

Mahlerian Quotations, Thematic Dramaturgy, and Sonata Form in the First Movement of Shostakovich's Fourth Symphony

Charity Lofthouse

The frontiers of music are never clear-cut: beyond its framing silence, beyond its inner form, it is caught up in a web of references to other music: its unity is variable and relative. Musical texts speak among themselves.

Michael Klein, *Intertextuality in Western Art Music*
(Klein 2005: 4)

Surpassing its three predecessors in both size and scope, Dmitri Shostakovich's Symphony No. 4 (1936) is broadly considered to be the most "Mahlerian" of his symphonic output. The reasons for this consideration range from its size, instrumentation, and use of folk idioms to a wealth of Mahler allusions and quotations distributed throughout its nearly hour-long duration. Indeed, the history of intertextual dialogue between Mahler and Shostakovich reaches back prior to Symphony No. 4's composition, finding its origins in Shostakovich's relationship with Ivan Sollertinsky, a champion of Mahler's music in the Soviet Union with whom Shostakovich took up in-depth study of Mahler's works (Sollertinsky 1932).¹

Analytical pathways to Shostakovich's intertextual exchange with Mahlerian practice could thus be traced along two root systems: those that analyze Mahlerian symphonism and those that compare Mahler's and Shostakovich's symphonic languages. Foremost in the first category is Theodor Adorno, whose analytical concepts have found a secure place in Shostakovich scholarship (Adorno 1992; Monahan 2008, 2007, 2011). The second category could stretch loosely from contemporary reception of Shostakovich's symphonies to Russian- and English-language writings by Genrikh Orlov (1961), Marina Sabinina (1976), Richard Taruskin (1997), Boris Gasparov (2005), and Pauline Fairclough (2006), to name but a few.

In addition to noting thematic and tonal allusions reminiscent of Mahler's First, Second, Third, Sixth, Ninth, and Tenth Symphonies, Fairclough claims that it is "at the more fundamental level of structure and dramaturgy that the parallels between [Mahlerian practice and Shostakovich's Fourth Symphony] are most suggestive" (Fairclough 2006: 46). Symphony No. 4's atypical expression of sonata-form thematic conventions evokes questions of thematic identity and sectional apportioning. In response, analytical readings of the first movement include "reverse" recapitulation, a sonata exposition with three main themes, and even disavowal of sonata form entirely.² These structural analyses also wrestle with the location and designation of the second theme, which appears in various guises throughout the movement.

Within Symphony No. 4's rich tapestry of Mahler quotations, interactions between its allusions and quotations and each composer's sonata-form layouts have yet to be explored. In this article, I link Mahler quotations, thematic dramaturgy, and formal design in reconsidering Symphony No. 4's dialogue with sonata processes through the lenses of Mahler's First Symphony and Sonata Theory (Hepokoski, Darcy 2006).³

I first highlight a Mahlerian "quotation" in Shostakovich IV/I, proposing the plaintive, lyrical bassoon "second" theme at m. 263 is a transformed

¹ For a thorough and excellent recount of Sollertinsky's work and the relationship between Sollertinsky and Shostakovich, see Fairclough 2001 and 2006.

² In addition to Fairclough and Sabinina, Hugh Ottaway, Michael Koball, Eric Roseberry, Richard Longman, Karen Kopp, and Charity Lofthouse have analyzed the first movement in various publications. See Fairclough 2006; Ottaway 1975, 1978; Koball 1997; Roseberry 1989; Longman 1989; Kopp 1990; and Lofthouse 2014.

³ The term "Sonata Theory" refers specifically to the theoretical framework developed by Hepokoski and Darcy. Related writings preceding *Elements of Sonata Theory* (Hepokoski, Darcy 2006) include Hepokoski and Darcy 1997; and Hepokoski 2002. Hepokoski explores dialogic form and Beethovenian practice in his article "Sonata Theory and Dialogic Form" (Hepokoski 2009).

Figure 1. Shostakovich, Symphony No. 4, i, mm. 47–159, thematic/quotation overview and layout.

Theme zone	Contrasting, S-like, fragmented theme zone						
m. #	47	60	75	96	111	128	159
Statements/ Repetitions	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	"Call to Attention" 1	"Call to Attention" 2	Return of P
Theme(s)	S-theme fragments (S-frag.)	S-frag.	S-frag.	S-frag.	S-frag./ P-rhetoric; Mahler "Inferno"	S-frag./ P-rhetoric; Mahler "Inferno"	P-frag., S-frag.

version of the *Durchbruch* fanfare from Mahler I/iv.⁴ Next, the Mahler I/i and I/iv quotations and allusions found throughout Shostakovich IV/i are contextualized through comparison with their formal locations of origin in Mahler I/iv. Lastly, I employ concepts from Sonata Theory to examine formal and tonal correspondences between the two movements, including the ways Mahler and Shostakovich treat the intersections of form and thematic recomposition or substitution. Similar techniques in each symphony suggest Shostakovich's "secondary" theme in m. 263 may serve as a compensatory development-space attempt to rectify an underdeveloped S-theme fragment heard earlier in the movement.

