orchestral in nature, and how the orchestral writing can be carried out on the organ. Discussion of the organ in Elgar’s orchestral and choral works is an interesting area but will not be discussed here. More information on the organ as an orchestral instrument may be found in Fanselau. Further, organ performance practice will not be discussed for the Sonata except in reference to orchestral ideas. More specific review of performance practices can be found in Pyper, Schoemann, and Wells.41

Dissertation review will include motivic and structural analysis of the Sonata as related to Elgar’s compositional strategy, discussion of what makes the work a symphonic rather than a sonata-based genre, introduction of possible outside symphonic influence, and investigation of Elgar’s orchestration within the Sonata. By filling these scholarly gaps, it will be possible to view the Sonata as fully representative of Elgar’s characteristic compositional style, full of expression, color, and compositional integrity.
Chapter 2

This chapter introduces the compositional issues in Elgar’s Sonata in G for Organ, op. 28 in lively dialogue with the nineteenth-century symphonic world, rather than with the English organ sonata or, for that matter, other keyboard music. First, a section on precursors to the Sonata demonstrates Elgar’s early interest in symphonic form and how his early compositional strategies and pacing were modeled on symphonic gestures and forms. By 1895, he was finally able to complete his first four-movement work in symphonic form with acceptable sonata forms, thematic and motivic unity, and orchestration. The rest of the chapter will focus on the influence that Elgar’s enthusiasm for symphonic composition had on the Sonata. His essentially symphonic inspiration will be shown through discussion of the treatment of motivic and thematic materials and through identifying orchestral gestures and instrumentation.

Unlikely Influences: English and German organ sonatas, French symphonies pour orgue

Elgar’s Sonata differed in content from typical English organ sonatas in the mid-to-late nineteenth century, which were generally modeled after Mendelssohn’s six “sonatas” of 1842, multi-movement works for organ without actual movements in “sonata” form. The English sonata that developed after Mendelssohn had three movements and commonly used chorale melodies and fugues among its musical materials, but until Elgar’s Sonata of 1895, full cyclic, four-movement organ sonatas with completely non-liturgical themes are unknown in the English organ sonata.

For further research, Quinn’s, “The pilgrimage to Leipzig and the effects on the English organ sonata,” provides an excellent history of the development of the English organ sonata after Mendelssohn’s sonatas.
repertoire.\(^{43}\) English organ sonata characteristics would have been known to Elgar through his own study of organ works and through discussion with his friend and collaborator, Hugh Blair, Worcester Cathedral acting organist, or any of his other organist colleagues\(^{44}\) and Elgar certainly would have employed these characteristics if he had intended to write in the sonata genre. However, Elgar’s Sonata was not written for the English organ sonata genre, as its four-movement structure indicates. In addition, as a practicing Catholic, Elgar would have been less likely to quote Anglican chorale tunes in his works.\(^ {45}\) Finally, Elgar’s own works list confirms a lack of attention to the sonata genre and the 1918 Sonata for Violin, op. 82, is Elgar’s only other sonata.

German and French organ music’s influence on Elgar’s Sonata have also been suggested but are overestimated. Joseph Rheinberger’s organ sonatas have been suggested as possible models,\(^ {46}\) but Rheinberger worked in the three- to four-movement sonata form with characteristic organ movements that included prelude, pastorale, adagio, fugue, and toccata. These were not the typical symphonic movement genres to which Elgar aspired as part of symphonic expression. Further, despite Elgar’s travels to France

\(^{43}\) W.T. Best, wrote the first known English organ sonata in 1858; the work has many characteristics of a suite rather than a sonata. Battison Haynes’s first organ sonata (1883-6) was the first English example to be written in four movements. Basil Harwood’s 1886 Sonata no. 1 in C# minor is another three-movement work that includes a first movement sonata form and a fugal finale, complete with German chorale melody. Cyclic treatment of the first movement theme occurs in the final fugue, another move toward the motivic unity of symphonic form. Edwin Lemare wrote an organ symphony in 1895, published in 1899 but the four-movement work includes a sonata, an Adagio Cantabile with a folk-song, a scherzo and ends with a fugue, again not symphonically conceived. Elgar knew of Lemare by at least 1912, when Elgar lobbied for Lemare’s appointment as Liverpool city organist. Nelson Barden, “The Midlands, Liverpool, Freiburg,” The Organ Music of Edwin H. Lemare, vol. 3, ed. Wayne Leupold, (Boston: Schirmer, 1990), 19.

\(^{44}\) Hugh Blair was a Cambridge B.A. and composer in his own right, well-versed in organ conventions. See appendix for Blair correction.


\(^{46}\) Fanselau, Die Orgel im Werk Edward Elgars, 307.
and interaction with music of Saint-Saëns and Guilmant, it is clear from the absence of the French toccata style in his compositions that Elgar was not influenced by French “symphonies pour orgue.” Instead, Elgar looked for inspiration in the symphonic canon.

**Definition of Symphonic**

The compositional materials in Elgar’s Sonata for Organ are best understood from the perspective of the symphonic genre. “Symphonic” is the term for composition with expanded structures (as in Beethoven’s late symphonies), presentation bound to the orchestral medium, thematic and motivic processes that are organic, that recognizeably unify all movements, and that are “suitable” for symphonic expression, although the qualifications of suitability were much debated as part of a culture of symphonic review. For the purposes of this paper, symphonic themes are motivically-based rather than expressly singable. These themes may be repeated but their initial forms are varied and/or transformed, from such compositional devices as sequence, contrapuntal imitation, inversion, retrograde, augmentation, diminution, dynamic and rhythmic change, to new functional roles, expansion and dissolution.

Expectations of symphonic form include varied polyphonic textures, a wide range of timbres, a “public” tone, with motives and themes that are not overly introspective, refined, or embellished. “Public” tone also indicates musical material with universal appeal rather than national, imperialist, or exclusive affinity. This concept of universality is related to the concept of Bildung, the German tradition of life-long learning that was popular in the nineteenth century, and was held in esteem by Elgar throughout his life.

---

47 Elgar heard Saint-Saëns play at La Madeleine in Paris in 1882. Moore, Elgar: a creative life. In 1886 (and 1896), Elgar served as concertmaster in Guilmant’s Symphony in D minor, with organ. Dennison, Elgar Studies, 23.

He remarked in a lecture series in 1905 that he believed that the place of a work of art was to “educate, help and improve mankind generally by being placed before an audience” and gave as his primary example the symphonies of Beethoven.\(^{49}\) His audience was as large a circle as possible – “a responsive, human and artistic mass.”\(^{50}\)

Finally, the distinction between “symphonic form” and “sonata form” is a lexical conundrum. As we know, in a typical four-movement symphony, first and last movements are often both in “sonata form,” the classical exposition-development-recapitulation structure that also defines the first and, often, last, movement of the classical “sonata,” a three-movement structure. Here, Elgar’s first and last movements are considered to be in “sonata form,” but the whole work, an organ “sonata,” can be considered in “symphonic form,” because of its scale, emotional weight, and cyclic coherence (thematic transformation, inter-movement recall of themes or contrasting movements).

These definitions are important because it is also interesting that Elgar did not call the Sonata a “symphony,” even though he had insisted that The Black Knight, with its less symphonic form, was one.\(^{51}\) Perhaps Elgar’s designation of the work as a Sonata was rooted in a realization that hybrid titles did not necessarily register with an audience, as proved to be the case with The Black Knight. Calling the work a Sonata for Organ meant merely that it was for organists to play, not that it was necessarily a true Organ Sonata. Thus, Elgar demurred to convention in this regard.


\(^{50}\) Ibid. 37.

\(^{51}\) Interestingly, Elgar also called Brahms’s Schicksalslied a “symphonic cantata” in 1900. Elgar’s genre designations seemed always to lead to “symphony” as a quality of composition, if not as a quantifiable entity. Dennison, “Elgar’s Musical Apprenticeship,” 8.
Defining the Sonata as Symphonic

Music theoretician Warren Darcy writes, “there are [always] two voices [in a composition]: the composer’s voice and the genre’s voice.”52 The Sonata shows the influence of Wagnerian sequence and harmonic originality, Brahmsian harmonic expansion and structural integrity, Schumannian melody and Beethovenian cyclicism. Elgar’s voice emerges with expansive melodies (both in intervallic leaps and length), harmonies in fewer than four parts, unusually-prepared or unprepared suspensions, ingenious counterpoint, contrasting noble, pastoral, and mystical themes, and precise and nuanced orchestration. The sonata’s voice, however, has not yet been well-identified as symphonic. As Darcy writes further,

Musical genres …are to be distinguished from mere forms insofar as they also carry an implicit social or ideological content…. [They] are socially constituted and reinforced, the results of hundreds of choices made by numerous pivotal individuals over a span of time and ratified by communities of listeners to suit their own purposes.53

The implicit social or ideological content of non-liturgical motives and endless melodies, counterpoint writing that is not idiomatic to the organ, rapid-fire motivic imitation between different timbres, contrasting allegretto and andante movements, and expanded sonata forms, all of which Elgar intentionally chose as his musical language, was that of the symphonic world, not of the organ sonata world. This important distinction unifies the work with Elgar’s whole symphonic body rather than miscategorizing it as a lone keyboard- or organ-centric work. The contents of his works list and the catalog of concerts attended or performed by Elgar confirm this pattern of intense interest in symphonic music, rather than attention to keyboard music; Elgar wrote only one other

sonata (for violin), written thirteen years later and the program catalog of Peter Dennison records knowledge only one Piano Sonata by Beethoven. Additionally, because Elgar cultivated so much symphonic composition before 1895, it is easy to correlate ideas in the Sonata to his earlier instrumental works and to the symphonic works of Beethoven, Brahms, Schumann, and others, including similar thematic material, orchestral textures and techniques, developmental tendencies, cyclic use of material, and instrumental choices. In the Sonata, therefore, the treatment of sonata form, the thematic development based on dense motivic work, the four-movement structure, with two middle movements contrasted by tempo and character, and the finale in hybrid sonata-rondo form, each with motives and themes from previous movements, all point to symphonic-scale models and ideals rather than to soloistic genres. Elgar’s constant affiliation with the symphony is clearly identified in this Sonata.

**Precursors to the Sonata in G for Organ, op. 28**

Elgar’s pre-1895 compositional patterns of symphonic-scale composition and thematic development matured between 1878 to 1895, during which time Elgar explored individual aspects of symphonic composition and strategy, including four-movement structures, sonata form, cyclic treatment, and thematic contrast. His compositional maturity progressed from heavy reliance on exact repetition to more varied thematic development, from employment of large quantities of thematic material to frequently-revisited primary-theme material, and from small-scale musical forms to cyclic, multi-movement compositions. This compositional trajectory will be traced through *The Shed* no. 4 (1878), *Froissart* (1890) and *The Black Knight* (1892). Discussion of orchestration

---

characteristics in comparison with the Sonata will occur at the end of the chapter.

*The Shed no. 4, “The Farmyard” (1878)*

Elgar’s first full sonata-form work was composed during the 1870’s. His *The Shed* no. 4, “The Farmyard,” has six individual themes that shows Elgar’s early attempt to inhabit sonata form. His lack of compositional feedback from a mentor may have contributed to this eclectic approach. The chart is based on analysis from Richard Braddy’s 1999 dissertation (slightly revised).

**Figure 2.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Shed, no. 4, 1878</th>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Second Theme</th>
<th>Closing section</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary theme</td>
<td>30 mm.</td>
<td>10 mm.</td>
<td>36 mm.</td>
<td>21 mm.</td>
<td>82 mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes presented</td>
<td>a b a b’</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>d b’ e f</td>
<td>c c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c a’ a c a a c e c a a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>Second Theme</td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Theme</td>
<td>29 mm.</td>
<td>19 mm.</td>
<td>30 mm.</td>
<td>52 mm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes presented</td>
<td>a b a b’</td>
<td>e c</td>
<td>d b’ e f</td>
<td>c c e a’ d’ c d’ f c e b’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the one hand, thematic overuse flaws the decision to base the development on the transition theme, c, which was used just previously in the exposition closing section. At the same time, use of themes b, d, e, and f in the coda signal a growing awareness of the varied compositional strategy needed for a large instrument piece.

*Froissart (1890)*

By comparison, in his orchestral overture for *Froissart*, Elgar reduces the number of themes to four. This reduction, however, limits the compositional possibilities for his

---

55 His first full four-movement work was “The Shed no. 5: The Mission,” which is discussed in Braddy’s dissertation, “The musical education of Edward Elgar.”

56 After Elgar married, his wife, Alice, was commonly acknowledged as his main critic.

development section and Elgar resorts primarily to theme a. Again, the overture relies on thematic repetition rather than development. Further, in an attempt at cyclic unity, he often repeats the introductory theme, as for example:

Example 2.1, Theme I

In the chart below, we see that this repetition of the introductory theme (I) occurs in the exposition at the end of the first subject (m. 36-39), in the middle of the second subject (m.75-76), in the development (m. 160-168), before the recapitulation (mm. 225-232), and in the coda (mm. 305-308).

Figure 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Froissart, 1890</th>
<th>Intro 13 mm.</th>
<th>Exposition Primary theme 22 mm.</th>
<th>Transition 15 mm.</th>
<th>Subordinate Group 58 mm.</th>
<th>Closing section (Primary theme) 32 mm.</th>
<th>Development 81 mm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Themes presented</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>a b b</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>c I</td>
<td>a’ c’</td>
<td>a b a’ a a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro 7 mm.</td>
<td>Recapitulation Subordinate Theme 7 Intro + 11 mm.</td>
<td>Transition 12 mm.</td>
<td>Primary theme 38 mm.</td>
<td>Closing section 10 mm.</td>
<td>Coda 32 mm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes presented</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>c c</td>
<td>a’ c b</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>a a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work, therefore, does not adhere to several important orienting conventions in sonata form. First, the primary theme appears surprisingly in the subordinate group and the recapitulation begins with subordinate group material, followed by a lengthened first
theme section. Further, the overture moves so quickly between themes that the sonata form is obscured even to the educated listener of the day, someone who would have been able to follow a standard sonata form.\(^{58}\)

Despite the disjointed form, the piece demonstrates several typical Elgarian “public” themes or affects: the march, the heroic flourish, the pastoral theme, and the Elgarian intervallic sigh. One march-like theme is subjected to Elgar’s early use of the compositional technique of developing variation. The second, third, and fifth notes comprise a motive that Elgar develops into four more themes later on. Three of the themes occur in primary subject group and the fourth theme begins the second theme.\(^{59}\)

Example 2.2

*Froissart*, mm. 5-7

These “topical” themes return throughout Elgar’s later works and comprise much of his signature extra-musical rhetoric that is often interpreted as “typically English.” Interestingly, Elgar’s recurrent ascending leap with appoggiatura (m. 6 above), his sigh motive, is notable in symphonic language because of its quasi-sentimental affect. This affect bridges the “public” and “private” emotional spheres, a boundary often pushed by Elgar and one that brought his symphonic works both acclaim for sincerity and disparagement for emotional over-sharing. Lastly, while his repetition scheme here is

\(^{58}\) In retrospect, Elgar called the work “good, healthy stuff,” in the sense that it was a worthwhile exercise in his own compositional development. Elgar to August Jaeger, letter, 20 March 1900.

\(^{59}\) Elgar’s theme also has telling similarities with Wagner’s Act I love duet from *Die Walküre*:

unsuited for sonata form, Elgar’s convention of primary theme usage in the Sonata recurs in his symphonies, suggesting that Elgar came to rely on the familiarizing and organizing effect of returning to “home” material, which he utilized in both his First and Second Symphonies.

_The Black Knight (1892)_

Elgar began his self-titled “symphony for chorus and orchestra,”60 _The Black Knight_, in 1889, the first summer after his marriage. He was encouraged by his wife, Caroline Alice, an author, to hone his musical skills by writing in larger forms. The couple’s shared literary tastes prompted him to attempt a large choral work; the text guided his “strong impulse for big composition.”61 In August 1889, encouraged by Alice, whose valuable experience in focused writing provided needed discipline to the process, Elgar wrote an initial eight-page sketch of the work, filled with “&c&c” at all the places that needed further development. After this effort, however, Elgar felt drained of ideas and the work was put on hold. His diary read, “blank hopeless.”62 Compositional stamina for pushing through writer’s block toward his ideal symphonic expression would come to him later.

While _The Black Knight_ cannot be considered a typical nineteenth-century symphonic form since it has no actual sonata movement,63 it embodies the other requirements of symphonic composition. Elgar incorporates varied and nuanced

---

60 Elgar’s publisher, Novello, preferred to call the work a cantata for marketing purposes. Elgar was disappointed when Novello refused to publish the full score, since the orchestra had as important a role as the chorus. In fact, while the text-setting in the work is not particularly smooth, the orchestration shows Elgar’s ease with instrumental melody, directness, and color.
61 Moore, _Elgar: a creative life_, 134.
62 Ibid. 138.
63 This is contrary to Kent’s description of the movement as such in his 1979 dissertation. There is no real subordinate theme in the “exposition” or the “recapitulation,” among other omissions.
orchestration, an attempt at cyclic unity, as well as captures the collective, “public,” spirit of the nineteenth-century genre. Throughout the four movements, the choir and the orchestra (no soloists) play equal roles in the musical action, and the almost post-modern nihilism of the poem’s plot provides more than enough emotional conflict for symphonic content. The use of Neapolitan sixth chords to express the Black Knight’s malice is one Wagnerian harmonic device that stands out. A chart of the formal characteristics follows:

**Figure 2.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene 1</th>
<th>Scene 2</th>
<th>Scene 3</th>
<th>Scene 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elgar</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>The Black Knight</strong>&lt;br&gt;Scene 1&lt;br&gt;¾&lt;br&gt;Allegro maestoso&lt;br&gt;G major&lt;br&gt;Form: ABA&lt;br&gt;A mm.1-54&lt;br&gt;Transition (12/8) mm.55-70&lt;br&gt;B mm.71-117&lt;br&gt;Retransition mm.118-48&lt;br&gt;[A material] A mm.149-end</td>
<td>Scene 2&lt;br&gt;4/4&lt;br&gt;Moderato&lt;br&gt;C major&lt;br&gt;2/2&lt;br&gt;Allegro molto e fuoco&lt;br&gt;C minor&lt;br&gt;Form: Through-composed</td>
<td>Scene 3&lt;br&gt;¾&lt;br&gt;Allegretto&lt;br&gt;Minuet&lt;br&gt;D major – B minor – G minor&lt;br&gt;Form: Through-composed</td>
<td>Scene 4&lt;br&gt;4/4&lt;br&gt;Andante maestoso&lt;br&gt;Ab – 2/4 C minor – G minor&lt;br&gt;Larghetto ¾ C minor – Allegro molto G minor&lt;br&gt;Andante 4/4 C minor – Lento – Maestoso—G maj.&lt;br&gt;Form: Through-composed, Scene 1 theme recurs at Maestoso</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main cyclic event occurs in scene IV, where Elgar revisits G major, Scene 1 heroic material (i, mm. 1-54) after a tragic death scene (iv, 66ff).

**Example 2.3**

Elgar, *The Black Knight*, sc. i, mm. 1-5
However, this thematic placement is inappropriate for the dramatic arc. Here, Elgar’s attention to symphonic cyclic technique overrides his attention to dramatic integrity. *The Black Knight* is an often-cited influence on the Sonata but it is only superficially influential. Elgar later borrowed and expanded *The Black Knight*’s heroic opening’s theme falling fourth, but in the Sonata, he shifted the metric accent, and incorporated a higher level of unity by playing with a rising/falling interval of a second. He also reused the cantata’s 9/8 time signature for his first movement subordinate group, the cantata’s first movement retransition material, and the contrasting C major/C minor tonalities in the second movement and the G major/G minor tonalities in the last movement. While *The Black Knight* movements were ultimately tied to the text’s content and through-composed, two years later, Elgar’s musically-abstract Sonata adhered very closely to sonata form and symphonic convention, as well as tightened the motivic development and expanded the harmonies to create a web of interrelated compositional elements.