Shostakovich's "Mahlerian" Second Theme

Analyses often denote mm. 47–159 as a lyrical, contrasting theme that expresses the potential for an attempted secondary theme, especially when compared to the just-completed strident and militaristic primary theme. These readings differ, however, as to whether this lyrical theme's rhetorical and tonal deficiencies eliminate it entirely as a prospect for the movement's S-theme

(it is not considered a second theme at all, but instead a contrasting subsidiary theme that takes part in a P-theme group), create a situation of eventual displacement (it is a flawed or "failed" secondary theme later supplanted by the "real" secondary theme beginning in m. 263), or compel a third theme (it is a troubled, loosely formed S-theme, necessitating a more suitably lyrical and cohesive compensatory theme presented in the development).⁵

It is during this debated "subsidiary" theme zone, mm. 47–159, that the first of Shostakovich's Mahler quotations appears. Figure 1 displays the thematic layout of mm. 47–159. The triplet "Inferno" motive from Mahler I/iv is quoted for the first time within this section at m. 132, soon after four statements of a series of five melodic fragments. Two of these melodic fragments (displayed in Example 1a and b) are notable: (1) the arpeggio outlined at mm. 53, 100, 106, and 109; and (2) the stepwise descending fourth followed by an ascending leap in mm. 61 and 69. These fragments are later expanded into what is broadly considered the movement's second theme at m. 263. The key areas indicated for each fragment reoccur

⁴ This nomenclature for identifying symphonic movements refers to the symphony and movement; I will use this labeling system throughout the article.

⁵ See Ottaway, Koball, Kopp, Longman, Fairclough, Sabinina, Roseberry, and Lofthouse. Several of these analyses consider this theme to be part of a primary-theme zone group or first subject group, with various characterizations ranging from "subsidiary theme" to "transition theme" to "false second subject" (Fairclough 2006: 83; Roseberry 1989: 389–395; Longman 1989: 9; Sabinina 1976: 101; Kopp 1990: 157; and Koball 1997: 5). Hugh Ottaway and Charity Lofthouse read the theme in m. 263 as belonging to development space (Ottaway 1975: 20; Lofthouse 2014: chapters 3–5). Though the subsidiary-theme designation is ascribed in most analyses, consideration of this theme's identity within particular analyses also seems to reflect the difficulties regarding its contrasting rhetoric with the primary theme and its ambiguous tonality. For example, Roseberry explicitly argues the identity of the theme beginning at m. 47 as a subsidiary theme of the first theme group, then immediately refers to it as a "secondary" theme. The interchangeability of the terms in this case is not explained.

Example 1a. Shostakovich, Symphony No. 4, i, mm. 47–72, reduction.

53

(C minor)

Thematic fragment later heard as first phrase of melody at m. 263

61

Hint of later theme's second phrase

pizz. arco cresc.

68

Clearer reference to second phrase of later theme

A minor to A major

arco *p espr.* *f* *p* *cr*

Example 1b. Shostakovich, Symphony No. 4, i, mm. 96–110, reduction.

during further statements throughout the rest of the movement.⁶

These thematic fragments and the “Inferno” Mahlerian quotation next appear – again paired – during a more subdued and tightly organized theme zone beginning at m. 261, wherein whole-tone harp accompanimental figures and a plaintive solo bassoon provide a more cohesive version of the fragments first heard in mm. 47–159. I propose this more unified version of the fragmented lyrical theme at m. 263, often considered the actual second theme, can be deemed an additional modified quotation from Mahler I/iv (see Example 2).

The openings of the first and second phrases from Shostakovich IV/i bear strong resemblance to the breakthrough brass arpeggios and subse-

quent theme from Mahler I/iv. Shostakovich IV/i’s opening arpeggio gesture, contour, and rhythm evoke the motive from the *Durchbruch* arpeggios in Mahler I/iv, including the strong-beat ascent of an octave launching from the fifth of a major triad, neighbor figuration emphasizing scale-degree 2 at the mid point, and the return to scale-degree 3 following the initial arpeggiated ascent. The second phrase presents a contour similar to the chorale-like Mahler I/iv theme first presented in m. 389 following the arpeggio breakthrough heard at m. 370; both melodies outline two motives of a descending fourth, followed by an ascending leap of a seventh.

Though one could argue these gestures too generic to constitute a quotation, several other associations in this section support its link to the

⁶ A major is the featured key at the fragment’s first return, in m. 263; F major is omitted; and D-flat major is featured at m. 812. The A-major and D-flat-major appearances are each paired with quotations from Mahler I/iv.

Example 2. Shostakovich, Symphony No. 4, i, mm. 263–275 and 287–295, demonstrating correspondences to Mahler, Symphony No. 1, iv, mm. 624–626 and 306–316.

Shostakovich IV/i, S-variant theme, first phrase (mm. 263–275).

263

Mahler I/iv, trumpet arpeggio breakthrough motive, third appearance (mm. 624–626); stems indicate correspondence to Shostakovich.

287

Shostakovich IV/i, S-variant theme, second phrase (mm. 287–295).

624

Mahler I/iv, Breakthrough theme, first appearance (mm. 306–316); marked intervals indicate correspondences to Shostakovich.

306

Figure 2. Shostakovich, Symphony No. 4, i, subrotation 3 key and quotation layout, outlining additive quotation/allusion schema of repetitions.

Theme statement	m. #	Key	Mahler I/iv quotations and allusions
Statement 1	263	A major	Breakthrough-variant theme; trumpet “Inferno” triplets
Statement 2	335	B major	Breakthrough-variant; cuckoo from Mahler I/i and I/iv
Statement 3	372	A major	Breakthrough-variant; cuckoo at pitch; “Inferno” triplets
Statement 4	428	D/C	Breakthrough-variant; key areas; descending-fourth melody and dominant six-four harmonic emphasis at breakthrough

Durchbruch theme from Mahler I/iv. The bassoon theme is consistently paired with additional direct quotations from Mahler I/iv during each of three successive repetitions in mm. 335, 372, and 428 respectively. Figure 2 shows quotations from Mahler I/iv and corresponding keys that appear during each repetition of the theme. First to return is the “Inferno” trumpet quotation, which accompanies the initial statement of the lyrical breakthrough-like theme. This is followed by the first appearance of the “cuckoo” fourths from Mahler I/i (also quoted in Mahler I/iv) during the repetition. The third statement contains both the “Inferno” and cuckoo quotations, with the latter featuring the original D-A fourth from Mahler I/i and I/iv.⁷

The final repetition presents the theme in D major, the “redemption” key of Mahler I/iv and the overall tonality of Mahler I/i, and surrounded by *furioso* scalar figures resembling those accompanying the brass *Durchbruch* arpeggios at m. 370 of Mahler I/iv.

This fourth statement of the lyrical theme then progresses into a *Durchbruch*-like continuation at m. 435, featuring a thematic motive first introduced in m. 307. Shown in Example 3, this C major breakthrough also strongly outlines the descending-fourth interval found in the chorale-like Mahler I/iv theme and unfolds over a dominant harmony in 6/4 position; this is a harmonic choice similar to the extended dominant harmony un-

dergirding the S-theme at the end of Mahler I/iv’s development. After this breakthrough, one last truncated statement of this lyrical theme accompanies a sardonic descent back to reality; instead of dreamlike harps and celesta neighbor-tone accompaniment, the Mahler cuckoos become mocking ninths as the basses and contrabassoon present an incomplete, grotesque version of the theme’s now distant and illusory lyricism.

Quotations and Locations in Sonata Space

Having outlined the thematic structure and Mahler quotations of mm. 261–476, let us turn to mm. 477–905, widely regarded as the movement’s development. Additional quotations from Mahler I’s finale imply further correspondence between the two works; though allusions attributed to Mahler’s Sixth, Ninth, and Tenth Symphonies are found in this section, the “Inferno” triplets and cuckoos remain most salient. In addition to similarities in thematic partitioning, corresponding placement of Mahler I/i quotations in Shostakovich IV/i and Mahler I/iv suggests the Mahler I/i quotations and allusions in Shostakovich IV/i can be considered as corresponding to the formal placement of similarly located quotations from the development of Mahler I/iv, not as borrowings directly from Mahler I/i.

Figure 3 illustrates the thematic layout of mm. 477–905 from Shostakovich IV/i and mm. 317–532 from Mahler I/iv. The overall thematic and formal

⁷ More generally, the key areas of these repetitions feature the pitches that serve as the melodic link between the brass arpeggios and the subsequent *Durchbruch* theme in Mahler I/iv: A–B–D, before arriving at the movement’s own *Durchbruch* suggesting C major. Finally, the last repetition’s key areas, D and C are the key areas employed at the D-major and C-major breakthrough statements in Mahler I/iv.

Example 3. Shostakovich, Symphony No. 4, i, mm. 428–451.

B-centered C diatonicism ...shifts through B-flat to suggested F major

428

ff S theme, fourth statement, now in D major Mahlerian "redemption" key

431

...shift to *f*

433

fff *riten.*

F major/minor or C major/minor? (01347)

Example 3, continued.

Breakthrough in C major, descending-fourth contour resembles Mahler I/iv breakthrough theme

435

fff espr.

fff espr. ascending scales resemble end of exposition

(C: V⁶)

440

Breakthrough shifts to B-flat major, still over G!