To summarize, Elgar had initiated a four-movement work with *Shed* no. 4, but struggled with thematic variation and eventually abandoned the rest of the movements. He had completed *Froissart*, a one-movement, sonata-form, orchestral overture, an attempt that yielded recognition for its orchestration but not for its formal clarity. He
then created a four-movement work in *The Black Knight*, again with excellent use of orchestral color and another attempt at thematic unity. With orchestration as a known strength, he was now ready to master all three symphonic processes at once – sonata form, motivic and thematic unity, and small-scale orchestration – in his next large work, the Sonata in G (1895).  

**Sonata in G for Organ, op. 28: the manuscript**

I suppose the public imagines the composer rising early and sitting over his music paper the whole day long. That is nowhere near the truth, as a matter of fact. In my own case, an idea comes to me, perhaps when walking. On return I write it down. Weeks or months after I may take it up and write out the movement of which is has become the germ. The actual labour of writing this, with the complete scoring, takes perhaps eight or ten hours. But the piece has gradually shaped itself in my mind in the meantime, and the actual writing is thus a small matter.  

[Elgar] began to get all these fragments—in some instances as many as twenty or thirty consecutive bars—on paper, though they were rarely harmonically complete. A clear vision of the whole symphony was forming in his mind. He would write a portion of the Finale, or of the middle section of the second movement, and then work at the development of the first movement. It did not seem at all odd to him to begin things in the middle, or to switch off suddenly from one movement to another.  

Obviously, then, Elgar’s compositional process was non-linear, a process that made sense for cyclic nineteenth-century creation that required plenty of pre-composition planning and strategy. The Sonata was originally commissioned by his friend and colleague, Hugh Blair, as an “organ voluntary” for a morning service during a planned

---

64 In 1898, while continuing to pursue his symphonic destiny, Elgar offered a symphony in response to a Leeds Festival commission, but they insisted on a cantata. His own symphonies did not come to fruition until 1908 and 1911. Moore, *Elgar and His Publishers*, 93-94.
visit of American travelers who wanted to promote cathedral music in America. However, true to form, Elgar found a way to practice symphonic design in this work, and so the piece became larger and grander in scale than originally intended, much to Hugh Blair’s chagrin, when he finally received the score, four days before its expected performance.

Elgar’s original manuscript for the Sonata shows his initial plan for the Sonata. His vision was for a work in four movements and he wrote on the cover page for the second movement:

I. Allegro
II. Lento
III. Intermezzo
IV. Finale

Later, he crossed this out and wrote next to it:

I. Allegro G major
II. Intermezzo G minor
III. Adagio Bb [4/8]
IV. Finale G mi and maj

The final sonata plan stands:

I. Allegro maestoso
II. Allegretto
III. Andante espressivo [2/4]
IV. Presto (comodo)

68 Edward Elgar, Sonata in G for Organ, op. 28, sketches, 1895, Add. Ms. 57993, fol. 16r., British Library, London.
69 After the premiere, Elgar took back this copy, revised, and recopied. He sent the fair autograph copy to Breitkopf & Härtel in Leipzig. The fair copy is missing. The copyright for the Sonata was transferred from Breitkopf & Härtel to British & Continental Music Agencies in 1941, before the carpet bombing of Leipzig in 1942 and 1943, and at that time, all documents and printing plates could have been sent back to England in 1941. British & Continental was bought by Faber Music after 1972, and Faber Music was acquired by EMI sometime in 1978. Faber Music may still have a box of letters from the British & Continental transfer including the fair copy manuscript and printing plates. Conversation with Faber Music yielded no further information at this time. Another possible location for the fair copy is in the papers of Hugh Blair, which were left to his wife, Catherine Dorrell Blair, in 1923. A probate search would yield Catherine’s descendents. The printed proofs (with Elgar’s corrections) of the manuscript were eventually presented to
The small tweaks made to the names of movements point to the influence of Elgar’s symphonic imagination. The renamed Allegretto, with its 4/8 meter and thirty-second-note values, becomes a lighter movement infused with quasi-scherzo tongue-in-cheek humor. The third movement change from 4/8 to 2/4 introduces a more typical slow movement meter, while the change of the Adagio marking to Andante espressivo, might have been in an effort to steer it away from merely a wistful, sentimental treatment to a forward-looking, energized impression. Elgar’s music has often been noted for a perceived nostalgia, but his tempos in recordings are neither heavy nor slow. In fact, his recording of the “Nimrod” movement of the Enigma Variations is faster and considerably more passionate than most of today’s sentimental performances.  

A newly-discovered set of metronome markings for the Sonata attributed to Elgar also support Elgar’s symphonic intentions and inform this dissertation’s interpretation of the Sonata. The markings were discovered by Michael Broadway on an 1896 published score and have been reprinted in the 2012 Elgar Research Guide by Christopher Kent.

Written in graceful cursive at the top of each movement is inscribed:

Dr. Elgar suggests: 

i. M.M. quarter = 112 or 108  
ii. M.M. eighth = 80  
iii. M.M. eighth = 72  
iv. M.M. quarter = 126

The first and third movement tempi are not surprising, but the tempo for the Allegretto...
(ii) is faster than the *andante*-like tempi in recordings from Herbert Sumson and Harold Darke, as well as the current slower performance practice. Instead, the metronome mark suggests a real *Allegretto* character rather than a slow movement. Further, the tempo suggested for the *Presto* movement is hurried for an organist but can be easily attempted with an orchestral ensemble.

**Methodology**

Previous examination of Elgar’s Sonata is limited primarily to qualitative description of section delineations and thematic character, as is the tradition in much of English scholarship from the tradition of Donald Tovey, early twentieth-century English music critic and professor. This section will reveal the Sonata’s symphonic form and scale, thematic strategies, and orchestration through both qualitative and quantitative discussion of compositional elements.

Lexical influence on the quantitative discussion of musical materials comes from Hepokoski and Darcy’s recent book on Sonata-Theory, called here, *The Elements*, which categorizes common sonata-form practices as well as classifies variants on the form. The theory follows the sequence of thematic “modules” through the exposition, development, and recapitulation. Several of the Sonata movements are structurally idiosyncratic (per Elgar’s compositional process). The visual organization of Sonata-

---

72 *Herbert Sumson at the Organ of Gloucester Cathedral*, Odeon LP HQS 1376; recorded 1965, released 1977; *Elgar Organ Sonata* (Harold Darke, organist), St. Michael’s, Cornhill; live recording 1965.

73 Elgar had begun work on this movement in April of 1895, possibly not in connection with the Sonata, since the work appears to have been intended originally for cello and accompaniment - a Brahmsian Intermezzo. Later in June, Elgar repurposed the Intermezzo as an *Allegretto* in G minor.


75 Hepkoski and Darcy, *The Elements*. 
Theory through charts brings linear organization to the musical materials and lends itself to comparison of thematic sequences that demonstrate Elgar’s compositional strategy. By applying this tool to Elgar’s often-ambiguous Sonata language, it is possible to identify similar structures in his other symphonic works. This paper does not offer a full Sonata-Theory analysis, but only begins to address the lack of quantitative approach of the work; the aim of the paper is to identify the work as symphonic, not to focus solely on Elgar’s approach to sonata form, although it is clearly important. Further study could delve more deeply into this area of research.

Qualitative discussion will focus on musical materials—both Elgarian and from other composers—that show nineteenth-century symphonic influence and that associate the Sonata elements with the orchestral idiom.

The following Sonata-Theory charts chronicle the cadential and thematic movement in Elgar’s four sonata movements, catalogued by decimal organization. These decimals indicate, for example, that themes P\textsuperscript{1.1} and P\textsuperscript{1.2} are variants of each other while themes P\textsuperscript{1.1} and P\textsuperscript{2.1} explore different motivic materials. An abbreviation index is provided below for the charts and analyses that accompany each movement’s discussion (see also Appendix C):

**Figure 2.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C: closing zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>P: primary-theme zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P\textsuperscript{fr}</td>
<td>P\textsuperscript{fr}: specialized sonata/rondo theme, recurring, with “rondo character”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>RT: retransition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S: secondary-theme zone, follows MC (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>S\textsuperscript{c}: secondary theme zone with closing rhetoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>TR: transition, following P, the energy-gaining modules driving toward the MC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

76 This musical planning can be seen in Elgar’s Symphony no. 1 (1908).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cadences</th>
<th>PAC: perfect authentic cadence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IAC: imperfect authentic cadence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HC: half-cadence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DC: deceptive cadence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EEC: essential expositional closure, the first satisfactory PAC that occurs within S and then proceeds onward to differing material. This can be deferred to the next PAC by immediate repetition of the melody or cadence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESC: essential structural closure, within a recapitulation, usually the first satisfactory PAC within S. This can also be deferred as above. The ESC occurs normally at the recapitulation’s parallel point to the exposition’s EEC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC: medial caesura, non-tonic cadence (usually V: HC) that indicates presence of two-part exposition and leads directly to an S theme. If there is no MC, there is usually no S (a continuous exposition).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elgar’s Motivic Materials and Influences**

Elgar’s Sonata is based on motives that include the interval of a falling fourth and rising second and two rhythmic motives with varied metric placement. The motives are characteristic of “public” musical material: compact and harmonically adaptable, rather than conducive to simple melodic treatment, and easily transformed, while remaining recognizable. For example:

**Example 2.4**

Historically, nineteenth-century composers had moved away from the eighteenth-century norms of symmetrical forms and melodic themes toward shorter, harmonically-indeterminate motives and larger, longer formal structures. The new emphasis was on

---

77 If the PAC never occurs, the EEC is never attained and the sonata is threatened with non-closure, i.e. sonata “failure.”
“originality” of musical materials and led to individualized forms based on the development and transformation of these original materials. When Elgar chose to write a four-movement work that was united cyclically by falling fourths, rising seconds and two rhythmic motives, he invoked this nineteenth-century practice. How he chose to proceed with these materials is interesting because it shows a careful navigation between Wagner’s and Brahms’s solutions for this large-scale compositional style.

Briefly, Carl Dahlhaus describes the compositional solutions of Wagner and Brahms in his essay “Issues in Composition.” On the one hand, Wagner created large forms with small motives by employing “real, modulatory sequence” in expositional areas and exploring a “wandering tonality” and chromaticism where single chords or unusual harmonic progressions carry great significance. Wagner’s harmonies are based on a chain-like order of succession, rather than hierarchies. On the other hand, Brahms addressed the same nineteenth-century ideal by employing a technique identified by Arnold Schoenberg for J.S. Bach’s works, called “developing variation,” here borrowed by Dahlhaus for Brahms. Developing variation is the evolution of a motive over a composition, even in the exposition of a sonata structure, a compositional technique that alters the form’s actual developmental processes to include, potentially, new material. Brahms also uses expanded harmony and enriched fundamental basses, and “integrat[es] remote degrees and regions in one secure tonic to which modulations can always be

79 Ibid. 76.
80 Schoenberg never actually applies the term “developing variation” to Brahms’s work in his essay, “Brahms the Progressive,” although the term is well-suited at this time to describe Brahms’s compositional technique.
Elgar was not a partisan in the fierce debate between Wagner’s and Liszt’s “New Music” and Brahms’s “Absolute Music,” and his compositional solutions show a combination of Wagner’s sequential development and Brahms’s expanded forms and enriched harmonic language. However, in contrast to the expectation that the motives drive the structure, Elgar’s large-scale strategy at this time seems to have been to “fill” a form, rather than to allow his materials to spin out as the form, as Dahlhaus suggests should be the case for nineteenth-century composition. Consequently, in the Sonata manuscript sketches, Elgar writes out the function of each section of material as “Primary Theme,” “2nd Theme,” “Working out,” and so on. Given Elgar’s history of partial successes up to this point with large-scale writing, this piece shows definitively that Elgar could write a work with nineteenth-century harmonic and motivic language in sonata and character movements that were cyclically-unified into a large symphonic form. If he “fills” the sonata form with motivic development here, his motives do fully drive later expositions and developments, including those of his symphonies. Nonetheless, Elgar was still on the cutting edge of nineteenth-century composition when he introduces unique solutions to the development of small motives in a large form, such sequential melodies, invertible counterpoint, quotation of key phrases on top of other textures, discreet and consistent reference to first subject material in transitions and closing sections (a quasi-cyclic, quasi-rondo application of thematic material), a massive-but-not-opaque sense of texture (in contrast to complaints about Brahms and Schumann), and a maze of activity in which new melodic lines and little harmonic events are created out of an original polyphonic matrix. These areas will be explored further.

i.  *Allegro maestoso*

   Exposition

   Elgar’s exposition introduces a wealth of musical ideas based on the motives described above and results in the most densely-composed piece of the four movements. The primary motive of the falling fourth is easily spotted throughout, transformed but retaining its motivic integrity in each succeeding theme. Nineteenth-century processes applied to these first movement motives and themes include the use of varied repetition and transformation, thematic strategies (multiple transition themes, primary subject material in the closing sections), compositional devices (contrapuntal thematic layering), and contrasting themes and moods. The chart below shows the thematic progression through primary material (P), transition (TR), and secondary group themes (S) – and allows quick identification of the thematic progression through the rest of the movement. Discussion of issues that this chart highlights will include the lack of frequent cadences, which is notable but expected in an expanded sonata form. The reasons for the comparatively long transition section will also be discussed further, as well as the use of only transition material in the development. The rest of the analysis of the exposition will focus on meter, key area, and thematic character.
**Figure 2.5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elgar Sonata for Organ op. 28, I</th>
<th><strong>Exposition</strong></th>
<th><strong>Transition</strong></th>
<th><strong>Secondary Theme Zone</strong></th>
<th><strong>S(^c) Zone</strong></th>
<th><strong>Development</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure numbers</strong></td>
<td>1 P(^1,1)</td>
<td>16 TR(^1,1)</td>
<td>42 S(^1,1)</td>
<td>75 S(^c) (= P(^1,1))</td>
<td>92 TR(^1,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 P(^1,1)</td>
<td>22 TR(^1,2)</td>
<td>46 S(^1,1)</td>
<td>82 P(^1,1) / TR(^1,3)</td>
<td>98 TR(^1,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 P(^1,2) TR(^1,1)</td>
<td>25 TR(^1,2)</td>
<td>50 S(^1,2)</td>
<td>84 P(^1,1)</td>
<td>101 TR(^1,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27 TR(^1,3)</td>
<td>54 S(^1,2)</td>
<td>86 P(^1,1) / TR(^1,3)</td>
<td>105 TR(^1,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 TR(^1,3)</td>
<td>56 S(^1,2)</td>
<td>88 P(^1,1)</td>
<td>111 TR(^1,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35 TR(^1,3)</td>
<td>58 S(^1,1)</td>
<td>90 P(^1,1) / TR(^1,3)</td>
<td>114 TR(^1,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37 P(^1,1)</td>
<td>62 S(^1,1)</td>
<td>92 TR(^1,1)</td>
<td>126 TR(^1,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66 S(^1,2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>141 TR(^1,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68 S(^1,2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70 S(^1,1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73 S(^1,2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key</strong></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G, Bm</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cadences</strong></td>
<td>21 I: HC</td>
<td>53 V: PAC</td>
<td>104 ii</td>
<td>105 bVII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65 V: HC</td>
<td>111-114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(EEC avoided(^{82}))</td>
<td>i: v – I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120 i: iv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141 I: HC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recapitulation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Transition</strong></th>
<th><strong>Secondary Theme Zone</strong></th>
<th><strong>S(^c) Zone</strong></th>
<th><strong>Coda</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure numbers</strong></td>
<td>149 P(^1,1)</td>
<td>181 S(^1,1)</td>
<td>214 S(^c) (= P(^1,1))</td>
<td>239 TR(^1,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>157 P(^1,2) TR(^1,1)</td>
<td>185 S(^1,1)</td>
<td>219 P(^1,1) / TR(^1,3)</td>
<td>240 P(^1,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>189 S(^1,2)</td>
<td>221 P(^1,1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>193 S(^1,2)</td>
<td>223 P(^1,1) / TR(^1,3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>195 S(^1,2)</td>
<td>225 P(^1,1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>197 S(^1,1)</td>
<td>227 P(^1,1) / TR(^1,3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201 S(^1,2)</td>
<td>229 P(^1,1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>205 S(^1,2)</td>
<td>233 TR(^1,3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207 S(^1,2)</td>
<td>238 TR(^1,1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>209 S(^1,1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>212 S(^2,1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key</strong></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cadences</strong></td>
<td>140 I: HC MC</td>
<td>192 I: PAC</td>
<td>229 I: V6/4- V4/2-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>204 I: HC</td>
<td>238 I: vi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(no ESC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{82}\) The avoidance of EEC suggests that this sonata exposition is “failed,” in that possibly an indication that Elgar did not know about this subtle tradition of cadential closure in sonata form, self-taught as he was. Alternately, as part of the nineteenth-century aesthetic, Elgar may have wanted to evoke the continuous, chain-like harmonies of Wagner in this section. Other composers who consciously use the failed sonata structure may intend a post-Enlightenment critique about the futility of the sonata’s ideology of orderly contrast.
To delve more deeply into the initial motivic framework of the piece, we will observe several points about Elgar’s primary theme, \( P^{1.1} \). This period with an antecedent of eight bars contains both the descending fourth motive and dotted, repeated-note rhythm identified above.

**Example 2.5**

The development processes that Elgar applies to this theme establish expectations for nineteenth-century thematic development. Accordingly, the addition of a triplet rhythm and expansion of the falling fourth to a falling fifth (mm. 3-4) show Elgar emulating Brahms’s pattern of immediate thematic development for expositional material. Measure five inverts the rising second of bar 1-2 to a series of falling seconds with rhythmic piquancy that contrasts the majestic dactyls of the first four bars. The final two bars of the antecedent conclude the initial thematic foray through a chromatically falling melodic line harmonized by diminished sevenths and a modally-flavored iv chord. By bar three, Elgar invokes Brahmsian influence through the pedal point and the varied repetition of the first falling fourth, but by bar four, we know that the composer is *not* Brahms by the definitively Elgarian upward arpeggiation over a 4/2 chord and the large octave leap. Elgar places himself immediately in dialogue with nineteenth-century compositional issues with this opening. The symphonic identity is established next.

The seven-bar, reharmonized consequent that elides into a sequential stream of arpeggiations then establishes a precedent for metric irregularity that further aligns the
Sonata with nineteenth-century musical language, and more importantly, with symphonic convention. The dissolution of the primary theme into this transition is signaled by the reversal of the arpeggiated/dotted rhythm structure to dotted-rhythm followed by arpeggiation.

**Example 2.6**

This is a climax for the page and functions as an affirmative gesture that moves the music “somewhere new.” The repeat of the primary theme before taking a different path, as in measures 9-15, is a common symphonic gesture often accompanied by a tutti orchestration that suggests that the full orchestra “enthusiastically accepts the proposed theme as the basis for a sonata.”

Significantly, this dissolution of the consequent also occurs in Mozart’s Symphony no. 40 in G minor, K. 550, which Elgar studied closely in

---

1878, thus supporting the notion that Elgar’s influences in this Sonata are symphonically-based.