445

Breakthrough is derailed, Mahler cuckoos as mocking ninths, sardonic S-theme in tubas, retransition

horns

ff tuba

c-b

Figure 3. Shostakovich, Symphony No. 4, i, and Mahler, Symphony No. 1, iv, development sections.

Shostakovich IV/i:					
Measure #:	160	233	252	436	
Thematic modules:	P+S, P TR	P S-variant	TR MC S-variant (w/ BT motive)	BT retrans.	
c:	f	A-flat/C	f/g-flat A+D (E-flat, A)	C B-flat	
Formal function:	Development	C/OCT/WT a/c	(Compensatory Fantasy/Interruption)		
Mahler I/iv:					
Zone:	Development pt 1		Preview 1		
Subrotation:	intro SR1	SR2	TR	BT prep/retrans.	
Measure #:	254 262	274	290	297 306	
Thematic modules:	intro P+S	P+S			
f:	g				C (quasi-tonicized)
Formal function:	Development		(Interruption-Preview)		
Shostakovich IV/i:					
Zone:	Development				
Measure #:	477	499	551	580 679	
Thematic modules:	P	P+S	P/TR	fugue: new (quasi-P/TR/S cycle)	
c:	f	A	f/OCT	OCT/WT (C/D/G/A)	
Formal function:	Development			(Interruption-S theme substitute)	
Mahler I/iv:					
Zone:	Development pt. 2				
Section:	Development pt. 2		Preview 2		
Measure #:	317	327	337	370 386 389 413	
Thematic modules:	P+S	P+S	intro, P+S, P+S	BT new	
f:	c: i		f: V	C-D	
Formal function:	Development			(Interruption-preview)	
Shostakovich IV/i:					
Zone:	Development				
Measure #:	717	818	882		
Thematic modules:	P+ TR	S, S + Mahler I/i	Retrans. (quotes Mahler I/iv mm. 445-457)		
c:	OCT, f, g, b-flat	D-flat, E-flat B	OCT, chromatic		
Formal function:		(Interruption-flashback?)			
Mahler I/iv:					
Zone:	Development pt. 2				
Section:	Flashback 2		Retrans.		
Measure #:	429	445	458		
Thematic modules:	Mahler I/i, S	S-based transition	S(!)		
f:	d-c		F:V		
Formal function:	(Interruption-flashback)				

BT = breakthrough

layout does not provide an identical correlation, but several congruencies are notable. First, both movements alternate more standard developmental passages with two instances of what could be considered extra-formal interruptions containing flashbacks, previews, or breakthrough material (these are distributed roughly in the

same order and formal location).⁸ Significant departures from expository materials or ruptures that feature contrasting instrumentation, new thematic modules, or other indicators of departure follow truncated and fragmented cycles of P/S statements. Second, C major is featured at the moment of breakthrough in both works. These

⁸ For a detailed examination of breakthrough and fantasy projection in Mahler, see Darcy 2001; Monahan 2008, 2007 and 2011.

Example 4. Shostakovich, Symphony No. 4, i, mm. 812–820, reduction, with Mahler allusions.

S-theme in D-flat major, key of Mahler I/iv secondary theme area

Turn and figure outlining minor sixth, resembles motives from Mahler I/iv:

(turn motive, Mahler I/iv, m. 405ff) (P1.2, Mahler I/iv)

breakthrough moments are followed by preparatory or retransitional passages before returning to more typical developmental P/S-centered activity at the beginning of the next section.

Perhaps most striking, near the end of each development zone both movements prominently feature their respective S-theme modules alongside quotations from the first movement of Mahler's First Symphony: in other words, both Shostakovich IV/i and Mahler I/iv allude to the same referential movement, Mahler I/i, just before the end of their developments. Example 4 displays mm. 812–820 from Shostakovich IV/i, near the end of the development section; this area of sonata space (mm. 812–905) presents several correspondences to Mahler I/iv. First, a series of S-theme statements begins in D-flat major,

Shostakovich IV/i's global Neapolitan and the key of Mahler I/iv's secondary theme. In addition to the S-theme, formal placement, and key area, the string accompanimental figures in mm. 812–820 transform the section's waltz-like triplet figure into a turn motive and ascending-sixth gesture resembling accompanimental turns and the second portion of Mahler I/iv's primary theme.

Mahlerian correspondences increase in the next passage: Example 5a shows mm. 422–446 of Mahler I/iv; Example 5b provides the corresponding passage, mm. 853–906 of Shostakovich IV/i. Following a module based on Shostakovich IV/i's breakthrough, a second S-theme statement in m. 831 – now in E-flat and shortened to only the opening Mahler-like arpeggio – leads to motivic

Example 5a. Mahler, Symphony No. 1, iv, mm. 422–446, reduction, outlining quotations and tonal/chordal events corresponding to Shostakovich IV/i.