Cadential suppression, chromatically-rich harmonic modulation, and rhythmic transformation of the dotted, repeated-note motive to the first transition motive (m. 16), all create symphonic expectations for this grand expositional space. Further, the sequential use of multiple first- and second-inversion dominant seventh chords (m. 16-20) propels the harmony gradually away from G-major confidence to F#-minor melancholy, creating a clear character change and a sense of harmonic rootlessness reminiscent of Wagner.

Multiple themes in a transition section affect the scale of development in subsequent sections and are another example of expanded nineteenth-century symphonic strategy and attention to proportions. Elgar’s penchant for introducing multiple transition themes shows the influence of his interaction with the symphonic scores of Beethoven, Schumann, and Brahms, all of whom used multiple transitional themes in their symphonic works. Although Beethoven’s “Waldstein” Piano Sonata also features this construction, Dennison’s “Musical Apprenticeship” indicates that Elgar was only acquainted with Beethoven’s Piano Sonata, op. 28, and he did not apparently know Mozart’s piano sonatas, either. Thus Elgar would have associated this transition complex with symphonic and instrumental music, not keyboard works. Here, Elgar’s half cadence in m. 21, mid-way through the exuberant arpeggios of the transition, signals the entrance of the second transition theme (TR\textsuperscript{1.2}) built on rising and falling fourths, a texture that implies a homophonic brass fanfare, and soon thereafter, the third theme (TR\textsuperscript{1.3}), a wistful...

\textsuperscript{84} Brahms Second Symphony, Schumann Second Symphony
melodic line that revisits the falling fourths and rising second of the primary theme:

**Example 2.7**

From Elgar’s sketches, it is apparent that the two transition themes in D and F# minor (mm. 21-33) were added to this section later, possibly to provide more material for the upcoming development section and to balance the musical proportions of the exposition’s longer subordinate group (S). The new proportions are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>P→TR</th>
<th>S→S'</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The insertion of so much transitional material (TR) in proportion to the number of measures of the themes (P: 16 bars, TR: 25 bars, S: 31 bars) potentially calls attention away from the primary theme (P) too quickly, but it is also a nineteenth-century aesthetic of providing abundant thematic and character contrast. Elgar later solves this strategic dilemma of providing enough development material in the exposition by either weaving a motto theme throughout or by introducing completely new material in his development sections in Symphonies no. 1 and no. 2. The latter is a technique explored infrequently in

---

85 Elgar, Sonata sketches, BL Add. Ms. 57993, fol. 3r.
86 Elgar, Sonata sketches, BL Add. Ms. 57993, fol. 3r; the material for TR\textsuperscript{1.2} appears after TR\textsuperscript{1.3} and a several crossed-out measures.
symphonic writing but found, for example, in both Schumann’s Second Symphony and Brahms’s Third Symphony (second and fourth movements), both of which Elgar knew well.

Another area of nineteenth-century composition involves key areas. Elgar often exploits foreign keys in order to reinforce abrupt changes of character, seen before in the transition section (G→F# minor [first going through the first transitional subject’s C# major]), in the Development (F→G minor), and in the recapitulation transition (G→B minor). These unusual key areas alert the listener to an abrupt change in musical rhetoric, an often-used Elgarian device. It seems likely that key areas were important to Elgar, since a standard feature throughout his major works, including in the “Enigma” Variations, was the contrast of G major and G minor, a contrast also found in Elgar’s beloved Symphony no. 40 by Mozart. Because of his absolute musical pitch, Elgar also seemed to gravitate toward F#, used in the minor here as an exotic contrast to G major, and set in F# major in the third movement.

Eighteenth and nineteenth-century key interest in key meanings may have played a role in this choice and F# minor was said by Berlioz in his *Traité d’instrumentation* to be a tragic and sonorous key while C# major was “elegant,” even “majestic [for Db major].”87 Berlioz goes on to cite F major as “energetic and vigorous,” G major as “rather gay and slightly commonplace,” and G minor as “melancholy, tolerably sonorous, soft.”88 While it would be naïve to endorse these meanings strictly, they are also not foreign to Elgar’s use of key characters in this movement and engage the alert listener’s attention as Elgar modulates pointedly away from G major to C# major and then F#

88 Ibid. 236, 262, 273, 276.
minor in mm. 16 to mm 25.

Meter changes provide another type of character contrast. The exposition’s subordinate group in 9/8, accompanied by a tonic pedal point drone, is meant to invoke the symphonic topic of the pastorale. This is in contrast to the primary theme’s heroic, vitality, the transition section’s up-beat, declamatory trumpet fanfare (TR\(^1.2\)) and the minor-mode lyricism of the F# minor theme(TR\(^1.3\)), which is metrically shifted to the second beat of the measure.

Elgar invokes the Romantic tendency to present striking thematic material with his self-contained second theme—an expressive cantabile melody. The theme provides another example of Elgar’s nineteenth-century approach to sonata form. The completely disjunct melody with rising and falling fourths and seconds, repeated note motives, and regular phrase structure introduces a new mood contrast: a dolce summer stroll (through the English countryside?), as for an example:

**Example 2.8**

![Example 2.8](image)

S\(^{1.1}\):

To extend the pastoral mood, a sub-theme (S\(^{1.2}\)) develops the second half of the subordinate group and reduces to an ascending fourth and repeated note motive.

**Example 2.9**

![Example 2.9](image)

S\(^{1.2}\):

The second group develops gently, with regular, metric harmonic articulations and use of direct repetition as the mode of expression, all of which continue to provide peaceful,
stable contrast to the constantly-moving, irregular primary theme and the unusual key changes and multiple themes of the transition. This is a typical Elgarian theme in its simple melodic nature, repetition strategy, and sighing iteration of the initial motive’s falling fourths. The Shakespearean “smiling with a sigh” signature emerges here.\(^{89}\)

The second theme closes with the reintroduction of the primary theme’s leaping contour and dactylic rhythm. The use of primary thematic material to delineate sections has already been discussed with regard to earlier works\(^{90}\) and this pattern persists as \(\text{P}^{1.1}\) functions as the closing section to the Sonata’s exposition (m. 75), prepares the developmental retransition (m. 141), and closes the recapitulation (m. 214) and coda (m. 240). For example, in the exposition’s contrapuntal closing section, Elgar layers the primary theme’s descending fourths, the primary theme triplet motive and the second transition theme (m. 75) in a truly instrumental crescendo of counterpoint. Here, as in the other cases, the frequent recurrence of the primary theme is an important orientating device for the listener. Elgar might have envisioned a low brass section to play the pedal line in mm. 81-86, since on the organ, it is difficult (but not impossible) to find the right balance with the close proximity of the upper voices’s counterpoint lines.

\(^{89}\) Othello, i, 3.

\(^{90}\) This was seen earlier in Chapter 2 in “Shed no. 4,” Froissart, The Black Knight, and can be found later in Symphony no. 1 (i, m. 202, 359, 542; iv, m. 97, 343).
Example 2.10

Elgar, op. 28, i, mm. 75-86

Surprisingly, this section, starting at m. 73, has often been mistaken for the commencement of the development. However, in the Sonata sketches, Elgar labels the material starting at m. 92 as the “Working Out” (his language for “Development”). This contrapuntal section recurs in the recapitulation in the parallel location (m. 214), labeled again by Elgar as the “Coda,” by which he really means “Closing Section” (rather than recapitulatory development) because of the identical function of the section and the unaltered themes. This development of exposition themes before the actual development section can be seen as a Brahmsian symphonic technique that occurs in many of Brahms’s works, including his Second Symphony, first movement, where the motive of a descending fourth is developed throughout the exposition (more in chapter 3).

Development

According to Sonata-Theory in The Elements, it is typical for a development section to treat exposition material in the same order in which it appears in the

---

91 This notion is seen by such scholars as Anderson, Elgar, 397; Fanselau, Die Orgelwerke, 149; McVeagh, Elgar the music maker, 24; Moore, Elgar: a creative life, 192.
92 Elgar, BL Add. Ms. 57993, fol. 7r, 8r.
93 The coda is marked “Schluss” by Elgar (m. 240). BL Add. Ms. 57993 fol. 13r.
exposition. This is the case for Elgar’s development, at least initially. Elgar limits the developmental material to the exposition’s three transition themes, presented in four episodes (mm. 92-96, 97-103, 104-113, 114-132, 133-145). This was also wise strategically because Elgar had based the exposition’s closing section on primary material and the subordinate theme was also too-recently explored. His modes of invention are sequence, interval expansion, character alternation and orchestral imitation of voices (albeit, often non-idiomatically for the keyboard). The motives are commingled and developed when the second transition theme (TR$^{1,2}$) takes on the fanfare qualities of the first transition theme (TR$^{1,1}$; m. 104) and the first transition theme is treated to melodic repetition in a quiet register (m. 113). These are not newly-conceived developmental processes, but they demand new orchestral colors for best performance effect.

**Example 2.11**

Elgar, op. 28, i, mm. 103-104; mm. 113-117

1. TR$^{1,2}$ texture with TR$^{1,3}$ rhythm
2. TR$^{1,3}$ contour with TR$^{1,2}$ rhythm

This treatment is obviously rooted in a symphonic concept tied to Elgar’s famously-varied orchestration. Elgar could have further developed these motives by expanding the intervals, changing the interval directions, modifying the rhythms, and so forth, but here he relies on change of orchestral color to provide the compositional interest. The organ he wrote for, the 1878 William Hill organ at Worcester Cathedral, was well-suited to

---

95 Interestingly, twenty years earlier, Elgar also used a transition theme in conjunction with the primary theme as development material in “Shed no. 4” (1878). Later in Symphony no. 1 (1908), he develops only transition material in alternation with new material (i, mm. 230-374).
provide different colors for the section.\textsuperscript{96}

It is important to note that while these episodic processes are smaller than symphonic episodes, it was surely because Elgar realized that the organ could reasonably accommodate fewer themes at a time than could an orchestra, and as a consequence, fewer development processes. The third process (example 2 above) is a slightly expanded intervallic contour from the original, but again, Elgar relies on repetition at different pitch levels and on different manuals rather than extensive motivic development.

These examples demonstrate that Elgar was still learning how to develop material but that he developed motives from a symphonic perspective rather than from the organ world, whose conventions would have suggested fugal treatment or introduction of a chorale melody.\textsuperscript{97} Elgar, on the other hand, thought of the organ as a small-scale orchestra with a wide range of pitch, dynamics, and color. He lays out melodic fragments like instrumental strettos, rather than the echo tradition of the organ, as in the development. He weaves inner voices into textures that require two, if not three, manuals, as in the expositional closing section. He also writes homophonic accompaniments derived from woodwind textures whose multi-voice chords can be made clear but quiet, while the organ dynamic level increases per note that is depressed, as in TR\textsuperscript{13}. This texture can be accommodated successfully on the part of the performing organist, but the presence of it indicates truly orchestral origins for the writing.

\textsuperscript{96} Although, few indications are to be found the Breitkopf & Härtel score of what he envisioned for these measures, some additional markings can be found in the Elgar Complete Edition “Organ Works” volume.

\textsuperscript{97} Other organ works of the same period, including by Parry, Stanford, Lemare, Harwood, and so on, are more idiomatically-conceived for the organ. This means that the textures they choose focus on accompaniment and solo, trio writing, two part writing, pedal points or pedal solos, chords or scales (but not in parallel motion), octave doubling, contrary motion, imitative voices in different registers, tenor solos with simple, clear accompaniment textures, and final chords rather than unison notes. They usually focus on two ideas at a time, and only rarely three or four musical lines running together.
Elgar’s recapitulation mirrors the ordered units of the exposition, rather than reverses the units, as was the case in *Froissart*. The primary theme is abbreviated and Elgar revisits only the second transition theme (TR\textsuperscript{1,3}), in B minor, followed by the second theme, which is presented in its original length. Because Elgar had not used any of the subordinate theme material in the development, it made compositional sense to include the whole section in the tonic rather than to reduce it. As mentioned above, the Coda revisits the primary theme in its original form, in inversion and in expansion and produces a triumphant close to the movement.

In summary, Elgar’s attention to symphonic-scale composition rather than keyboard composition is seen mainly in its compositional proportions, thematic pacing, and developmental processes. The often cadential-shunning key characters mark the movement as squarely rooted in nineteenth-century musical language of Elgar’s heroes, Wagner, Brahms, and Schumann.
ii. Allegretto

Although historically this movement often occurred after the slow second movement, Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony provides a precedent for a second movement scherzo or lighter movement. Elgar knew this when he exchanged the inner movement order. However inner symphonic movements are placed, they must connect motivically to the outer movements while offering contrasting characters. Oddly, several scholars suggest that this movement has little motivic connection to the rest of the work. 98 However, the initial right hand figuration incorporates references to the descending fourth motive (m. 1). 99 The tenor melody ascends with an upward sixth leap acts as a counterbalance to the subsequently descending fourth leaps in the melody (mm. 2-3). Thus, connection to the first movement continues with cyclic treatment of the fourth, which appears throughout the ternary ABA movement. Soon, the fourth becomes a rising fifth through expansion and inversion and is also treated to sequence with the dotted repeated note figure (m. 7):

Example 2.12

Elgar, op. 28, ii, mm. 1-3  Elgar, op. 28, ii, mm. 6-7

99 As mentioned earlier, this movement was started in April of 1895 and likely not intended originally for organ, given the cello-like characteristics of the main melody.
The dotted figure in m.7 refers to the first movement’s transition theme (TR$^{1,3}$), another motivic correlation.

Key relationships and expressive markings also contribute clues to the movement’s character. Elgar employs a plagal relationship between the sections. His use of an introspective G minor in the Allegretto A section compared with the extroverted, march-like B section in C major provides stimulating character contrast and mirrors the tradition of major/minor contrasts in middle sections, especially in Minuet/Trio, Scherzo/Trio, and other ABA forms.

Elgar writes unusual *tenuto* marks over the repetition of the A-section. These expressive gestures are not seen regularly in other composers’s orchestral language and suggest a suddenly more intimate character—a momentary return to the initial Brahmsian Intermezzo concept for the piece.

**Example 2.13**

Elgar op. 28, ii, mm. 15-17

Several measures later, though, a set of bifurcated expressive markings hints again at a scherzo character. The right hand must play *scherzando* as the left hand plays *dolce*, a contrast which is, in itself, scherzo-like.
Example 2.14

Elgar, op. 28, ii, mm. 24-25

In the B section, the right hand chordal countermelody again incorporates the rising second and descending fourth from the first movement (m. 33).

Example 2.15

Elgar op. 28, ii, mm. 32-33

This texture is difficult to play on the organ at a march-like tempo, but with an orchestra, each instrument plays independently and the resulting character is light and fresh. The Gordon Jacob orchestration of Elgar’s Sonata provides immediate proof of the ease with which these ideas translate to an orchestra. All through the transcription, Jacob makes light of difficult organ textures through contrasted instrumental groups, orchestral shading, and special use of percussion and special instruments (including harp, glockenspiel, timpani, and snare drums).100

100 See Chapter 4 for additional transcriptions of the Sonata.
After the trio-centric B-section and shortened retransition, the A section returns to more inward tenor melodic treatment.

**Figure 2.6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elgar op. 28, II</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Transition (TR)</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure numbers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 A&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>22 TR&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>32 B/T&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>59 A&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 A&lt;sup&gt;1.2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>24 TR&lt;sup&gt;1.2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>52 T&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>64 A&lt;sup&gt;1.2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 A&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>54 T&lt;sup&gt;1.2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>70 A&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 A&lt;sup&gt;1.2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 A&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>C minor/ C major</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td>G minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadences</td>
<td>21 Gm: PAC</td>
<td>24, 27 C: IV-I</td>
<td>39 C: PAC</td>
<td>57 C: iv-i</td>
<td>71 Gm: PAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed earlier in Chapter 2, the metronome marks suggested by “Dr.” Elgar indicate that the Allegretto may be a quasi-scherzo movement for the Sonata. The scherzo’s expected sense of humor is expressed through the contrast of the melody’s playfully introspective chromaticism, bubbly thirty-second notes, and impish pizzicato bass, a comedic counterbalance. It also has aesthetic roots in Mendelssohn’s fairy-like Overture to *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, and seen later in his own *Dream Children* and *Wand of Youth* suites.

The duple meter used throughout the piece does not defy scherzo practice, though scherzos are traditionally in triple meter. After an A section in clear duple meter, Elgar’s gradually introduces triplet figures (known already from the first movement) in mm. 24. He then incorporates them fully into the B section with the new material and creates the impression of a fleeting triple meter subdivision. Brahms uses a similar duple/triple contrasting device in the scherzo of his Piano Quintet op. 36, m. 17, by introducing new
material and a triplet subdivision that shifts metric emphasis to 6/8, a compound meter reference.\textsuperscript{101}

Another possible connection for this movement is Brahms’s String Quartet op. 51, no. 1, with its third movement scherzo, Allegretto molto moderato e comodo, in 4/8, an unusual meter in the symphonic repertoire,\textsuperscript{102} so far, the only example of 4/8 encountered in this research. The off-tonic, minor beginning of both Elgar’s and Brahms’s movements, the busy, descending sequential motives, the interplay of 5/3 and 6/3 sonorities and the pick-up notes mirror very closely Elgar’s treatment of his opening Allegretto. Additionally, the b6-5 falling seconds are notable similarities.

\textbf{Example 2.16}

Elgar op. 28, ii, mm. 1-2

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.7\textwidth]{example2.16.png}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{101} Ryan McClelland, \textit{Brahms and the scherzo: studies in musical narrative}, (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010), 105.

\textsuperscript{102} Elgar heard String Quartet op. 51, no. 1 in January 1887 (and April 1902). Dennison, “Elgar’s Musical Apprenticeship,” 21.
An additional influence may have been Schumann’s Fourth Symphony Scherzo Trio, with its remarkable contour similarities in the violin part in comparison with Elgar’s opening accompaniment figure (compare with Example 1.17).\(^\text{103}\)

**Example 2.17**

Schumann’s descending sequence plays with a two-against-three rhythmic feature, as well as the use of fourths and seconds, rising and falling. The affect is a floating, airy Bb major contrast from the insistent D minor repeated note counterpoint of the scherzo.

\(^{103}\) This figure also appears in the Schumann’s Second Symphony, second movement Romanze, mm. 385-399.
While Schumann’s circular figure is the main melodic feature against a descending woodwind harmonic accompaniment, Elgar’s similar circular figure in minor adds an ambiguous modal sixth and acts as the counterpoint to an ascending tenor melodic line. Herein, Schumann’s Scherzo and Brahms’s Allegretto find significant points of similarity with Elgar’s Allegretto and link the movement further to orchestral writing.

**iii. Andante espressivo**

The Andante’s escape from G minor to Bb major, F# major, and D minor (intertwined third relationships) and uninterrupted melodic processes identify it as a typical Romantic slow movement with compositional roots in Schumannian and Brahmsian long melodies. The movement has been described as both in binary and ternary forms by different scholars, probably due to the similarity of the development section with the subordinate subject. The form of the movement is ambiguous but lends itself reasonably to small sonata structure. Elgar’s habit of separating sections in his orchestral works with light double bar lines indicates one potential formal delineation, with key areas related by the descending third paradigm:

**Figure 2.7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Dev.</th>
<th>Recap.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>(come prima)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. 1-32</td>
<td>mm. 33-48</td>
<td>mm. 49-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bb maj</td>
<td>F# maj.</td>
<td>D min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bb maj</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

104 For instance: Schumann Second Symphony, third movement; Brahms Second Symphony, second movement.
106 See Elgar’s *Froissart*, First Symphony, and Second Symphony.
However, Hepokoski’s Sonata-Theory with attention to cadences (or lack thereof) leads one to conclude that the form actually is a two-part sonata, with primary, transitional and secondary themes in the exposition that lead directly back to the recapitulation (with variation). The lack of cadence between the primary theme and transition forces this classification, although the thematically-distinct transition could be mistaken for the secondary theme. Nevertheless, the result is that this movement has three main themes, and after their presentation, they are intertwined and varied. How they are labeled is of less consequence than the effectiveness of their materials, which are considered one of the highlights of Elgar’s compositions—a truly elegant “adagio” movement.

**Figure 2.8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elgar op. 28, III</th>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Secondary Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure numbers</strong></td>
<td>Primary Theme</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>Secondary Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 P⁰</td>
<td>33 TR¹</td>
<td>49 S¹</td>
<td>57 P¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 P⁴</td>
<td>41 TR¹</td>
<td>58 TR¹</td>
<td>59 P¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 S¹</td>
<td>60 TR¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key</strong></td>
<td>(Gm) Bb</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>Dm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cadences</strong></td>
<td>(no MC)</td>
<td>40 VII: HC</td>
<td>60 bIII: V⁴/2-I6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41 VII: PAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48 VII: PAC MC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recapitulation</strong></td>
<td>Primary Theme and Transition</td>
<td>Secondary Theme</td>
<td>Codetta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure numbers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 TR¹/P¹</td>
<td>81 S¹</td>
<td>86 TR¹/P¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 TR¹</td>
<td>82 TR¹/P¹</td>
<td>87 TR¹/P¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key</strong></td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>Bb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cadences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>80 I: PAC MC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85 I: PAC ESC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elgar’s movement actually begins with a bare three-chord modulation form G minor to Bb major, an arresting in medias res treatment seen in many symphonic works. These include Mozart’s Symphony no. 40 in G minor, a life-long favorite of Elgar’s,

---

107 Type-1 Sonata, according to Hepkoski/Darcy.
Mendelssohn’s overture for *A Mid-summer Night’s Dream*, the latter which Elgar both heard and performed at least three times,\(^ {108}\) and an earlier version of Brahms’s Fourth Symphony.\(^ {109}\) Elgar’s falling thirds included (Gm)-Bb-F#-Dm-Bb; third relations were also used by Haydn and Beethoven, and more interestingly, in descending thirds, by Brahms. Instead of tonic-dominant relationships, Brahms’s falling thirds have been argued to promote a character of intense concentration and melancholy.\(^ {110}\) Elgar’s increasingly euphoric movement transforms this intense third-based key relationship to one of transcendent beauty and serenity.

The movement introduces three melodies: a slow-moving, disjunct, syncopated mid-range tune based on an earlier cello melody and a floating, ethereal, string-like, step-wise melody with triplet rhythms, and a falling triplet-laced melody accompanied by the repeated chord texture of the first movement’s transition theme (TR\(^ {1,3}\)).\(^ {111}\) Cyclic treatment continues with the use of the rising and falling fourth motive, rising and falling seconds and the dotted-repeated-note motive throughout the primary and secondary melodies.

\(^{108}\) Dennison, “Elgar’s Musical Apprenticeship,” 24. The same *in medias res* treatment occurs in Beethoven’s First Symphony in C major, first movement, with a V/IV first chord that only resolves to I in bar 8. Elgar, however, does not indicate a record of interaction with this composition.


\(^{111}\) The earlier cello melody was entitled “Traumerie” in an 1887 sketchbook and copied by Elgar on the facing page of the sketch manuscript. BL Add. Ms. 57993, fol. 21v.
Example 2.18

Elgar op. 28, iii, mm. 1-12, primary theme

![Primary Theme Example]

Elgar op. 28, iii, mm. 33-40, second theme

![Second Theme Example]

In the transition theme, which reverses the falling fourth, rising second to falling second, rising fourth, Elgar includes an inner voice reference to the movement’s primary theme in mm. 31-35, a moment of inner thematic unity. Further Elgarian thematic invention occurs in measure 49 where embellishment of the subordinate theme includes an obbligato pedal line that counterbalances the soaring violin-like line in the right hand and again in m. 61, and where Elgar returns to the primary theme in combination with the subordinate theme in a voice-crossing episode.

---

112 On the organ, the pitches are less obvious in this range, but in an orchestral setting, they would be heard as an elegant countermelody.
Example 2.19

Elgar, iii, mm. 61-62

This end of the movement is reminiscent of the first movement’s closing section treatment and the final unison note (i, m. 252; iii, m. 92). Elgar fuses melody, key areas, and alternatingly tranquil and soaring instrumental textures in pursuit of – and achievement of – a symphony-worthy slow movement that suits the pipe organ’s scale.

iv. Presto (comodo)

Elgar’s pattern of primary theme reiteration infuses this finale movement’s sonata structure with rondo elements. According to Darcy, a typical sonata-rondo must have three units of repeated thematic material, starting each time with the principal rondo refrain (Pr). Because the finale’s first unit ends with P material and the second unit starts with S material, this finale must be a sonata. On the one hand, the reappearance of the primary theme (P) in the non-repeated exposition’s closing section occurs in G minor, the tonic key, which signifies sonata-rondo form. On the other hand, Elgar’s second appearance of primary theme material (P) occurs without the perfect authentic cadence (PAC) retransition (RT) required for Sonata-Theory rondo form, and so the

---

113 The primary theme’s character confirms this sonata/sonata-rondo hybrid, though some scholars have argued that it is either firmly sonata or rondo form. Sonata form argument: Kent, Moore, Wells. Sonata-rondo and rondo argument: Fanselau, Breitkopf & Härtel press release for the Sonata (Leipzig, 1898).

114 1. Pr TR S / C → RT, cadence on V:PAC or III:PAC
   2. Pr TR S / C → RT, cadence on I:PAC or i:PAC
   3. Pr (+ coda), ends with I:PAC

Hepokoski and Darcy, The Elements, 405.

115 Ibid. 405.
movement cannot be considered a true sonata-rondo. However, the return of the primary theme after each contrasting section\textsuperscript{116} implies a closer relationship on the sonata-rondo/sonata continuum.

**Figure 2.9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elgar Sonata for Organ op. 28, IV</th>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Second Theme</th>
<th>$S^c$ (closing-zone rhetoric)</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure numbers</td>
<td>1 $P^{1.1}$</td>
<td>33 $TR^{1.1}$</td>
<td>60 $S^{1.1}$</td>
<td>94 $S^c=P^{1.1}$</td>
<td>136 $P^{1.1}$ from mvt. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 $P^{1.1}$</td>
<td>from mvt. 1</td>
<td>68 $S^{1.1v}$</td>
<td>142 $P^{1.1}$</td>
<td>146 $P^{1.1}$ from mvt. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 $P^{1.1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>76 $S^{1.1}$</td>
<td>155 $P^{1.1}$</td>
<td>159 $P^{1.1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79 $P^{1.1}$</td>
<td>170 $S^{1.1}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80 $S^{1.1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83 $P^{1.1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84 $S^{1.1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86 $S/ P^{1.1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Gm</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eb, F#m, Bm, C#m, Ab, Gm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadences</td>
<td>13 i: PAC</td>
<td>52 III: HC MC</td>
<td>76 III: V/V PAC</td>
<td>131 III: PAC</td>
<td>213 I: HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32 i: PAC</td>
<td>59 III: V-I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(no EEC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$S^c$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(closing-zone rhetoric)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure numbers</td>
<td>218 $P^{1.1}$</td>
<td>230 $TR^{1.1}$</td>
<td>245 $S^{1.1}$</td>
<td>279 $S^c=P^{1.1}$</td>
<td>304 $P^{1.1}$ from mvt. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>264 $S^{1.1}/ P^{1.1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>325 $S^{1.1}$ from mvt. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>265 $S^{1.1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>327 $P^{1.1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>268 $S^{1.1}/ P^{1.1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>335 P $P^{1.1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>341 $P^{1.1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Gm</td>
<td>Gm</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadences</td>
<td>229 I: HC</td>
<td>261 V: PAC (no ESC)</td>
<td>340 I: PAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>279 I: HC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see from the chart that this particular movement has the abridged

\textsuperscript{116} The primary theme reappears after the exposition, the closing section, at the end of the development, in the recapitulation, and in the coda.
recapitulation section typical of the nineteenth-century sonata in favor of an extended coda with the climax/apotheosis of the movement. The exposition is 135 bars, the development is 82 bars, the recapitulation is much reduced to 86 bars, and the coda lasts 36 bars with cyclic references to the first and third movement themes.

In terms of Hepokoski’s cadential requirements after the second theme, which Elgar again avoids in this movement, it is possible that Elgar did not know about sonata-form cadential convention, self-taught as he was.\textsuperscript{117} He may also have wanted to engage with rondo-like ideas without fully committing to the form, since form “deformation” was an accepted part of the nineteenth-century aesthetic.\textsuperscript{118}

Darcy suggests that rondo themes have orderly structures and light, memorable characters.\textsuperscript{119} This theme’s 12-bar period (4+8 measures) frames a breathlessly light character formed by use of the minor mode, a \textit{pp} dynamic, perpetual-motion rhythmic momentum, march-like pulse and innate tutti orchestral contour (with un-organ-like parallel six-three chords).

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Section & A & B & A’ & C & A’’ & B’ & A’’’ \\
Key & i & III & III & bVI/VII & i & I & I \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{117} Later in his career, Elgar also indicated that he did not know the definition of a “supertonic” in music. His education had been thorough but he did not necessarily share the same musical terminology as his peers.

\textsuperscript{118} The following chart presents Elgar op. 28, iv, as a sonata-rondo with the typical ABACABA designations, for simplicity. The harmonic scheme for a rondo is followed except for the second refrain (A’), which should be in i, rather than III, and B’, which should be in a constrasting key.

\textsuperscript{119} Sonata-rondo refrains are often described as “light, square-cut, and memorable,” with internal organization (sentence, period, etc.) and internal repeats. Refrains are distinguished from episodes by change of color, dynamics, register and texture. Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{The Elements}, 405.
Example 2.20

Elgar op. 28, iv, mm. 1-4

Additionally, because the primary theme does not have the memorable “personality” required of the typical rondo theme, its frequent recurrence is not tiring as might be expected. Instead, the primary theme is a dynamic contrast to the subordinate theme, a successful compositional gambit employed by Elgar in this sonata/rondo synthesis.

Meanwhile, the character of the hushed, rushed parallel sixths of the primary theme (P) contrasts with the casual, cheerful, soloistic Bb major secondary theme, as well as with the slow developmental material.\(^{120}\) The subordinate group in Bb major is another march-like, instrumental theme. Elgar’s compositional interest in periodic structures in this movement follows the conservatively-expanded structures of Brahms rather than the chain-like episodes of Wagner.

Example 2.21

Elgar op. 28, iv, mm. 61-69

The interval of a falling fourth, falling second, dotted rhythm, and repeated notes above are inverted, transposed, and put to rhythmic variation with triplets, Elgar’s standard

introduction of motivic unity. This second theme has a strikingly stable tonality, much like the first movement’s second theme, and but suggests a frank, carefree tone that is unusual for a nineteenth-century symphonic theme, as seen in the more reserved themes of Brahms and Schumann. However, it certainly fits the requirements of thematic content with its “public,” perhaps naïvely-happy character.

Elgar’s development section and coda contain new developmental processes: inter-movement thematic use and slowed harmonic rhythm. The latter creates a feeling of decreased momentum. The development and the coda both return to the movement three opening theme (iv, m. 137; m. 304), invoking both Beethoven’s and Schumann’s tradition of thematic summation in finales:

**Example 2.22**

Elgar op. 28, iv, mm. 137-144

Use of previous material and quieter affect, often with slowed pacing in development are common symphonic strategies. Other works such as Haydn’s Symphony no. 45, Mozart’s Symphony no. 32, tone poems of Richard Strauss, and Schumann’s Fourth symphony, and Brahms’s Second Symphony, Beethoven’s piano sonatas, among others, introduce slower sections in development. Nevertheless, this unusual feature has not yet been discussed with regard to Elgar’s Sonata, even though it is an obvious indicator of symphonic influence.

The pianissimo development with slower harmonic rhythm continues in m. 155
with primary theme material inverted subordinate theme material, juxtaposed by key area, range, and presumably multiple organ registration changes, though not marked as such in the Breitkopf & Härtel plate reproductions still used today. The piece’s momentum stagnates in this section unless registration and tempo are carefully attended. This repetition follows certain nineteenth-century sonata developmental tendencies away from structural development and toward episodes, sequential restatement, re-harmonization, and re-orchestration. It may not be a dynamic concept for an organ work, but it functions superbly as an orchestral idea, as is heard in the nuanced orchestration of the Gordon Jacob arrangement of the work. For the development, Jacob employs cellos for the Adagio melody (m. 137, m. 147), then oboes, flutes, harp (m. 143), clarinets (m. 157), flutes, and violins (m. 170). Jacob’s orchestration allows tonal flexibility and variety, both of which sustain the listener’s interest in this section. For these reasons, it is clear that the integrity of these developmental processes come from the symphonic idiom.

The conclusion of the work is a study in momentum-building, for which purpose the rhythm of the primary theme is perfectly suited. This rhythmic motive also occurs in Elgar’s Cello Concerto op. 85 in a similar texture that builds compositional momentum (iv, 5 bars after marker 60).

---

121 Elgar’s sketches provided many more registration indications and the 1988 Elgar Collected Works edition edited by Christopher Kent includes these changes. There are however, a few inadvertent omissions in the fourth movement. See Appendix D for additional markings.
124 Edward Elgar, Sonata in G for Organ, op. 28, transcribed for full orchestra by Gordon Jacob, (Netherlands: Fentone Orchestral Music Ltd. / De Haske, before 1946) unpublished score.
126 Basil Harwood also uses this rhythmic motive in his Sonata in C# minor (finale), but the motive may have been a common element of the nineteenth-century musical grammar.
Example 2.23 Elgar Cello Concerto, iv, 5 bars after marker 60

The coda’s rhythm in m. 304 is reminiscent not only of the third movement primary theme contour, but of the first movement’s primary theme rhythm and accentuation, which provides multiple layers of thematic reference in the finale.\textsuperscript{127}

Example 2.24

Elgar op. 28, iv, mm. 304-310 (Coda)

After a number of orchestral-style flourishes, the work culminates in a Tuba solo

\textsuperscript{127} This compositional feature has also been connected to Beethoven finales as well. Moore, Elgar: a creative life.
in m. 341, and another final, low, unison G.\textsuperscript{128}

\textbf{Example 2.25}

Elgar, iv, mm. 341-end

Elgar begins and ends both the movement and the work with this typical orchestral unison swell that confirms the content of this work as symphonic.

\textbf{Orchestral Writing in the Sonata}

The Sonata’s symphonic sounds are achieved through Elgar’s use of the organ’s pitch, color, and volume range. He provides multiple examples of his orchestral imagination through orchestral gestures and instrumental textures. Traces of his orchestral thought also occur in the score with unusual pitch ranges, with layers of independent voices and when he implements orchestral techniques that require rapid-fire texture and acoustic changes. He writes imitative melodic lines, swooping orchestral arpeggios, and sweeping dynamics, each produced on the organ by facility with pistons and agile manual changes, but which are more easily translated to an orchestra with swelling strings and woodwinds. In almost every case, Elgar’s most obvious non-idiomatic organ writing contains the independent voice leading used in instrumental composition, examples of which can be traced to both earlier and later instrumental works. Selected orchestral indicators will be discussed next.

\textsuperscript{128} Gordon Jacob implements tutti orchestra, including a full array of horns, trumpets, and trombones, though at only a \textit{f} dynamic, which is presumably to leave room for a complete crescendo toward the end.
**Orchestral Gestures**

In the first movement, the repeated arpeggiations in m. 16 represent a typical Elgarian orchestral gesture, seen in early in his career in *Froissart* (m. 2), in his Symphony no. 1 (iv, mm. 394-399), even in his unusual piano improvisations (no. 2, m. 19; no. 4, mm. 93-6).¹²⁹

**Example 2.26**

These flourishes each provide a transition to new musical ideas.

Following the fanfare episode, a series of imitative fragments of the first transition theme (TR¹¹) feature different orchestral colors in different registers, from the oboe to the flute (mm. 113-132). The phrase is completely orchestral in conception because the end of the inner voice added at m. 116 is not actually playable except by inter-manual *legerdemain*, but would sound rich and warm assigned to the medium-range viola.

---

Example 2.27

Elgar, 28, iv, mm. 113-117

The Gordon Jacob orchestration alternates these measures with violins, flutes, viola, clarinet, oboe, flute and the glockenspiel.

A final orchestral feature in the first movement and finale is the low, octave final note. Elgar clearly envisioned an orchestral tutti note, with timpani and swelling crescendo/decrescendo dynamics.

Example 2.28

Elgar, op. 28, iv, mm. 249-252

This “swell” is simply not possible on the organ at fortissimo (unless the dynamic goes down to mp), and had Elgar thought more organistically, he would have written a full chord. Some performers actually alter this ending, either to a chord or to an added octave in both manuals and pedals, to imitate the intended sfz. orchestral dynamic swell.  

Instrumental Idioms

Elgar’s repeated note upward leap is a solo instrument figuration because of the delicate dynamics it implies, namely a soft crescendo on the leap and descrescendo on the

---

130 Roger Fischer, organist emeritus at Chester Cathedral, is one performer who discussed this change. Roger Fischer, interview by author, 4 June 2012, Prestatyn, Wales.
appoggiatura. The organist can accommodate this small-scale gesture somewhat through controlled attack and release, but it is also easily-adapted to an orchestra. This figure appears orchestrally in *The Black Knight* (mm. 292-295), in the first movement subordinate theme (mm. 72-74), in the second movement in the right hand accompaniment (m. 7), and in Symphony no. 1 (I/i, m. 214, 216).

**Example 2.29**

The development brass fanfares (mm. 104-10; see p. 22) are another obvious orchestral gesture, but one that overlaps felicitously with the orchestral organ idiom.

In the second movement (mm. 1-19; see p. 25) and the fourth movement (mm. 1-32 and mm. 218-235; see p. 32), the right hand patterns are not idiomatic to the organ, but would present an effective texture for a woodwind or string section. Both suggested tempos are brisk, which is more feasible with orchestra. In the second movement, the tenor melody (m. 2) was obviously intended for cello solo, with the expressive chromaticism and leaps, while the pizzicato bass line is another clear instrumental effect (see p. 24).

The third movement’s octave doubling (mm. 23-27, 33-5, 42-46, etc.) is an English Romantic organ technique for adding upperwork on organs that had few 2’ or mixture stops. It is one of the few sections that has clearly organ-centered writing. The
organ can also produce an effective *Tranquillo* atmosphere with sub-couplers and super-couplers are added to the fundamental pipe sounds, a registration indication not included, but assumed by the English organist.\textsuperscript{131} The octave doubling is also a rich, string-like orchestration texture that provides a shimmery halo effect. Not surprisingly, this beautiful movement is closely related to Elgar’s *Serenade for Strings* (1892) for its warmth and depth of expression in string writing.

**Example 2.30**

Elgar op. 28, iii mm. 33-40

Elgar’s finale development also uses doubled octaves and repeated phrases (mm. 170-174, 175-177, 186-190, 191-193) that require varied timbres of the orchestra. On the organ, there is little time to change registrations each time for these, and as a result, the section must be carefully registered so that it does not lag in interest. The Gordon Jacob orchestration solves this by varied Elgarian-style orchestration where melodic fragments pass easily between instruments to create a huge variety of sounds.

\textsuperscript{131} The chord in measure 33 can be rolled to ease gently into the new key area, a technique employed in concert by Thomas Trotter in May 2012 at London’s Temple Church.
Example 2.31

Elgar op. 28, iv, mm. 170-177

The final instrumental example comes from Elgar’s sketches for the coda, m. 304, where he initially called for tuba on a 4-voice bass chord. The next three measures are his published version.