Chordal quotation from Mahler I/i

423

turn figure

429

ppp

p

Breakthrough arpeggios

Melodic quotation from Mahler I/i

D/E \flat half-step juxtaposition

433

435

ppp

molto rit.

pp

Example 5a, cont.

C/A \flat juxtaposition (seen throughout development of Shostakovich IV/i)

Musical score for measures 439-440. The key signature is one flat (B-flat). The score is in piano (pp) and features a complex rhythmic pattern with triplets and sixteenth notes in the right hand, and sustained notes in the left hand. The notation includes a C/A \flat juxtaposition.

C/F juxtaposition (seen throughout development of Shostakovich IV/i)

Cuckoo quotations in C and F; cuckoos only quoted in development section of Mahler I/iv

Musical score for measures 441-442. The key signature is one flat (B-flat). The score is in piano (p) and features a complex rhythmic pattern with triplets and sixteenth notes in the right hand, and sustained notes in the left hand. The notation includes a C/F juxtaposition and cuckoo quotations.

Mahler I/iv S-based transition fragment

Musical score for measures 443-444. The key signature is one flat (B-flat). The score is in piano (pp) and features a complex rhythmic pattern with triplets and sixteenth notes in the right hand, and sustained notes in the left hand. The notation includes a Mahler I/iv S-based transition fragment.

Mahler I/iv S-theme quotation

(the following measures feature "flashback" material as a retransition leads to an attempted Type 3 recapitulation)

Example 5b. Shostakovich, Symphony No. 4, i, mm. 853–906, reduction, displaying Mahler allusions from development space.

(The preceding passage featured fragments of the breakthrough theme, originally derived from Mahler I/iv breakthrough)

Allusion to chordal quotation from Mahler I/i

853 *pp* S-theme, shortened to only arpeggios

B/B \flat half-step juxtaposition

Ascending sixth with descending semitone resolution resembles P1.2 of Mahler I/iv (see Example 4)

862

(Loosely resembles melodic "flashback" material from opening and closing of Mahler I/iv development)

870 [2,5,6,7,8,E] (012369) in strings

[2,3,5,6,7,8,T,E] (01345689)

[1,3,4,7,T] (01369)

(melodic expression of (012369))

878

[0,2,4,7] (0247)

[E,1,3,6] (0247)

pp \triangleleft *p* *p* \triangleleft *mp*

Example 5b, cont.

886

mp \triangleleft *mf* *mp* \triangleleft *mf*

A/C boundary dyad featured throughout the movement

[0,2,3,5,6,8,9]
(0235689) septachord, OCT and complement of (01369) in m. 875

Retransition featuring fragment very closely resembling Mahler I/iv S-based transition fragment, now OCT

894

f \triangleleft *ff* *ff* \triangleleft *fff* *ff*

Full chromatic collection

fragmentation and a stasis point in m. 853 that closely resembles Mahler I/iv in texture, Mahler I/i quotation, and location in sonata space.

In Shostakovich IV/i, the development-concluding presentation of the S-theme (the last in a series of four statements) appears in B major at m. 854.⁹ Simultaneously, the wind instrumentation and texture sustaining B-flat strongly alludes to the opening of Mahler I/i (and, with the presence of the *campanelli*, a return to fantasy-like flashback instrumentation heard throughout mm. 261–476). A Mahler I/i flashback is similarly featured near the end of the development of Mahler I/iv; there, a quotation from the first movement appears in m. 429 during a flashback episode following the second breakthrough interruption. Moreover, the B/B-flat semitone juxtaposition from Shostakovich IV/i corresponds to the D/E-flat

dyads at an analogous location in development space in Mahler I/iv: mm. 432–435. This dyad accompanies a presentation of the breakthrough arpeggios as well, and is succeeded by a presentation of the triplet “Inferno” motive.

Shortened to just its initial Mahlerian arpeggio, Shostakovich IV/i’s B-major S statement at m. 854 launches a series of Mahlerian quotations and allusions in succession, unfolding through the end of the development and roughly mapping onto the events at the conclusion of Mahler I/iv. The S-theme arpeggios are followed in m. 860 by a figure whose ascending-sixth leap and semitone descent again resembles the P-theme module from Mahler I/iv. A descending melody in mm. 864–872 journeys in mirror opposition to the chromatic ascending “flashback” theme from the opening and closing of Mahler I/iv’s development. Lastly, an

⁹ Like Mahler I/iv, Shostakovich IV/i’s development features melodic material from the S-theme near its conclusion; this B-major statement of the S-theme in Shostakovich IV/i serves as the last main thematic module of development space.

octatonic retransition in mm. 898–906 is nearly identical to an S-based fragment from a transition passage near the end of Mahler I/iv's development (see Example 5a and 5b). This retransition reorients the Mahler quotation into octatonic figures that usher in the return to the movement's opening introductory module at m. 906.