Example 2.32

The first example occurs in a less vivid range for that sound on the organ, but a large brass section could pull off this effect easily and clearly, creating a moment of impact, brilliance and finality. Elgar apparently acknowledged this idiomatic mis-calculation and made the change to full-voiced chords with a mixture-rich plenum registration in his published version.

Instrumental Pitch Range in the Sonata

In the first movement, the contrapuntal section at m. 75, as well as the third

\[132\] BL Add. Ms. 57993 fol. 33r.
movement combination of themes A and B in m. 82-end (see. p. 28) are both orchestral textures with mid-range material better suited for the spatial organization and clarity of orchestral instruments. On the organ, the clarity can be achieved but only with great care and quickness.

**Example 2.33**

Elgar op. 28, i, mm. 75-81

![Example 2.33](image)

During the chain trills, the lower voices in mm. 341-343 are also thematically-connected. On the organ, unfortunately, they are largely unheard because of the range. In an orchestra, however, the clarity needed is possible, with the flute given the trill and another wind instrument with the lower voice.

**Example 2.34**

Elgar op. 28, i, mm. 133-139

![Example 2.34](image)

In the transition section (ii), the layered voices are easily treated with orchestra with the appropriate instrumental ranges. If Elgar were thinking instrumentally, as it

\[133\] Long chain trills, or *Kettentriller*, often in rising or falling sequence, can be another intensifying orchestral texture.
seems he was, oboe and clarinet can be used effectively in these areas (mm. 24-27; see Gordon Jacob orchestration). On the organ, the range of the descending dotted figures (C–E) makes it important to find a solo stop with clarity and dynamic evenness in both soprano and tenor ranges.

**Monumental Scale and Emotional Range in the Sonata**

There is question about whether this work is actually symphonic in scale because Elgar does not develop his themes as strenuously as seen in later symphonic works. However, it is symphonic *because* Elgar knew the pipe organ’s capabilities for developing musical ideas and worked carefully under these parameters. In general, Elgar knew that he could not develop the Sonata’s symphonic processes the way he might if he were writing for a full orchestra with many more voices at his disposal. The organ allows a limited number of simultaneous voices—realistically, three as a maximum, but potentially four at a time. Instead, Elgar relied on the organ’s strengths of color variety, and pitch and dynamic range.

Another common issue of symphonic scale is length. Here, the thirty-minute duration of the work is commensurate with other symphonies of the time:

- Beethoven’s First and Fifth Symphonies: 8: 25-30 minutes
- Brahms’s First, Second, Third, Fourth Symphonies: 35-45 minutes
- Schumann’s Third Symphony: 30 minutes

The Sonata has the emotional range that a symphony should, in comparison with Brahms’s Second Symphony, another large work with pastoral elements. Elgar’s work evokes the vivid energy of the English landscape on a brilliant summer day written

---

134 As we know, four simultaneous voices on the organ can be obtained with pedalboard, one hand per manual, and a third manual for “thumbing” up or down.
described so aptly as Yeats’s “bee-loud glade”\(^\text{135}\). Where Brahms carefully grounds his D major “idyll” with darkly-ominous brass instrumental material, Elgar’s materials evoke the exuberance of youth, with a dash of humor in the second movement. While Elgar’s music lacks consistent emotional grounding, with its unrooted leaps and abrupt harmonic changes – issues of emotional timing – it does not lack the necessary symphonic technique and idealism. Ultimately, this work is that of a young man who has finally arrived in the symphonic world that he has dreamed of all his life: this is the work that shows that he has arrived at the beginning of his symphonic journey. With thirteen more years of maturity, Elgar finally achieves the necessary *gravitas* in his Symphony no. 1.

**Conclusion**

The Sonata in G for Organ, op. 28 is a nineteenth-century tour-de-force in symphonic form. Elgar’s early interest in symphonic form, and practice with compositional strategies and pacing helped him complete his first four-movement work in symphonic form by 1895. It has been seen that his approach to sonata form with primary theme articulation is consistent with earlier and later works. His means of developing the descending fourth across the four movements shows signs of cyclic unity, compositional integrity, and symphonic process, and his attention to orchestration and texture, while limited by the organ’s resources, shows skill with symphonic concepts of color and variety. In sum, Elgar’s symphonic strategies imbue the Sonata with energy, intelligence, and presage future compositional successes with his First and Second Symphonies. Chapter 3 will extend the symphonic influences on the piece to the

compositional inspiration Elgar derived from Brahms’s Second Symphony.
Chapter 3

It is common knowledge that Elgar drew musical inspiration from nineteenth-century composers Beethoven, Schumann, Wagner, Berlioz and Brahms, but no attention has been given to the influence of Brahms on Elgar’s Sonata, although the influence of Brahms’s Third and Fourth Symphonies on Elgar’s Symphonies has been much discussed.\textsuperscript{136} Edward Elgar’s lifelong respect for Johannes Brahms’s works and frequent interaction with many of them as early as 1881, suggests a likely influence of the latter on Elgar’s 1895 Sonata and provides a meaningful starting point for discussing Elgar’s affinity with nineteenth-century symphonic music.

Over the course of the 1880’s and 1890’s, Elgar deepened his knowledge of Brahms by attending concerts, performing his works, and thorough score-study. In addition, he used other composers’ works as models, including symphonic works by Schumann and Wagner. This pattern of imitation provides a compelling basis for this compositional lineage. Because of several structural and thematic similarities to Elgar’s Sonata, Brahms’s Second Symphony is, in this writer’s opinion, one heretofore unexplored model on which Elgar may have leaned for inspiration.\textsuperscript{137} Comparison of Elgar’s Sonata with Brahms’s Second Symphony and mention of several other Brahms and Schumann works will help further re-define the compositional content of Elgar’s Sonata as symphonic rather than that of the typical nineteenth-century English organ sonata, thus lending credence to the Sonata’s nickname, Elgar’s “Symphony no. 0.”\textsuperscript{138}

\textsuperscript{137} Schumann’s Second Symphony is another possible influence, but will be pursued in further research.
\textsuperscript{138} In conversation with Martin Bird, editor of the Elgar Society Journal, I learned that Anthony Payne was to have been editor of a book on Elgar’s symphonic development, of which the first chapter was to have been a treatment of the Sonata, commonly referred to as “Symphony 0.”
Elgar’s Reception of Brahms

Elgar both heard and performed many of Brahms’s major compositions, studied his scores, and wrote and spoke about his impressions of the works. Peter Dennison’s chronology of collected concert programs provides a full perspective on Elgar’s concert-going and performance schedule.\textsuperscript{139} Elgar’s collected lectures in Percy Young’s \textit{A Future for English Music}, as well as newspaper articles and letters-to-the-editor, provide further proof of Elgar’s special interest in Brahms’s music.

Elgar Writings on Brahms

Few examples exist of Elgar’s formal writings on music, apart from two letters-to-the-editor in 1886 and rough notes from his University of Birmingham lectures in 1905-1908. Both of these writings focus heavily on Brahms’s chamber works and symphonies, showing that Elgar cultivated a long-term admiration of Brahms’s compositions and paid close attention to Brahms’s formal structures and themes. This pattern of attention will provide evidence in the next chapter that Elgar used specific formal elements borrowed from Brahms’s work in his Sonata in G for Organ. The following analyses of the letters-to-the-editor and the lecture notes demonstrate Elgar’s deep interest in his musical colleague.

In 1886, the twenty-nine-year-old Elgar advocated in his village for a lively Malvern Concert Series, located in an upper-middle-class but small provincial town adjacent to Worcester, a resort destination at the feet of the Malvern Hills in which Elgar

loved to walk. Thus, in the 1880’s, the Malvern Concert Series was well-supported by town residents, a series that provided programs of Haydn, Mozart, Schubert, Beethoven, Schumann, Mendelssohn, Spohr, Veit, and Rubinstein in bi-monthly concerts. In these letters, he promoted and then reviewed a concert featuring Brahms’s chamber music. Three ideas pertinent to Elgar’s career emerge from this review. First, he showed skill in preparing an audience for the reception of complex music, a sensitivity needed by this and similar audiences as he prepared to write music at the same level of abstraction. Secondly, Elgar presented compositional goals in this review, as made clear by his analysis of the importance of Brahms’s work. His intent was not dispassionate, in this sense. He was presenting his own musical manifesto. Thirdly, Elgar plainly pointed to Brahms as one of his compositional role models.

Elgar knew that he needed an audience such as this one to truly appreciate his own work and he viewed advertising for this concert series somewhat opportunistically. He praised the community’s receptivity of Brahms’s complexity, hoping to cultivate their respect for the late Romantic compositional expression that he was training himself to write. Further, Elgar’s analysis of Brahms’s work led him to view Brahms’s music as important because it was “free from any provincialism of expression of national dialect.” Elgar continued, “[He] writes for the whole world and for all time.” Brahms was the standard against which Elgar felt that classical music should be judged and the standard he emulated as he wrote his own music. Elgar noted Brahms’s intellectual framework for composition, his signature abstract melodic style, his use of transparent polyphonic

---

140 Edward Elgar, “The Classical Chamber Concerts – Johannes Brahms,” letter-to-the-editor, Malvern Advertiser, (December 21, 1886 and January 29, 1887). Elgar submitted the first concert promotional letter and the subsequent concert review as letters-to-the-editor to avoid the newspaper fee for advertising and concert reviews. It is not clear whether he was engaged by the concert series to advertise or whether he wrote the letters on his own initiative, although avoiding fees suggests the latter.
treatment, his free harmonic treatment, his expression of multiple moods, his logical development and ability to observe classical rules while still expressing modernity and compositional mastery. Ultimately, Elgar concluded that Brahms was “by general consent placed at the head of the musical world.” Every composer uses a role model at some point in his or her life, and it is clear that Elgar found a kindred spirit in Brahms. Not surprisingly, all of these compositional elements came to be defining characteristics of Elgar’s own music.  

Lectures on Brahms

After Elgar wrote the Sonata in 1895 he continued to study Brahms’s music, but there is little written evidence of this study until 1905-1906, when he delivered a series of endowed lectures at the University of Birmingham. Elgar demonstrated specific knowledge of Brahms’s Second Symphony in manuscript notes for his lecture on “Critics” (December 6, 1906), although it is not clear to which features of the symphony he might have called attention.

A theme of respect for the expressive neutrality of Brahms’s musical expression continues throughout the lectures and corresponds with Elgar’s ideal of the purpose of music. In his lecture on Brahms’s Third Symphony of November 8, 1905 in Birmingham, his Brahms analysis was reported in The Manchester Guardian. The writer summarized,

Sir Edward Elgar lays it down that music is at its height when it merely “calls up a set of emotions in each individual hearer,” … themes that are purely self-existent, not springing from the desire to ‘describe something else,’ are taken and

---

141 Elgar, A Future for English Music, 263. One concern that Elgar leveled at Brahms was related to “undue repetition” in development, repetition which appeared as “tediousness” to Elgar. Ironically, this is the main critical observation about Elgar’s youthful Froissart (1890). Another complaint was that Brahms’s music was “Often lumbering. Looks well on paper but does not sound well.”

woven into a tonal pattern - is by far the highest form of musical art.”

The Birmingham Post recorded the lecture a little differently:

The form of the Symphony was strictly orthodox [said Elgar], and it was a piece of absolute music. There was no clue to what was meant, but, as Sir Hubert Parry said, it was a piece of music which called up certain sets of emotions in each individual hearer. That was the height of music…

Elgar spoke confidently, although he eventually ran into resistance. There was understandable contention at his use of the word “absolute” because of its association with the Wagner/Brahms disagreement over the value of programmatic and non-programmatic, or “absolute,” music. Brahms, of course, had sided with “absolute” music. However, instead of intending to refer to that debate, Elgar only meant to reinforce his ideal vision of symphonic writing—one that he associated with both Brahms (and the spirit of Wagner, though he was not known for symphonies). He clarified his stance in his Birmingham lecture on December 13, 1905. Elgar’s emphasis here is not actually on “without a programme,” since this comment follows his description of the evolution of music from vocal music to march and dance music to collections of pieces, and finally to the sonata and symphony. He said:

I hold that the Symphony without a programme is the highest development of art. Views to the contrary are, we shall often find, held by those to whom the joy of music came late in life or who would deny to musicians that peculiar gift, which is their own, a musical ear, or an ear for music. I use, as you notice, a very old-fashioned expression we all know what it conveys: a love of music for its own sake.

By “development,” he means “development as a form of music in the evolution of music from the middle ages to present.” Further, “without a programme” means “a love of music for its own sake.” While this clarification did little to assuage the public confusion

144 A Future for English Music, 207.
over what looked like the miscategorization of Elgar of his own music—which often referred to a “programmatic” literary source—it does redefine Elgar’s compositional ideal apart from the merely nationalist, romantic idiom often superimposed by twentieth-century scholarship on Elgar’s expression.

Elgar’s admiration for what he perceived as Brahms’s “absolute” compositional identity reflects his belief that his own work was similarly motivated. Of his first symphony’s extra-musical program, he wrote that it represented “a wide experience of human life with a great charity (love) and a massive hope in the future.”\(^{145}\) He could have said the same of his musical mentor’s many works.

Elgar’s later symphonies were noted for Brahmsian (and Wagnerian) influence, as seen by the 1909 review of Symphony no. 1 in *The Times* (London): "There are characteristic reminiscences of *Parsifal* … and rhythmically the chief theme looks like an offspring of Brahms.” The review concluded, "[I]t is not only an original work, but one of the most original and most important that has been added to the stock of recent music.”\(^{146}\)

**Elgar and Brahms Performances: conductor, performer, listener**

Over the course of his life, Elgar heard at least twenty-four Brahms works, many multiple times. In 1882, on a trip to Leipzig, he wrote, "I got pretty well dosed with Schumann (my ideal!), Brahms, Rubinstein and Wagner, so had no cause to complain.”\(^{147}\)

Elgar conducted Brahms’s *Alto Rhapsody, Ein deutsches Requiem*, Partongs op. 44,

---

Second Piano Concerto, *Schicksalslied*, Third Symphony (four times), *Tragic Overture*, Variations on a Theme by Haydn, and Violin Sonatas Opp. 100 and 108. He performed as concertmaster for Brahms’s repertoire and attended performances of all the symphonies, string quartets, and many other works. While Elgar heard more Beethoven and Wagner overall, Brahms was his third-most listened-to composer, a close favorite.  

**Elgar’s Models**

Elgar used symphonic models and long texts as both compositional inspiration and in developing structural direction and focus, as seen from the musical transcriptions in many of his early compositions (the so-called “Shed Music”) and in his later Symphony no. 1, a work with notable Brahmsian influence. This pattern of compositional “borrowing” can be seen with the Sonata, where he clearly uses a symphonic model rather than an organ sonata model for his composition. The Sonata itself was written in four movements and, as discussed in chapter 1, Elgar tended to re-purpose any work or commission toward this goal of writing symphonic music. Furthermore, up to this point, Elgar had not yet written a full-scale work without a model in mind (or, a text, as in the case of his choral works). It is unlikely that he would have

---

composed completely without a model for his first full-length non-text-based work. The following chart illustrates this pattern of influence. Selected Elgar works are paired with recognizable outside models and evidence of influence ranges from specific musical quotations to structural characteristics:

**Figure 3.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Elgar compositions</th>
<th>Significant Model(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1878 Shed no. 4</td>
<td>Influences of Mozart Symphony no. 40 in G minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878 G minor symphony exposition</td>
<td>Mozart, Symphony no. 40 in G minor (exposition only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890 <em>Froissart</em> Overture</td>
<td>Wagner overture influences (<em>Die Meistersinger</em>, <em>Flying Dutchman</em>, <em>Tannhäuser</em>, <em>Faust Overture</em>); sonata form experiment (based on 13th century poem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892 <em>The Black Knight</em> (“symphony for choir and orchestra”)</td>
<td>Text by Samuel Longfellow; Four movements, no real sonata form, some cyclic elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895 Sonata in G major for Organ, op. 28</td>
<td>Brahms Second Symphony (1877); <em>The Black Knight</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899 Enigma Variations</td>
<td>Schumann, <em>Études symphoniques</em> (1834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901 <em>Cockaigne</em> Overture</td>
<td>Wagner, <em>Die Meistersinger</em>; Elgar <em>Enigma Variations</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904 <em>In the South</em> Overture</td>
<td>Strauss, <em>Don Juan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907 Symphony no. 1</td>
<td>Schumann, Symphonie no. 2, Brahms Symphony no. 3; Elgar Sonata in G for Organ, op. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911 Second Symphony</td>
<td>Brahms Symphony no. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919 Cello Concerto</td>
<td>Elgar Sonata for Organ, op. 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elgar’s works cited above confirm that he employed compositional models (both literary and musical) to provide focus as he developed his own formal coherence. Similarly, models can be found in his later works.

In sources that suggest other compositional models for the Sonata, Fanselau is the only one to suggest symphonic influences.149 His suggestion of Schumann’s Second Symphony in C major is plausible because the movements, like Elgar’s, are presented in

---

149 Fanselau, *Die Orgel im Werk Edward Elgars*, 306.
the order of sonata-allegro (3/4), scherzo (2/4), sonata (2/4), and a freely-treated sonata finale with themes from the Adagio and a new theme (2/2). This section will focus on Brahms’s Second Symphony with occasional references to other works, including Schumann’s Second and Fourth Symphonies.

**Brahms Second Symphony and Elgar**

Importantly, in the week of November 25, 1889, a few months after stepping away from work on *The Black Knight*, Elgar attended two concerts in the same week at the Crystal Palace, each featuring Brahms’s Second Symphony, apparently his first hearing of the work.\(^{150}\) This phenomenon of concert repetition occurs only twice elsewhere in Jeremy Dennison’s list of Elgar concerts.\(^{151}\) Brahms’s Second Symphony must have resonated with him sufficiently to merit a second hearing.

The Elgar diaries confirm the attendance at these two concerts. The diary for Nov 25 reads: “A. & E. Househunting & C.P.” [Alice and Edward Househunting and Crystal Palace]. The program for the first concert was:

**November 25, 1889**
**Crystal Palace Program:**
- Allegro Moderato in D (Brahms)
- Adagio (Brahms)
- Allegretto (Brahms)
- Allegro Vivace in D (Brahms)
- Marche Caracteristique in C – Schubert
- Waltz “Christina” – Dan Godfrey
- Ballad for Orchestra – Hamish MacCunn
- Selection of Scottish Airs – Bishop

---

\(^{150}\) Corrections of the dates listed as 25 and 30 October 1889 from Dennison’s chapter are 25 Nov. 1889 and 30 Nov. 1889.

\(^{151}\) Dennison, *Elgar Studies*, 16-30.
The Elgar diaries for November 30 read: “To C.P. Concert 3.” [To Crystal Palace Concert 3].