Sonata Theory, Rotation, and Thematic Overwriting

Thematic quotations and formal correspondences within sonata space between Shostakovich IV/i and Mahler I/iv illuminate larger notions of thwarted thematic expectations within sonata-form frameworks. The thematic and formal correspondences between the two movements outlined above suggest two points of reconsideration regarding the formal layout and thematic dramaturgy of Shostakovich IV/i.

First, quotation and formal correspondences to Mahler I/iv, coupled with considerations of Sonata Theory's rotational processes, buttress an interpretation of Shostakovich IV/i as complicating sonata-form space with thematic displacements and extra-formal visions of thematic salvation. Second, as a result of rotational and formal correspondences and of the S-theme's identification as a quotation of Mahler I/iv's *Durchbruch* theme, Shostakovich's lyrical "second" theme beginning in m. 263 may be reinterpreted as unfolding within development space, serving as a dream-like, compensatory development "breakthrough" version of the earlier, "failed" secondary theme. This compensatory statement is part of a series of thwarted thematic and rotational promises, with fragmentation, fantasy projection, and substitution culminating in the brutal reimagining of this theme at the end of development space, another choice in dialogue with Mahler I/iv's *Durchbruch*.

Generically, Mahler I/iv and Shostakovich IV/i engage with expectations of the exposition's thematic retracking in recapitulation space, a process framed by Sonata Theory as rotation. Considered a foundational principle, rotational structures "extend through musical space by recycling one or more times – with appropriate alterations and

adjustments – a referential thematic pattern established as an *ordered succession* at the piece's outset" [emphasis added] (Hepokoski, Darcy 2006: 611).¹⁰ Typical to sonata-form movements is a layout wherein three large-scale rotations correspond to the exposition, development, and recapitulation, with the exposition's P/S thematic layout serving as a referential rotation for the remainder of the movement.

Alterations to sonata-form rotational structures may range from straightforward transpositions to large-scale deformations and even wholesale recomposition. Such a recomposition or substitution is referred to by Hepokoski and Darcy as thematic "overwriting." Heard commonly as episodic displacement of primary-theme material at the beginning of development space, writing over a theme involves substituting new material for an expected, rotationally ordered thematic return while otherwise maintaining the rotational ordering of the referential (typically expository) rotation. These substitutions may be a predictable element of an otherwise rotational episodic development section, or appear as a driving force behind thematic dramas wherein a major expected return – e.g., the return of the primary theme at the moment of recapitulation – may be written over (Hepokoski, Darcy 2006: 212–215).¹¹ This exceptional choice significantly impacts the sense of return generically expected at recapitulation space.

The thematic quotation outlined earlier – Shostakovich's "secondary" theme as a quotation of the *Durchbruch* of Mahler I/iv – may be coupled with formal and thematic correspondences to Mahler I/iv (viz. the gradual emergence of an additional thematic module during developmental space, the return of the secondary theme in the tonic before the primary theme, and the replacement of the exposition's secondary thematic statement with a development-space theme) to create a formal correlation between placement and function. The "secondary" theme of m. 263 in Shostakovich IV/i may thus be reinterpreted, in the light of its Mahlerian associations, as a compensatory *Durchbruch* theme, a fantasy version of

¹⁰ Rotational deformations are examined in depth in Darcy 1997.

¹¹ Overwriting a problematic or flawed theme in Mahler's symphonic works is addressed in Darcy 2001.

Figure 4. Mahler, Symphony No. 1, iv, large-scale overview.Large-scale rotations: **Rotation 1 - Exposition**

Zone:	Introduction	P				MC			
Subrotation:		SR1		SR2		TR?	SR3		
Measure #:	1	55		74		107	112		144
Thematic modules:		p1.1 p1.2 p1.3		p1.1 p1.2 p1.1 p1.4		Coda?	p1.1 p1.2 p1.3		MC (coda as fill)
f:	V	i	V	i	V	i	V	i	i:PAC

Large-scale rotations: **Rotation 1, cont.**

Zone:	S	EEC	C
Subrotation:			
Measure #:	176	222	222
Thematic modules:			
f:	VI (D-flat)	EEC	VI

Large-scale rotations: **Rotation 2 - Development**

Zone:	Flashback 1	Development pt 1			Preview 1		
Subrotation:		intro	SR1	SR2	TR	breakthrough	prep
Measure #:	238	254	262	274	290	297	306
Thematic modules:	I/i	intro	P+S	P+S			
f:	IV	g			C (quasi-tonicized)		
Formal function:	(Interruption-flashback)	Development			(Interruption-Preview)		

Large-scale rotations: **Rotation 2, cont.**

Large-scale rotations: Rotation 2, cont.								
Zone: Development pt. 2					Preview 2			
Subrotation:	SR1	SR2			BT	prep	choral	coda
Measure #:	317	327	337		370	386	389	413
Thematic modules:			intro, SR1, SR2				a a b a' b a'	
f:	c: i		V		C-D		D	
Formal function:	Development				(Interruption-Preview)			

Large-scale rotations: **Rotation 2, cont.****Rotation 3 - Recapitulation/Breakthrough**

Zone:	Flashback 2	Retrans.	P	Breakthrough			
Subrotation:			P	BT	prep	chorale	coda
Measure #:	429	458	533	631	646	649	696
Thematic modules:	I/I, S	S					
f:	d-c	F:V	i	D(!)	D	D	D
Formal function:	(Interruption-flashback)						

what the fragmented statements in mm. 47–159 should have been.