The second concert included the following:

**November 30, 1889**

**Crystal Palace Program:**
- Overture “Euryanthe” – Weber
- Recit and Aria “Wo berg ich mich (Euryanthe)” – Weber
- Romance “Glöcklein in Thale (Euryanthe)” – Weber
- Incidental Music to Macbeth – Sullivan
- Ballad for Orchestra “The Ship o’ the Fiend” – Hamish MacCunn
- Second Symphony – Brahms

The programs share only Brahms’s composition and since the other music is considered “light fare,” it is likely that what brought Elgar back the second time was the Second Symphony. Dennison’s research suggests that these are the first two times that Elgar heard the symphony. There could have been a strong association of that symphony with memories of Elgar’s first autumn in London when he was newly-married, and free enough to attend concerts and compose every day of the week. His personal life at this time in his career lends credibility to the idea that the Brahms symphony impressed him concomitantly with the development of his own composition, *The Black Knight*. This Brahmsian association would also have had an influence on Elgar’s composition of the Sonata a few years later when Hugh Blair, acting Organist of Worcester Cathedral, commissioned the work for the summer of 1895. The shared meter of all three first movements—in Brahms’s Symphony and Elgar’s *The Black Knight* and Sonata—gives the first hint of an important relationship. The significance of the metrical similarity, as well as the methodology for choosing Brahms’s Second Symphony as a point of

---

152 Elgar Birthplace Museum and Archive Supervisor, Christopher Bennett, email correspondence, 14 February 2013; Elgar Scrapbook Vol. 2.; Elgar Diaries accession 7416 reference 705:445

153 Although no Brahms Second Symphony score is to be found in Elgar’s collected books, his library holdings fluctuated throughout his life. He was a great borrower and lender according to Christopher Bennett of the Elgar Birthplace Museum and Archive, May 2012, Worcester, England.
comparison will be discussed later in this chapter.

Hans Keller, a mid-twentieth-century German music analyst residing in England, wrote that Elgar’s musical language showed the same concern with rhythmic and motivic structure seen in Brahms’s music.\(^{154}\) This observation highlights one of Elgar’s primary compositional influences: the musical practice of dense thematic interplay and formal innovation heard in the nineteenth-century German musical tradition, where sonata form expectations were often flouted, harmonies were extended and cadences avoided, and chromatisim added distinct flavor to melody and harmony.

Musical influence on a composition is indicated in several ways, including known interaction between these two composers. They each may have performed, heard, discussed, and studied the same compositions. On a compositional level, the correlation of compositional devices, structural and textural similarities, thematic contours, thematic characters, key and meter relationships, and instrumentation also provide a reasonable basis for proof of stylistic relationship.

Brahms’s symphony presents a summery character tinged with melancholy shadows, through the contrast of pastoral themes, gentle flowing melodies with the dark timbres of brass instruments. While there is some irony present in this exchange, Brahms said of this work, “I couldn’t say which movement I’m fondest of…[a] happy, blissful atmosphere pervades the whole, and it all bears the stamp of perfection and the effortless discharge of lucid ideas and warm emotion.”\(^{155}\) Brahms’s friend Billroth had already observed of the symphony, a similar tone. Billroth said, “Why, [the symphony] is all


blue sky, babbling of streams, sunshine and cool green shade!”

Perhaps anecdotally, but not completely irrelevently, Elgar’s work was also written in the summer during very hot weeks at the end of June and early July of 1895. The atmosphere of Elgar’s work reflects the same kinds of “blue sky, babbling streams, sunshine and shade,” but without the tone of modern irony. Those Brahmsian qualities are transferred to the English countryside through the contrast of noble, wistful, lyrical, and march-like themes and textures, major/minor tonality shifts, a modal pentatonic flair, and adept instrumentation. A formal overview of Brahms’s work organized by Sonata-Theory terminology will orient the subsequent discussion of compositional similarities: theme/motive, character, meter, key, compositional texture, and orchestration.

**Overview of Brahms’s Second Symphony**

Brahms’s four-movement work begins with a D major sonata movement in 3/4, a meter that is often correlated with the pastoral topic. Brahms’s initial motto theme (m. 1, 4, 5) precedes the unfolding of the primary theme, a triadic distant-sounding horn-call (mm. 2-9), confirming the pastoral tone of the movement.

**Example 3.1**

![Example 3.1](image)

Each succeeding theme incorporates this lower neighbor note interval, alternating between lyrical, confident, and lullaby- and march-like themes. The movement adheres

---

156 Ibid. 251. Billroth to Brahms, letter, 14 June 1877.
to sonata form with multiple transitional themes; an expositional closing section based on the second subject group (in contrast to Elgar’s signature primary theme strategy); a development based on the principal theme and the motto theme, as well as references to the first transitional theme; a shortened recapitulation (absence of the second transition theme); and a coda based on the principal theme, signaling formal expansion. Key areas include D major (primary theme and recapitulation), F# minor (second theme group), and F major/E minor, (development).

**Figure 3.2**

Key: all previous abbreviations apply (see Appendix C)

x = “Motto” theme  
c.s. = counter-subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brahms Second Symphony, I</th>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Second Theme</th>
<th>Closing Section</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure numbers</td>
<td>Primary theme</td>
<td>44 TR(^{1,1})</td>
<td>82 S(^{1,1})</td>
<td>156 C=S(^{1,1})</td>
<td>183 P(^{1,1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 P(^{1,1})</td>
<td>58 TR(^{2,1})</td>
<td>90 S(^{1,2})</td>
<td>expositional repeat :</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 x</td>
<td>66 TR(^{2,2})</td>
<td>102 S(^{1,1})</td>
<td>Fmg</td>
<td>191 P(^{1,1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118 S(^{2,1})</td>
<td></td>
<td>195-224 canon,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>126 S(^{2,2})</td>
<td></td>
<td>fugato P(^{1,1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136 S(^{1,3})</td>
<td></td>
<td>254-298 x, P(^{1,1}) TR(^{1,1})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F# minor, A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>F, Em, F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cadences</td>
<td>14 D: HC</td>
<td>51 D: HC</td>
<td>122 PAC</td>
<td>222 Em: HC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81 F#m: PAC</td>
<td>126 A: PAC</td>
<td>299 E pedal point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>155 A:V-I6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recapitulation</th>
<th>Primary Theme</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Second Theme</th>
<th>Closing Section</th>
<th>Coda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure numbers</td>
<td>300 P(^{1,1}) /TR(^{1,1})</td>
<td>350 S(^{1,1})</td>
<td>423 C=S(^{1,1})</td>
<td>447 P(^{1,1})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No TR(^{1,2})</td>
<td>362 S(^{1,2})</td>
<td></td>
<td>456 x</td>
<td>492 TR(^{1,1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>370 S(^{1,1})</td>
<td></td>
<td>477 P(^{1,1}) 500 x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>386 S(^{2,1})</td>
<td></td>
<td>513 P(^{1,1})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>395 S(^{2,2})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>404 S(^{1,3})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Bm, D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>395 D: PAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>516 D: iv-I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second movement, an *Adagio* slow movement with a loose sonata structure, is in B major in 4/4. The first theme is a lyrical 16-bar cello melody followed by a
transition section based on primary theme material. The second theme is in F# major, 12/8 meter, and features a disjunct, gently-syncopated melody in the woodwind section over a pizzicato bass line. The closing section transforms the disjunct thirds and fourths of the second subject into step-wise notes filling thirds and fourths. The development introduces a countersubject used in counterpoint against the second theme, which is omitted from the recapitulation.

**Figure 3.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brahms Second Symphony, ii</th>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Second Theme (12/8)</th>
<th>Closing section</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure numbers</strong></td>
<td>Primary theme (4/4)</td>
<td>18 TR₁₁</td>
<td>33 S₁₁</td>
<td>45 S₁₂</td>
<td>50 S₁², 55 enharmonic shift A#--&gt; Bb 57 S₁²/c.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F# m</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>B, Gm, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadences</td>
<td>17 B: HC</td>
<td>42 F#: V-I</td>
<td>49 B: V-I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recapitulation</strong></td>
<td>Primary Theme (4/4)</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>Second Theme</td>
<td>Closing Section</td>
<td>Coda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure numbers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>79 TR₁₁</td>
<td>81 TR₁₁</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadences</td>
<td>62 B: V-I</td>
<td>79 C: viii-I</td>
<td>91-92 B: V-iv</td>
<td>91-94 B: V-iv-...-I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *Allegretto*, the scherzo movement, features a compact succession of smaller binary and ternary forms, alternating triple and duple meters in G major. The return to more direct motivic resemblances to the first movement is seen in the use of the Motto theme, x, and its inversion throughout the piece.
Figure 3.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure numbers</td>
<td>1 a</td>
<td>33 c</td>
<td>107 a</td>
<td>126 f</td>
<td>194 a</td>
<td>233 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 b</td>
<td>41 d</td>
<td></td>
<td>130 g</td>
<td>202 b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 a</td>
<td>51 c</td>
<td></td>
<td>153 f</td>
<td>219 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63 e</td>
<td></td>
<td>164 g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71 c</td>
<td></td>
<td>176 f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79 transition</td>
<td>180 transition</td>
<td>(3/4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83 c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93 d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99 transition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A, C,</td>
<td>F#, G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadences</td>
<td>10 G: V-I</td>
<td>33 V-I</td>
<td>125 V/ii</td>
<td>191 F#: V</td>
<td>207 G</td>
<td>233 G: bVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 G: V-I</td>
<td>51 e: V-i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>218 G: V-I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The finale is a sonata in D major with several important rondo-like characteristics, including an energetic, rondo-like theme and a non-repeated exposition. The development section begins as if in rondo form with the repeat of the primary group in D, before moving on to other material, including an unexpected *Tranquillo* episode in F# major. The re-introduction of P material suggests a rondo form but instead the P material is merely used to surprise the listener before Brahms continues with different development processes. The recapitulation features all exposition material in D major, except the second transition theme, which is omitted. The motto theme (x) recurs, woven together contrapuntally with the principal theme in a lengthy coda section that starts with delayed secondary thematic material.
**Figure 3.5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brahms Second Symphony, iv</th>
<th>Exposition Primary theme</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Second Theme</th>
<th>Closing section</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure numbers</td>
<td>1 P&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>32 TR&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>78 S&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>114 P&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>155 P&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 P&lt;sup&gt;1.2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>44 TR&lt;sup&gt;2.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>86 S&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>121 P&lt;sup&gt;1.2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>170 (P&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;)-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 PTR</td>
<td></td>
<td>90 S&lt;sup&gt;1.2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>133 P&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>182 (P&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;)-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98 S&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>138 P&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>184 P&lt;sup&gt;1.2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44 TR&lt;sup&gt;1.2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>189 P&lt;sup&gt;1.2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78 S&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>196 S&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>204 Tranquillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>214 P&lt;sup&gt;1.2&lt;/sup&gt;/TR&lt;sup&gt;1.2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>221 closing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x/P&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>241 D: PAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56 D: HC, MC</td>
<td>97 A: HC</td>
<td>147 D: HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74 A: V-I</td>
<td>114 A: V-I</td>
<td>154 D: IAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>204: F#:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>241 D: PAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation Primary Theme</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>Second Theme</td>
<td>Closing Section</td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure numbers</td>
<td>244 P&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>264 TR&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>281 S&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>317 (P&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;)-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>248 P&lt;sup&gt;1.2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>275 TR&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>290 S&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>321 C&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>251 (P&lt;sup&gt;1.2&lt;/sup&gt;)-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>293 S&lt;sup&gt;1.3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>326 C&lt;sup&gt;1.2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>341 C&lt;sup&gt;1.3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>353 S&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>363 S&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375 x/P&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>391 P&lt;sup&gt;1.1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>397 P&lt;sup&gt;1.2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>279-81</td>
<td>317: PAC</td>
<td>386 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D: V-I</td>
<td></td>
<td>403-417 V-I-V-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparison of Elgar’s Sonata and Brahms’s Symphony**

The following comparison of Elgar’s Sonata and Brahms’s Symphony has been organized into six thematic areas: themes and motives, character, meter, key, compositional texture, and orchestration.

**Themes and Motives**

It is significant that Elgar encountered Brahms’s Symphony twice in the same week in 1889. This enabled him to recognize two of the work’s motives, the rhythmic contour of the first movement (mm. 2-3), and a most important motive for his own work,
a descending fourth pattern, especially in the last movement, examples of intensified motivic material in mm. 4, 5, 8-9, 10-11.

**Example 3.2**

![Example of Brahms Symphony No. 2, i, mm. 1-9](image1)

![Example of Brahms Symphony No. 2, iv, mm. 1-12](image2)

![Example of Elgar Op. 28, i, mm. 1-4](image3)

Thematically, the contour of the main Elgar theme in first movement of the Sonata shares a common dactylic rhythm with Brahms’s first movement and also shares the falling fourths and rising seconds from mm. 5 and 9 of the finale. Like Brahms’s finale, which uses intervallic repetition and rhythmic intensification, Elgar repeats his opening motive, adding triplets to the third repetition, and expanding his falling fourth to a falling fifth. Elgar does not copy the pastoral mood, instead transforming these motives into a triumphant, exuberant, march-like theme. As mentioned above, this pattern was typical of Elgar’s model use. He transforms but does not abandon the models. The resulting Sonata theme is in dialogue with the thematic cohort of which Brahms’s Second Symphony was a member.
The added quasi-periodic structure of the phrases and ¾ meter replication are further similarities. Emphasis on irregularity was a common feature in nineteenth-century sonata composition because it showed originality within a universally-accepted formal structure. Brahms’s first movement theme is a period with an irregular consequent (14 bars) that extends antecedent motives with inversion (m. 14) as it dissolves into the transition, as discussed earlier with regard to Elgar’s primary theme consequent. Brahms uses an inner orchestral line based on the motto theme (m. 17: violin and viola) to begin the dissolution while Elgar uses an echo effect based on his dotted-rhythm and sequential modulation to F# minor. Brahms’s transitional move comes from the material he has already introduced, while Elgar’s exudes energy and drive, rather than complete thematic self-containment. The arpeggations are a new element, an Elgarian twist that gives the transition unique personality and verve. Elgar knew that he needed to keep the piece moving at this point and so shifts to Elgarian flourish rather than delving more deeply into his already-established materials. This is not a flaw in this case, since organ writing profits from textural shifts in capturing the attention of the listener, more than extended contrapuntal passages on the same registration. Elgar was sensitive to the differences between his ideal symphonic expression and the organ writing needed to execute these ideas and this passage demonstrates that sensitivity.

The use of slow thematic material from previous movements in the last movement’s development sections is another clear indicator of symphonic influence. Elgar’s fourth movement development features material from the second and third movements in a contrasting piano section (mm. 137-154).
Example 3.3

Elgar op. 28, iv, mm. 137-142

Earlier mention of a discussion with Anthony Payne, who “finished” Elgar’s Symphony no. 3 with all the material that Elgar left before he died. Anthony Payne feels that this slow section was an inexplicable compositional flaw. In fact, however, Elgar’s slow section is significant example of nineteenth-century compositional influence. Brahms’s fourth movement development (mm. 208-239) revisits material from the first movement and the fourth movement primary theme with a tranquillo character.
Example 3.4 Brahms Second Symphony, iv, mm. 206-211, themes from mvt. 1

Inclusion of suddenly quiet material in fast finale developments is an infrequent compositional technique in the symphonic world, but another example can also be found in Schumann’s Second Symphony (iv, m. 280; “Clara’s theme”) and Fourth Symphony.

Elgar may also have learned much about how to write a long, lyrical theme from Brahms. Brahms’s second movement Adagio cello theme contains several important motivic affinities with Elgar’s third movement Andante theme. Brahms’s theme is a continuous melody with ascending fourth leaps, repeated dotted notes, and an expanding leap figure (mm. 10-11):
Example 3.5

Brahms builds his whole cello melody from two motives: descending step-wise motion, and a dotted rhythm.\footnote{Frisch, a noted musicologist, suggests that this melody contains four ideas (m. 1, m. 2, m. 6, m. 10). I identify only two motives, described above, whose inversion, expansion, augmentation, and sequence constitute Frisch’s last two motives. See Frisch, \textit{Brahms}, 123-129.} The initial descending line introduces the dotted rhythm and its subsequent intervallic expansion in compelling musical prose. The first twelve bars avoid cadential closure as harmonic areas are suggested but ultimately eluded, and the phrases vary from two, to three, to four beats long, with each phrase modifying the previous metric accent in the 4/4 meter. The only constant is the forward motion of the melody as the narrative waves circumvent harmonic rest.

Motivically, Brahms’s first phrase is repeated and varied with the dotted figure expanding to a minor third on the repetition. Then the dotted-note figure is inverted as a rising fourth, shifted to an anacrusis function and used to start the unraveling of the extended five-bar sentence structure. In measure three, the descending line is also varied with rising seconds, creating a circular descent. Bars 3 and 4 are then varied in sequence and the rising fourth is augmented to a rising sixth with slower dotted-note values for more emphasis (mm. 8-9). The climax of the phrase occurs in m. 9, descends, and
revisits dotted rhythm anacrusis motive, this time with a rising-tritone and rising-sixth, in an inversion of motivic order of the sentence and intensification through reduction of the melody. The effect of this whole construct is a beautiful, taut continuity, traces of which can be found in Elgar’s theme.

Elgar’s third movement soprano melody of 26 measures is also similar to Brahms’s extensive 32-measure melody in sheer length, compositional spinning-out and in the motivic material: ascending fourths, rising seconds, dotted and repeated note motives. Where Brahms varies his themes quickly, Elgar uses more varied repetition and expands his motives more slowly. By m. 10, Elgar is where Brahms was by m. 2. However, this more gentle variation gives the movement a serene quality in contrast to Brahms’s yearning cello melody.

Example 3.6

In Elgar’s version, the melody also avoids cadence until measure 26. Brahms achieves this avoidance by beginning on a dominant pedal point, and with metric ambiguity, deceptive cadences, and a linkage technique where the leading tone for an imminent cadence instead becomes a new idea. Elgar uses first and second inversion chords and
this linkage technique to stave off cadences. One example is in m. 9, where a cadence in Bb major appears to be the intent of the phrase, but the sequence insertion of a new rhythmic motive and *tenuto* which diverts attention. Instead of proceeding to Bb, the rhythmic squeeze touches Bb then descends to a G (m. 9-11). Underneath this activity, a chromatic pedal line from C-C#-D leads to a Bb 4-3 suspension in first inversion, which functions as a V of Eb major (IV), a warm contrast to the questions brought up by reference to G minor.

Elgar and Brahms also use abrupt enharmonic modulation when they decide to suddenly vacate a motivic process (Brahms: ii, m. 55; Elgar: iii, m. 32; iv, m. 209). This is a common nineteenth-century compositional technique, but worth mentioning because it is effective in avoiding cadences and creating swift shifts in tone.

Incidentally, Elgar’s second movement cello theme is a possible use of this tenor register in homage to Brahms’s beautiful second movement.

**Example 3.7**

![Example 3.7 Elgar original op. 28, ii, mm. 1-3](image)

Elgar originally planned to use this material as the third movement, but ultimately switched the order of the two inner movements, perhaps in an attempt to disguise his Brahmsian model (or in homage to Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony). Schumann’s Second Symphony Adagio could be another source of ideas for Elgar’s Andante espressivo.\(^{158}\)

---

\(^{158}\) The contrapuntal middle section in Schumann’s work also appears to have been an influence on the outbreak of counterpoint in Brahms’s second theme (mm. 51-61).
Example 3.8

In viewing this melody, it is interesting that Schumann’s third measure, beat 2 rhythm also occurs in Elgar’s melody (m. 7) with tenuto marks.

Another recurring motive in both movements is the sequence of upward leaps, seen below (ii). While the motive was obviously part of the nineteenth-century affective aesthetic, it is significant to find it so many places in Elgar’s work and to contemplate its origins. Elgar came under many of the same musical influences as did Brahms and as such, the motive is noteworthy.

Example 3.9

It is interesting that this motive follows Elgar throughout his compositions, even until the motto-theme of dying “Delight” in his Second Symphony. It appears in Elgar’s third movement above in measures 10, 12, 16, 30, and 32, as well appears as the closing to the second group in the first movement exposition (mm. 72-74), already shown.