Comparison with the overall formal layout of Mahler I/iv highlights the thematic and rotational connections that underpin this recontextualization. Shown in Figure 4, Mahler I/iv's development features continuing P/S rotational cycles and departures from development space altogether, looking backward and forward with interruptions, flashbacks, quotations, and previews of break-

through material to come.¹² In a process similar to Shostakovich IV/i, the secondary theme of Mahler I/iv emerges at the end of the Flashback 2 section and is further developed throughout the retransition. This appearance of the secondary theme is comparable in length to its original expository statement. Furthermore, it is in *F major*, the major-mode inflection of the movement's global tonic, blurring the tonal lines between development and recapitulation spaces. This F-major return is

¹² The structural analysis and thematic labels referred to here are from unpublished analytical sketches created by Warren Darcy from 2005. I created the graphs using Darcy's proposed layout and analytical terminology; the hermeneutic analysis is my own. Seth Monahan outlines this general partitioning of the movement similarly, including dividing the development into flashback, preview/premonition, and *Durchbruch* spaces. See Monahan 2011: 47.

Figure 5. Shostakovich, Symphony No. 4, i, large-scale thematic/rotational overview.

Exposition					Development		
Rotation	Rotation 1				Rotation 2	Rotation 3	Rotation 4
m.#	1	18	31	32	160	233	252
Theme	P	TR	MC	S-theme fragments	P+S, P TR, S fragments	P S fragments	TR, S, S+P

Development, continued					Tonal Resolution (Crux)	Coda	
Rotation	Rotation 5		Rotation 6		Rotation 7	Rotation 8	Rotation 9
m.#	477		717	787	906	1006	
Theme	P(fifth too low)	fugue	P + TR	S, S, S + Mahler,	P(introductory) + S-telos	P TR	P+Mahler
	P+S-var, P/TR	no S!		retransition	followed by S fragments		

further complicated by its placement over a pedal C-natural in the bass, creating a sustained cadential 6/4 harmony that destabilizes this tonic return of the secondary theme.

The subsequent tonic return of Mahler I/iv's primary theme at m. 533 then attempts to bring about a standard recapitulatory rotation. Rather than a full return including the secondary theme in the tonic, the breakthrough theme interjects directly after the primary theme and produces the movement's jubilant *telos*. This breakthrough and its succeeding thematic modules appear in the order first featured during the development and completely displace the expected secondary-theme recapitulatory appearance normative to a sonata recapitulation.

Figure 5 shows the overall thematic layout of Shostakovich IV/i. The arrival of the "lyrical" bassoon theme in m. 263 – set apart with dreamlike instrumentation after a crisis point and emerging from an F-minor Mahler I/iv tonal landscape – may be reconsidered as presenting not merely a developing variant of the previously troubled lyrical theme attempt, but also a transformed, subdued, and fantasy-like version of the *Durchbruch* theme from the development of Mahler I/iv. The theme in m. 263 attempts a rescue of the problematic S-theme by creating its own fantastic "breakthrough" version, coopting the triumphant, bombastic brass theme from Mahler I/iv as a means of redemption. The theme's eventual

telos appearance at m. 906, as a displacement of the primary theme at the moment of return to tonic, then may be considered as strongly in dialogue with the analogous tonic statement of the secondary theme and subsequent *telos* statement of the *Durchbruch* during the recapitulation space in Mahler I/iv.

Furthermore, the recomposition of the original S-theme fragments can be recontextualized as part of a larger pattern of substitution and overwriting resulting from the unsatisfactory status of the S-fragments in mm. 47–159. During subsequent rotations, additional attempts to address the difficulties of the initial presentation result in continued fragmentation, as heard throughout mm. 160–232. Still consistently paired with Mahler quotations, the lyrical, *Durchbruch* version in m. 263, though quoting Mahler's successful breakthrough, is troubled by its dreamlike instrumentation; the tragic, then sardonic recasting of Mahler's triumph eventually gives way to ironic polka and waltz textures in a return to development-space reality.