Elgar’s second theme in the first movement of the Sonata is related to the second theme of Brahms’s second movement in its compound meter, lyrical character, and contour (inverted in Elgar’s work). The rising triadic contour and syncopation in Brahms’s melody are inverted to a falling contour and more gentle syncopation, which
matches the affect of Elgar’s theme.

**Example 3.10**

Brahms Second Symphony, ii, mm. 33-36

![Example 3.10](image1)

Elgar op. 28, i, mm. 43-46

![Elgar op. 28, i, mm. 43-46](image2)

Brahms uses a pizzicato cello texture as a counterpoint to his syncopated melody, so Elgar’s pedal point drone would have been one way to make his own syncopated triadic contour original. The *dolce*-marked triadic contour coupled with the descending step-wise motion in each are treated differently but the materials show Brahms’s influence on Elgar.

Finally, a distinct dactylic rhythm with a lower-neighbor note pattern is introduced in Brahms’s first movement (m. 127), in a motto-based transition between subordinate sub-themes. This is the same rhythm with inverted intervals in Elgar’s finale principal theme, transformed by an upper neighbor construction.

**Example 3.11**

Brahms Second Symphony, i, mm. 127-128:
The function of both Brahms’s and Elgar’s rhythms are to build momentum and it is striking that they do this with the same rhythmic gesture, a sign of general influence, though it is found elsewhere in nineteenth-century literature. The 6/3 chords of Elgar’s mm. 1-4 add harmonic ambiguity to this forward-driving function. The Sonata also contains the exact contour of this motive later on in the movement as part of the final closing section with the added harmonic decisiveness of root motion:

Example 3.12

Elgar, Sonata, iv, mm. 295-302:

This linear treatment, rather than sequential repetition, creates the same high energy transition in both works. Interestingly, Elgar’s inner alto voice starting in m. 295
introduces an inner melody that imitates the contour of the Brahms theme following the rhythmic passage above.

**Example 3.13**

Both Brahms and Elgar use these melodies to build anticipation toward their closing sections. However, in Elgar’s case, the inner melody is essentially inaudible because of the rest of contrary motion of the upper and lower voices, although as an orchestral texture, it is cleverly composed. Again, Elgar assimilates a main idea from Brahms and nineteenth-century practice and uses it as a supporting idea – a sign of mature compositional borrowing.

Finally, the contrary motion of Elgar’s manual octaves and quick-footed ascending in mm. 299, the final build-up to the coda, can also be found in the finale of the cello concerto, a discovery made in conversation with Christopher Kent.\(^\text{159}\)

---

\(^{159}\) Interview with Christopher Kent, 26 April 2012, Wiltney, England.
Example 3.14

Elgar, Cello Concerto, iv, 5 bars after marker 60

Here, the motive appears unadorned by harmony or countermelody to a forte climax. The change from lower-neighbor-note figures to ascending figures intensifies this rhythmic motive as compared with Brahms’s polychoral effect seen earlier.

Thematic similarities are one sign of compositional influence. Character designations can also provide clues about the origins of Elgar’s inspiration.

Character

While some scholars argue that Elgar’s G minor theme is inappropriately diffident in character for a finale,\textsuperscript{160} it might be considered a good counterbalance to the confidence of the first movement’s primary theme. Both Finales begin quietly with homophonic perpetual motion textures.\textsuperscript{161} Brahms’s Allegro con spirito \textit{(piano, sotto voce)} is seen in Elgar’s Presto comodo \textit{(piano only; sotto voce would not have been out of character)}. Elgar’s parallel 3rds and sixths create a fauxbourdon effect while Brahms’s

\textsuperscript{161} See also Mendelssohn’s perpetual motion machines, including \textit{A Midsummer Night’s Dream} Overture, op. 21 and String Quartet op. 44 no. 2, Scherzo.
motivic repetition is carillon-like.

**Example 3.15**

Elgar op. 28, iv, mm. 1-4:

![Example 3.15](image1)

In addition, the G major/G minor contrast which Elgar plays on throughout brings in a similar kind of light/dark contrast that Brahms presents in his symphony through particular orchestration choices and especially effective use of low brass instruments to create an ominous effect. Another compositional influence may have been Mozart’s Symphony no. 40, which begins in G minor with a piano, *molto allegro* marking and an accompanying-figure, perpetual-motion theme similar in character to Elgar’s theme.

**Example 3.16**

Mozart, Symphony no. 40, i, mm. 1-5

![Example 3.16](image2)

This opening accompaniment-figure was also popular in nineteenth-century composition, as in Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto, which begins *in medias res* and with an accompanimental figure in the strings before the immediate entrance of the solo violin.
Meter

Elgar’s use of ¾ as a meter throughout his works is reserved for character pieces (dance movements, scherzos, songs), although he also uses the meter for most of his liturgical sung works, a Fantasia (1881), and technical exercises. His few other uses of the meter during his mature period include the Coronation March (1911), his Carillon (1914), his Violin Sonata Romance (second movement, 1918), and the plan for the Third Symphony scherzo. Otherwise, all uses of ¾ occur as inner movements (scherzos or minuets) when he writes in larger forms. It is clear that Elgar invokes metric identity when The Black Knight begins in ¾ with a non-dance character, and when this affect and meter are reused in the Sonata. In both the oratorio and the Sonata, Elgar means a more exuberant, quasi-heroic, quasi-pastoral character – a noble countryside affect. Elgar only revisits this ¾ first-movement character again in the Severn Suite, op. 87, with a Pomposo marking and a syncopated theme that introduces a sophisticated metric displacement motive. Thus, meter is indeed a significant choice for Elgar and has consequence for the rest of the work. The Sonata does not revisit 3/4, although its companion piece, The Black Knight does in its third movement. When Brahms’s first movement begins in the fairly infrequent symphonic meter of ¾ (typical of pastoral and heroic symphonies), it is not implausible to wonder if it is significant that Elgar’s Sonata also begins in ¾, a choice of meter that lends the piece a more imaginative character.

As a side-note, outside of Elgar’s works, ¾ is also a significant first-movement meter. In a study of all the orchestral works that Elgar knew before 1895, the following
list contains Elgar’s potential models that satisfy the qualifications of ¾ meter, Allegro (not including slow introductions), four-part symphonic form.\textsuperscript{162}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Work(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Beethoven | Symphony no. 3 ("Eroica")  
Symphony no. 8  
Piano Sonata in D, op. 28 ("Pastoral")  
Violin Sonata op. 30, op. 96 |
| Brahms  | Violin Sonata op. 100  
Symphony no. 2 ("Pastoral") |
| Dvorak | Symphony no. 6 |
| Haydn | Symphony no. 96 (slow introduction), no. 97 |
| Schumann | Symphony no. 2 ("Pastoral") |

Characters explored above in ¾ include the heroic, pastoral, dance-like or folk-like affect.

Schumann’s Third Symphony, while it contains a first movement in ¾, was omitted because of its five-movement structure that is related more to Beethoven’s Pastoral Symphony. Interestingly, Elgar heard or performed each of the symphonies twice (except for the Haydn works), while the instrumental pieces (and Haydn symphonies) received only one interaction. This narrows Elgar’s potential models down to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Work(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Beethoven | Symphony no. 3  
Symphony no. 8 |
| Brahms  | Symphony no. 2 |
| Dvorak | Symphony no. 6 |
| Schumann | Symphony no. 2 |

Dvorak was later eliminated because he is not typically listed as one of Elgar’s top three influences. The remaining Beethoven, Brahms and Schumann were examined and the Brahms symphony made a slightly larger impression at the time, although all three composers are certain influences on the Sonata and further study would focus on expanding and enriching the web of influence on this Sonata.

Missing from this list are Mozart and Wagner, but otherwise, the list captures all

\textsuperscript{162} These works were culled from Peter Dennison’s catalog of musical works that Elgar heard or performed. Dennison, “The musical apprenticeship of Elgar,” 19-30.
of the composers who were influential in Elgar’s study of symphonic works. The significance of this finding is that while it may seem random to select Brahms’s Symphony no. 2 out of so many nineteenth-century symphonies, it is actually not as naïve a choice as it may seem, considering Dennison’s documentation of pieces Elgar actually knew. Elgar admired and studied relatively few pieces in his life, and these works or names come up again and again in his letters and writings.

To continue, Elgar’s second subject area is in 9/8, a compound meter that adds further pastoral character. Elgar is known for his ability to capture the pastoral quality of country life, and it could be that his combination of 3/4 and an opening majestic nobilmente affect with inverted intervals was his attempt to avoid a direct copy of Brahms’s more subdued pastoral character in the Second Symphony. It is clear, however, that Elgar’s second subject is distinctly pastoral, so perhaps the sonata could be considered Elgar’s incarnation of the pastoral symphonic concept. None of Elgar’s other symphonies can be called pastoral, another reason to believe that Elgar had already explored this dramatic designation in his Sonata and did not want to repeat himself later.

Form

Both works have corresponding movements, which is not necessarily important, since these are common movement progressions for symphonic works.

**Figure 3.6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brahms op. 73</th>
<th>Elgar op. 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. sonata</td>
<td>i. sonata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. sonata</td>
<td>ii. scherzo/allegretto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. scherzo</td>
<td>iii. sonata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. sonata/rondo</td>
<td>iv. sonata/rondo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, it is interesting to note that both Brahms’s and Elgar’s final movements share an ambiguous sonata-rondo form, each with a large structural *tranquillo* section and contrasting major/minor tonalities, as seen below:

**Figure 3.7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brahms Second Symphony, iv</th>
<th>Elgar Sonata op. 28, iv</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. 1</td>
<td>m. 1</td>
<td>m. 244</td>
<td>m. 218</td>
<td>m. 245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Second theme</td>
<td>D maj.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary theme</td>
<td>A maj.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D maj.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G maj.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 78</td>
<td>m. 60</td>
<td>m. 281</td>
<td>m. 245</td>
<td>m. 279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Second theme</td>
<td>D maj.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’</td>
<td>Closing section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Closing section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 155</td>
<td>m. 94</td>
<td>m. 317</td>
<td>m. 279</td>
<td>m. 304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’</td>
<td>Closing section</td>
<td></td>
<td>A”</td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Bb maj.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D maj. start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G maj.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 206</td>
<td>m. 136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>[tranquillo]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tranquillo</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F# maj.</td>
<td>Eb maj., F#m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One difference between the two works is how Elgar treats his expositional closing section by introducing his primary theme again, rather than waiting for the development section. Nevertheless, the inter-movement cyclic treatments in development contribute one more area of similarity.

**Orchestral Textures**

Elgar’s codetta counterpoint combines motives from the first theme and takes that idea from Brahms’s closing section to the exposition (mm. 155-157). First movement use of second subject in bass voices, flute counter-melody and triplet motive in the flutes over the second subject are important similarities found below:
As discussed in chapter 2, Elgar’s counterpoint is so original to his compositional style that it must have conceptual origins in his symphonic studies. Brahms and Schumann studied Bach closely during their careers, and it is possible that Elgar absorbed some of their interpretations of Bachian counterpoint in this example. It is also possible that Elgar’s writing style here refers to Wagnerian elaborate orchestral counterpoint, with the primary theme featured as a leitmotif.\textsuperscript{163}

The conventions of accompanying figures are often recognizable between composers. The last sub-theme of Brahms’s secondary group, introduces a syncopated chord accompaniment figure that is very Brahmsian. Elgar’s similar accompanying figure over a first inversion chord, an Elgarian convention for his second transition theme, may be more related to Beethoven and Schumann, but it is a decidedly Romantic texture meant to increase drama.

\textsuperscript{163} Dennison, “Elgar and Wagner,” 95.
Example 3.18

Brahms, i, mm. 134-138:

![Example of Brahms, i, mm. 134-138]

Elgar, i, mm. 163-165:

![Example of Elgar, i, mm. 163-165]

Elgar’s accompanying figure is also reminiscent of an accompanying figure in Schumann’s Preludes for organ, perhaps a stronger relationship, except that Elgar’s records show no proof of his having known Schumann’s organ works.  

Orchestration

Similarities in orchestration can be found between many orchestral works but these do not necessarily imply influence. However a comparison of the Elgar Sonata manuscript sketches reveals Elgar’s use of tuba in the same structural areas as Brahms’s Second Symphony, a marker of at least some shared nineteenth-century convention. Elgar’s use of the tuba is important as a nineteenth-century symphonic marker, but his

---

\[164\] Robert Schumann, Six Studies For Organ Op. 56 No. 4.
“tuba” markings were not carried into the printed version.\textsuperscript{165} Breitkopf & Härtel’s editors did not recognize the significance of these markings but they are suggestive of Elgar’s general symphonic influences in this organ work.

Brinkmann notes Brahms’s special use of the tuba in Second Symphony, an instrument that was introduced later in that symphony’s composition.\textsuperscript{166} According to Brinkmann, the use of the tuba had been unusual in central European symphonic music and came relatively late as a practice to the Viennese tradition of Brahms.\textsuperscript{167} Tuba was found in orchestral works by at least 1855 in Wagner’s Faust Overture and also by Liszt and Berlioz. Tchaikovsky also employed tuba in his Second Symphony (1872). Because Brahms did not use the instrument in his First Symphony, the tuba was a notable feature in the Second Symphony. Elgar’s call for the tuba stop in his manuscript sketches lends emphasis to the Coda in the same manner in which Brahms highlights with tuba in the finale, making it plausible that Brahms’s unusual tuba use influenced Elgar’s choice of registration.

**Figure 3.8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuba Use in Brahms op. 77</th>
<th>Tuba Use in Elgar op. 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Second Symphony, fourth mvt. <strong>beginning of Coda</strong> mm. 346-429</td>
<td>• Sonata Sketches, fourth mvt. <strong>beginning of Coda</strong> mm. 304-319 (BL Add. Ms. 57993 33r, m. 18 – 33v, m. 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sonata published edition, fourth mvt. <strong>middle of Coda</strong> mm. 317-319, mm. 341-end</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, the prominent English romantic organ tuba, often used for single line solos in

\textsuperscript{165} Breitkopf & Härtel simplified many of Elgar’s registrations, including this one, to make the work seem more transferrable to Continental pipe organs which did not have this traditional English tuba sound.


\textsuperscript{167} Brinkmann, *Late Idyll*, 24.
choral works, is used unusually here for a chordal, orchestral effect, a climactic device heard in later Elgar symphonic works as well such as the First Symphony.

**Example 3.19**

The sketch’s use of the Tuba on a large chord (sketch, m. 304) would have negated the soprano voice’s sixteenth-note running line on the organ, so it is likely that Elgar wrote the effect initially assuming that it would sound like Richard Strauss’s suggestion in Berlioz’s *Treatise on Instrumentation*. Strauss submits, “The softer bass tuba or, even better, the low horns are excellently suited to supporting the *basso cantante*.”

Either it became apparent in the premiere that the organ tuba could not produce the nuanced dynamics of an orchestral tuba, or Bretikopf & Härtel felt that fewer specific registrations would help sales of the work, or the editors did not recognize the significance of the tuba at this location. Whatever the reason, Elgar’s published version does not include the tuba registration that shows a orchestrational lineage to Brahms’s use of the instrument, even though this idea was an influence on the work.

Elgar was a student of music all his life and his self-borrowings are well-documented. However, the influence of Brahms on Elgar was substantial and should not

---

be neglected in future study, especially in relation to Elgar’s truly orchestrally-conceived Sonata.
Chapter 4

Elgar: Post-Sonata Reception

Elgar believed that his Sonata was a large-scale and authentic representation of his artistic aesthetic. In an 1897 letter to his friend and Novello editor, August Jaeger, he wrote enthusiastically:

Look here! In two years I have written
Lux Xti
King Olaf
Impl. March
S. George
Organ Sonata (big)
Te Deum\(^{169}\)

Elgar believed in the Sonata as part of his main output, not as a side commission, yet he wrote no more large-scale works for the instrument. This was in part because his eye was on the symphony, but also because the reviews of the work had suggested that it was perhaps too difficult to play, and more importantly, overly complex. Later in Elgar’s career he clarified his avoidance of further organ composition in a brief interview with an American organist, Charles Heinroth, who wrote of the encounter:

When Sir Edward was in Pittsburgh upon the occasion of the dedication of the enlarged Carnegie Institute some eleven years ago, I took occasion to ask him when we might expect a new work for the organ to follow his first Sonata. The answer was not encouraging. “I am told,” he said, “that the G major Sonata is considered too hard.” Upon hastening to reply that the difficulties did not seem insurmountable, certainly not out of proportion with other works in the regular concert repertoire, he quickly corrected: “I do not mean too hard for the performer, but for the audience.” \(^{170}\)

Because Elgar had viewed the Sonata as valuable, perhaps this perceived level of

---


difficulty prompted him to offer the work for the Pianola, an instrument that allowed multiple performances at home, rather than in cold cathedrals, a comfortable venue in which listeners could become better acquainted with the work and focus closely on thematic content rather than orchestration. The Pianola also gave performers control of expression but absolved them of responsibility for note accuracy since the instrument rolls were “pre-programmed” with the notes. The following section offers original research on Elgar’s involvement with the Pianola, a new technology in his time.

**Elgar and the Pianola**

A discussion of the history of the Pianola and Elgar’s involvement as a spokesperson for the Orchestrelle Company, a maker of the Pianola technology, will demonstrate the respect with which Elgar viewed his Sonata for Organ, Op. 28, in the context of his compositional *oeuvre*. Elgar did not compromise his artistic vision when he decided to endorse the Pianola technology. Instead, he felt that the Pianola supported his aesthetic principles. Ultimately for Elgar, the universal nature of musical expression was unbounded by instrumental timbre, although he was exceptionally skilled at orchestration. Further, the recording technology of Elgar’s time was not developed enough to handle the complexities of pipe organ acoustics, so transcribing the Sonata for Organ for the Pianola was one way of recording it for posterity.\(^{171}\) Even though Elgar needed the income from this product endorsement, it will be clear that he approved of the technology from an artistic standpoint as an appropriate means of distributing his

\(^{171}\) The Sonata might be more popular today if there had been a recording overseen by Elgar in the 1930’s. While Elgar was unable to provide a traditional recording of it since the orchestral transcription of the piece, a transcription project of which he approved, was completed by Gordon Jacob by 1946, twelve years after Elgar’s death.
orchestral, solo organ, and violin and piano works.\textsuperscript{172}

While it is common knowledge that Elgar felt that “good orchestration is the fitness of the means to the end…the accurate choice of the vehicle to present the musical idea in an entirely adequate way,”\textsuperscript{173} and more emphatically, that “WE MUST NOT APPROACH THE ORCHESTRA THROUGH THE PIANO,”\textsuperscript{174} Elgar viewed the ultimate nature of his music as “absolute,” meaning that music was meant to be “simple,” “pure and beautiful.”\textsuperscript{175} Musical ideas were surprisingly transferrable rather than fixed to a particular instrument, especially if the instrument could be improved.\textsuperscript{176} Elgar’s many piano transcriptions of his own works and his orchestral arrangements of Bach’s organ works give some idea of the musical translation between media that Elgar felt still conveyed the spirit of the music. In 1905 he said of Bach, “We can learn that Bach was not content to accept any limitations; new instruments were always tried and he did not look upon his orchestral machine or method as fixed or unchangeable.”\textsuperscript{177} This expectation that musical instruments were constantly evolving was one reason that Elgar was attracted to the Pianola.

Although Elgar was a world-famous orchestrator by this time, he was surprisingly unconcerned about protecting his reputation with timbre through the “flattening” process of transcription. He felt that the core meaning of his music would survive in the

\textsuperscript{172} Access to both the Pianola and to Pianola rolls are limited and few know about the existence of the Elgar Sonata in G Pianola roll. Michael Broadway, a contemporary premiere performer on the instrument in London, owns one such roll.

\textsuperscript{173} \textit{Birmingham Post} Nov 9 1906, \textit{A Future for English Music}, 260. “Sir Edward Elgar delivered the second of his series of lectures on orchestration at the University last evening. He pointed out that …orchestration was composing for instruments and [that] it was a great creative part, and not an extra to the composition at all.

\textsuperscript{174} Elgar, \textit{A Future for English Music}, 251.

\textsuperscript{175} Elgar, “Orchestration,” \textit{A Future for English Music}, 249.

\textsuperscript{176} Elgar oversaw or made piano versions of many of his works. He also presented Bach’s famous Fantasia and Fugue in C minor, BWV 537, originally for organ, as an orchestral transcription.

\textsuperscript{177} Ibid. 241.
translation to the piano, and as we see here, to the Pianola. Elgar followed the development of new technology with great professional and personal interest. Soon after its inception, he became a proponent of the Pianola, a new technology for pianos based on paper rolls with perforations that allowed music to be played through a pneumatic device. 178 Many of Elgar’s large instrumental works were transcribed for the instrument on paper rolls, including his symphonically-scaled Sonata. This surprising application of instrumental inter-adaptibility leads to new insights on Elgar’s goals for universality in music. Further, the Pianola discussion can extend understanding of Elgar’s performance preferences in instrumental genres, as well as his desire for his works to be played in a wide variety of venues.

First, it is important to understand the mechanical workings of the instrument in order to comprehend how Elgar’s endorsement of the Pianola medium reified his conception of music as abstractly available, not tied to one sound. 179 The following discussion of the kinds of problems the Pianola solved in musical life during Elgar’s time will provide unusual insight into Elgar’s rationale for transcription (which fell out of favor for most of the latter twentieth century) and describe his aural world, ideas applicable to understanding his Sonata.

Elgar endorsed the Orchestrelle Company in London (Aeolian Co. in New York), a company that built a piano-playing technology that required musical interpretation by the pianolist. 180 The Pianola, or “playing piano,” is a piano fitted with a self-playing mechanism, usually pneumatic, that strikes piano keys based on information from

178 Elgar used his name to endorse many products, including cigars, the gramophone and the Pianola.
179 “My idea is that there is music in the air, music all around us, the world is full of it and you simply take as much as you require.” Moore, Elgar: a creative life.
180 See page-long advertisement on behalf of the company in the August 1916 Music Student.
perforated paper rolls. The music roll perforations correspond to the individual notes and their durations in the piece. It was necessary for the performer to operate the damper and *sostenuto* pedals and to regulate the tempo and dynamics, so each “performance’ was truly unique.

Music rolls could include printed instructions suggesting dynamics and other expression to be used by the person operating the instrument, as several of Elgar’s works did (though not for the Sonata for Organ). The pianist would interpret the music with the same flexibility and empathy as a traditional performer. He or she was able to control his playing to accommodate ensemble playing the way that any traditional pianist could. Although the instrument could play effectively without alteration, by 1912, pianists could add dynamic and tempo marks and extra note perforations to the roll. This meant, hypothetically, that more notes could be included than a single pianist could play. It also meant that a performer’s style was “recorded” on the piano roll, a pre-digital-age coup.

Most of the rolls were manufactured between the end of the nineteenth century and the late 1930s and the majority of those with “serious” music originated from the Aeolian Company, whose policy was to produce rolls of the highest standard possible. The company encouraged contemporary composers either to write new works for the instrument or to have extant pieces edited and transcribed for inclusion in their Pianola roll catalogue. Works by Stravinsky, Scriabin and Grainger were all available, as were many by British composers such as Cyril Scott, Joseph Holbrooke, Arnold Bax, Granville Bantock and Balfour Gardiner. Further, keyboard repertoire ranging from Bach and Handel to Debussy and Ravel was well represented. As one of these solicited composers, Elgar’s music roll contributions to the Orchestrelle Pianola music roll catalogue included:
Salut d’Amour op. 12  
Sonata, op. 28  
“Enigma” Variations, op. 36  
Symphony no. 1, op 55  
Violin Concerto op. 61  
Wand of Youth, op. 1a, 1b  
Cockaigne Overture op. 40  
Pomp and Circumstance Marches

It is significant that Elgar believed that with a non-traditional performer his music could be well-represented by the Pianola. He had great interest in the development of technology and did not seem concerned about the replacement of live-action performer via gramophone recordings or Pianola transcriptions, which require performers, but not ones who can physically play the music.

By offering the Sonata on a Pianola roll Elgar also implied that the work was characteristic of his best composition, worthy of public interest (interest that it had not yet received outside of the organ world), and that he believed that its musical integrity would hold up to piano transcription in the same way that he believed his symphonic works would translate well to the medium. Elgar included the Sonata with his other orchestral works, an indication that Elgar recognized the large-scale nature of the work, and hoped that a Pianola treatment would make it more accessible to players—and audiences.

The problems addressed by the Pianola are discussed at length in an advertisement in the Music Student of 1916. The advertisement offers the benefits of the instrument—in this case, with regard to Elgar’s works—including its ability to provide “an untiring accompaniment,” a tool for analyzing the harmonies of orchestral works, “an authoritative interpretation of the composer’s own intentions” [as long as the composer
has provided a printed reading on the Pianola roll], and an excellent memory aid.\textsuperscript{181}

Another interesting feature was that because of the fixed nature of the perforations, wrong notes were not possible. Elgar had lamented the low quality of much of the piano playing he heard, so the Pianola solved another problem prevalent in performance. A 1907 article quoted Elgar: “There is no art in which mediocrity becomes so palpable, and the piano is an instrument which refuses to be cajoled by a bad player.”\textsuperscript{182} Elgar’s standard of playing was high, and it is appropriate to extend this sentiment to his standard for organ-playing, even though he absolved Hugh Blair of all responsibility for the precarious premiere of the Sonata. As mentioned above, Elgar may also have offered the Sonata on a Pianola roll because the Pianola apparatus resolved all of the technical difficulties in the piece, allowing the performer to focus on musical expression.

In terms of musical expression, Elgar had perceived a shift of piano performance practice at the turn of the twentieth century from a more gentle touch and conversational phrasing to the emergence of a heavier touch and dramatic style of performance. The Pianola technology allowed performers to easily maintain both clarity, precision, and artistic nuance, which Elgar prized. The obvious drawback, of course, one that Elgar does not mention, is the lack of the subtle touch of the traditional performer. Elgar explained his interest in the Pianola in an interview:

Paderewski and Busoni in their best days meet my ideal, I suppose, of piano playing. As for the violent and fireworky school, I’d far rather have a Pianola!…Indeed, I’m not sure that the Pianola is not our best means of hearing piano works well performed today. Paderewski and Busoni are not always at


\textsuperscript{182} \textit{Birmingham Post}, \textit{A Future for English Music}, (June 22, 1907). Elgar also thought that the piano might be on the way out of favor as an instrument since “mechanical players were multiplying in such vast numbers that the human piano-player would probably disappear.”
hand, but we can domesticate good pianism in the Pianola. The state of things as it used to be has been curiously reversed. Some years ago the pianists had the beautiful touch and the Pianola the hard one. The Pianola maker in those days was trying to imitate the touch of the pianist. Nowadays the pianist seems to be trying to cultivate the touch of the early Pianolas.\footnote{Edward Elgar, interview by Edward Bellerby, \textit{The Music Student}, (August 1916).}

From this comment, it can be deduced that Elgar liked the touch produced by the Pianola. Characteristics of the Pianola sound are a quick turn-around on key strike, a precise-but-delicate handling of densely-notated passages, and a facile and uniform \textit{rubato} and \textit{accelerando}. The overall sound covers the dynamic range, but with careful pedaling, musical ideas are clearly articulated, even passages with many simultaneous voices. The resulting effect of the Pianola is that of an ensemble of piano notes rather than the carefully-curated voicings of a soloist, perhaps the very sound that attracted Elgar to the Pianola in the first place. In fact, his own piano playing had been described as “orchestral.” Dora Penny was the daughter of the local rector of the Parish Church and described Elgar’s piano playing this way:

\begin{quote}
Although I had not left school very long I had heard a number of good pianists, but I had never heard anything quite like this. He didn’t play like a pianist, he almost seemed to play like a whole orchestra. It sounded full without being loud and he contrived to make you hear other instruments joining in. It fascinated me…\footnote{Moore, \textit{Elgar: a creative life}, 202.}
\end{quote}

Perhaps the key to Elgar’s preferred sound is this: that it was corporate and polyphonic. Elgar’s music is often said to stir up a feeling of “national” identity, but the identity that his music exudes is more accurately described as a collective, polyphonic idealism that eclipses “national” identity. Accordingly, it is fitting that Elgar played the piano like a collective body rather than like a soloist. One could then extend sense of collectiveness to interpretation of his organ writing. For this reason, instead of viewing the Sonata as a
work for a solo organist, it is more appropriate to view his Sonata as an idealized symphonic work. Performed on the Pianola, the Sonata would be a symphony for piano; performed by orchestra, it would be a symphony for orchestra; and performed on the organ, it is a symphony for pipes. At the end of the day, for all the debate about genre and classification, Elgar wrote music that celebrated the collective, beautiful nature of life, whatever form the music took.

**Transcriptions of the Sonata**

Apart from the Pianola transcription of the Sonata, four other orchestral and wind band transcriptions have been made of the work, each with little or no prior knowledge of the other existing transcriptions. The ease with which the Sonata transfers to the orchestral idiom has been discussed extensively and these transcriptions add support to the argument:


  The significance of this arrangement is its addition of percussion and harp to the aural soundscape. Jacob makes effective Elgarian use of timpani, glockenspiel, and harp at appropriate compositional transitions. These define the structure of the work for the listener.


---

\(^{185}\) Conversation with Joseph Adam, organist at St. James Cathedral, Seattle (15 April 2013), led to the observation by Adam has found that a good mental paradigm for registering the Sonata on the organ is to think of it as a wind band piece with contrasted wind choruses.
• Anthony Addison, arranger, Edward Elgar, Symphony in G major from the Organ Sonata, op. 28, Study Score 932, (Musik Produktion Höflich: Munich 2009). Scored for full orchestra.

Addison acknowledges in his preface that he did not know of the Jacob transcription when he made this version.

• John Morrison, arranger. Unknown details.

**Conclusion**

Elgar’s “Symphony no. 0” must be considered as a symphonic-style piece in order to understand its real significance for Elgar’s genius in orchestral composition. Arthur Honegger wrote, “I frequently compare a symphony with a novel in which the themes are characters. After we have made their acquaintance, we follow their evolution, the unfolding of their psychology.” Elgar takes a falling fourth, a rising second, a few rhythms and creates triumphant, heroic, march-like, wistful, pastoral, lyrical, and ethereal “characters” that are in close dialogue with the Austro-German symphonic tradition. These themes “unfold a psychology” that combines of all the triumphs and uncertainties of a composer who was an active participant in the early English musical “Renaissance” but whose musical ethos was rooted in late-Romantic, German symphonic music.

If it is true that Elgar’s First Symphony explores the conflict between the ideal and the real, then the Sonata explores the reality of the ideal. The optimism and sincerity of this work transcended an English tradition of symphonic circumspection that often verged on cynicism and an insular organist culture that needed to respect the work, though it could not recognize it immediately. Instead, Elgar’s intent was to engage with what he felt was the highest evolution of art and to lift humanity to this ideal. In this spirit he observed:
Now—the English working-men are intelligent: they do not want treating sentimentally, we must give them the real thing, we must give them of the best because we want them to have it, not from mere curiosity to see HOW they will accept it. ¹⁸⁶

Here, Elgar suggests that it is possible for the reality to meet the ideal, at least in music.

This perspective reinforces the excellence with which Elgar approached his Sonata when we see that he took Brahms, Schumann, Beethoven, and Wagner as models and crafted for this monumental instrument a monumental work of quality and depth.

Appendix A

Selected Chronological List of Works

c. 1867 Humoreske Broadheath and other music for Elgar children’s play *The Wand of Youth*

c. 1870 *Fugue in G minor* for organ (unfinished)

1874-1888 orchestral music, chamber music, arrangements, vocal works (part-songs, songs) often lost, unfinished or destroyed, often premiered in Worcester

1884 Spring: Helen Weaver breaks off engagement to Elgar

1886 Marries Caroline Alice Roberts in Brompton Oratory in London

1888 *Salut d’amour*

1889 *11 Vesper Voluntaries for organ*, op. 14

1890 Carice Irene Elgar, daughter, born, August 14

1890 *Froissart* concert overture op. 19, written West Kensington, performed St. James’s Hall 16 November 1900

1893 *Serenade in E minor* op. 20

*The Black Knight*, symphony for chorus and orchestra, op. 25, ded. Hugh Blair, MA Mus B, Pub. Novello 1893, (other songs, violin music, etc)

1894 *Sursum Corda* for strings, brass, organ op. 11, premiered by Hugh Blair 9 April 1894 (more songs)

1895 *Sonata in G* for organ, op. 28

*Scenes from the Bavarian Highlands*, six choral songs with piano, op. 27

1896 *The Light of Life*, for SACTB solo, chorus and orchestra, op. 29
*Scenes from the Saga of King Olaf*, cantata for STB soloists, chorus, orchestra

1897 *The Banner of St. George*, op. 33, *Te Deum and Benedictus* for chorus and organ, op. 34

1898 *Caractacus*, cantata for STBB soloists, chorus, orchestra, op. 35

1899 *Variations on an Original Theme (Enigma)* for orchestra, op. 36

1900 *The Dream of Gerontius* for mezzo-soprano, tenor, bass soloists, chorus, and orchestra, op. 38

1901 Millitary Marches, *Pomp and Circumstance*, op. 39

1902 *Coronation Ode*, for SCTB soloists, chours, and orchestra, op. 44

1903 *In the South*, concert overture, op. 50

1904 *Introduction and Allegro for String Quartet and String Orchestra*, op. 47

1906 *The Kingdom*, oratorio for SCTB soloists, chorus, orchestra, op. 51

1907 *The Wand of Youth*, Suite no. 1 for orchestra, op. 1 A

1908 *Symphony no. 1* in Ab major, op. 55, *The Wand of Youth*, Suite no. 2 for orchestra, op. 1B

1909 *Elegy* for string orchestra, op. 58

1910 *Concerto in B minor* for violin and orchestra, op. 61

1911 *Second Symphony* in Eb major, op. 63

1912 *The Crown of India*, for contralto and bass soloists, chorus, orchestra

1912 *Cantique*, op. 3, for organ, ded. Hugh Blair
1918  *Sonata in E minor* for violin and pianoforte, op. 82
1919  *Concerto in E minor* for violoncello and orchestra, op. 85
1930  *Severn Suite*, op. 87 for brass band
1932  *Severn Suite*, op. 87 arranged for orchestra
1933  *Organ Sonata no. 2*, op. 87a (arranged from *Severn Suite*)

Proportion of works: 233 total
- solo songs and song-cycles: 61
- orchestral: 58
- part-songs: 49
- chamber music: 36
- unfinished and projected works (including lost works): 32
- arrangements and transcriptions of music by other composers: 31
- church vocal music (including early unpublished items): 22
- piano solos: 16
- large-scale choral works: 13
- dramatic works: 10
- juvenalia (excluding unfinished works): 9
- organ: 5
- misc. 1 (carillon)
Appendix B

At one time or another during his search for musical identity, Elgar was associated with most of Worcester’s musical institutions either as a performer, teacher or composer/arranger:

1870  Crown Hotel Glee Club second violin (father plays first violin)
1872  Deputy Organist for mass at St. George’s
1872  Deputy Ringer of curfew bell at St. Helen’s Church; fired for “unauthorized and unorthodox experiments in campanology” (de-la-Noy 32)
1873  Assistant Organist at St. George’s, Worcester
1874  Anthem arranged for strings performed at All Saints’ Church, Worcester
1876  Violin teacher
1876  Arranges Flying Dutchman for Glee Club, writes Tantum Ergo and Salve regina for St. George’s
1877  Conducts and plays with Worcester Amateur Instrumental Society
1879  Conductor of Glee club
1890  Froissart commission from committee of Worcester Festival for an overture (not the first time he overprovided music)
1893  The Black Knight
1895  Sonata for Organ, op. 28, commission for visiting Americans
# Appendix C

## Sonata-Theory Abbreviations

| Themes | C: closing zone  
P: primary-theme zone  
P_{rf}: specialized sonata/rondo theme, recurring, with “rondo character”  
RT: retransition  
S: secondary-theme zone, follows MC (see below)  
S_{c}: S-based closing zone  
TR: transition, following P, the energy-gaining modules driving toward the MC  
C-F: caesura-fill |
|---|---|
| Cadences | PAC: perfect authentic cadence  
IAC: imperfect authentic cadence  
HC: half-cadence  
DC: deceptive cadence  
EEC: essential expositional closure, the first satisfactory PAC that occurs within S and then proceeds onward to differing material. This can be deferred to the next PAC by immediate repetition of the melody or cadence.  
ESC: essential structural closure, within a recapitulation, usually the first satisfactory PAC within S. This can also be deferred as above. The ESC occurs normally at the recapitulation’s parallel point to the exposition’s EEC.  
MC: medial caesura, dominant cadence that (usually I: V or I: V/V) indicates presence of two-part exposition and leads directly to an S theme. If there is no MC, there is usually no S. |

---

187 Hepokoski and Darcy, *The Elements*. 
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Appendix D


The whole work is well-edited until the finale, from measure 86 to 230, where editorial omissions occurred and manuscript sketch markings are provided below. The metronome markings are repeated from chapter 2.

I.
Tempo: quarter=112-108

m. 11 LH F# should be G

II.
Tempo: eighth=80

III.
Tempo: eighth=72

IV.
Tempo: quarter=126

Corrections:

m. 86 tenuto on soprano G
m. 87 staccato soprano A
m. 87-88 slur from soprano G to F
m. 89 no slur under LH notes, two note slur beat 3
m. 90 two note slur beat 1.5 A-G, slur under sixteenths of beat 2
m. 91 slur under beat 1, slur under beat 2
m. 94 sf and decrescendo beats 1.5 to end of measure
m. 97 cresc. and decresc.

m. 99 cresc. Over soprano beat 1, no tenuto m. 2
m. 106 slur over full measure
m. 117 no staccato or tenuto
m. 118 no tenuto
m. 120 no staccato
m. 121 beats slurred separately
m. 123 no slurs
m. 124 no slur
m. 129 no marcato
m. 134 dim.

m. 135 no dim.

m. 136 p
m. 141 pedals: +Reed
m. 142 Right hand part meant for left hand, left hand part for right hand
m. 142-146, 147-148 no crescendo/decrescendo
m. 149-150 crescendo and decrescendo above soprano
m. 157 slur from F to G of m. 158, no slur m. 158 beat one
m. 159-162 left hand slur to beat 1 m. 162
m. 161-162 slur G# to E of m. 162
m. 163-164 soprano slur over both measures
m. 163 left hand slur under beat 1 to end of beat 2 instead of to m. 164
m. 164-166 left hand slur from D m. 164 to D m. 166
m. 165-166 soprano slur over both full measures
m. 170-174 soprano slur continues to beat 1 F# of m. 174
m. 174-177 soprano slur begins on B m. 174 and continues to G in m. 177
m. 178 mf instead of f
m. 178-181 soprano slur continues over all bars
m. 180 no “Sw.”
m. 181 “Sw.” right hand
m. 182 slur only A to C#
m. 186-189 soprano slur stops at D m. 189
m. 196 f left hand
m. 196-197 soprano slur over both measures
m. 218 mf left hand
m. 218-230 inner voices in right hand are circled, suggesting Elgar considered their omission?
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