The next substantial rotational invitation to S-theme material at m. 580 supplants an expected secondary theme with a frantic four-voice fugal string passage in mm. 580–716. After a waltz-like version at m. 854 is mired in the static texture of Mahler I/i, the theme's C-minor *telos* version emerges at m. 906 as victorious, yet brutalized by the oppressive primary-theme texture and minor-

mode presentation. No longer lyrical, the “triumphal” version uses the thematic and formal roadmap of Mahler I/iv, paired with the rhetoric of its own militaristic opening, to shore up the movement’s foundering thematic structure, which endangers both the execution of the overarching sonata form trajectory and the movement’s driving, relentless, almost menacing musical energy.

Form versus (Mahlerian) Content

In light of the Mahlerian quotations and correspondences outlined here, where does this reconsideration position what is considered by many scholars to be the “real” arrival of S in m. 263? Certainly the S-theme presented at m. 263 is what is commonly considered rhetorically, thematically, and formally necessary to cement an unequivocal secondary-theme zone; thus, the later statement seems to compensate for the failures of the earlier statement. In this light, considerations of the S-theme fragments as a failed or aborted attempt that is addressed by the later, more cohesive statement beginning in m. 263 (or even as a variation of the P-theme) are certainly plausible. The bassoon version of the theme is presented in A major, a chromatic variation on the common submediant S-theme default in expositions at the time. Furthermore, the most prominent melodic fragment at m. 47 is not the Mahlerian arpeggios, but rather a descending scale violin melody, arguably that section’s “main” theme.

Conversely, this movement’s saturation with Mahlerian quotations and its obsessive rotational cycles complicate the nature of the secondary theme’s “failed” origins and its role within the overall sonata structure. Whereas the eventual thematic arrival of the secondary theme in the development is indeed the first cohesive appearance of this theme, I contend the rhetorical effects of m. 47’s similarity to a rotationally expected S-theme, its “failure,” and the dramatization of its subsequent statements support a hearing of the first rotation through these thematic modules in mm. 47–159 as corresponding to the expository

rotation of a sonata-form structure. In addition to its contrasting lyrical style, this section features key areas commonly associated with S-themes (the first fragment highlights G minor, v, a common key choice for minor-mode sonata movements, and later features VI, a then-common S-theme option, and the Neapolitan, the S-theme tonality of Shostakovich V/i). Further, the two highlighted Mahlerian fragments from mm. 47–159 eventually displace their scalar-melody counterpart, most prominently at the movement’s recapitulatory return to C minor. This reversal of fortunes serves to further underscore both the importance of these Mahlerian fragments at their first appearance and the meaning behind the rotational retracing of their “failure” to rise above the violin’s melodic hegemony earlier on.

Pauline Fairclough refers to Shostakovich’s Fourth Symphony as a particular manifestation of the Soviet concepts of *syuzhet* versus *fabula*, “plot” versus “story” or form vs. content (Fairclough 2006: 56). In Shostakovich IV/i, each successive rotation engages the dilemma of the initially fragmented secondary theme, and rhetorical drama is built by the consistent thwarting of rotational expectations, as well as constant reminders – engendered through the very same process of rotation – of the formal processes threatened by such thematic failures. Highlighting the connections between this movement and Mahler’s First Symphony and grounding these observations in Sonata Theory allows expressive possibilities that position Shostakovich’s thematic and formal innovations within a constellation of dialogic norms and deformations, adding another layer to the interchange between form and content. This frames the movement so that, as Seth Monahan emphasizes regarding Mahler’s music, “later happenings, down to their smallest inflections might be understood as the consequence of earlier events” (Monahan 2011: 37). Shostakovich’s formal and thematic processes in Symphony No. 4, equally captivating, create a grand formal plot, with a grand story to match.

References

- Adorno**, Theodor W. 1992. *Mahler: A Musical Physiognomy*. Transl. Edmund Jephcott, Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
- Darcy**, Warren 1997. Bruckner's Sonata Deformations. – *Bruckner Studies*. Ed. by Timothy L. Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw, Cambridge / New York / Oakleigh: Cambridge University Press, pp. 256–277.
- Darcy**, Warren 2001. Rotational Form, Teleological Genesis, and Fantasy-Projection in the Slow Movement of Mahler's Sixth Symphony. – *19th-Century Music* 25/1, pp. 49–74.
- Fairclough**, Pauline 2001. Mahler Reconstructed: Sollertinsky and the Soviet Symphony. – *The Musical Quarterly* 85/2, pp. 367–390.
- Fairclough**, Pauline 2006. *A Soviet Credo: Shostakovich's Fourth Symphony*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Gasparov**, Boris 2005. *Five Operas and a Symphony: Word and Music in Russian Culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hepokoski**, James 2002. Beyond the Sonata Principle. – *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 55/1, pp. 91–154.
- Hepokoski**, James 2009. Sonata Theory and Dialogic Form. – *Musical Form, Forms and Formenlehre: Three Methodological Reflections*. William E. Caplin, James Hepokoski, James Webster, ed. by Pieter Bergé, Leuven: Leuven University Press, pp. 71–89.
- Hepokoski**, James, Warren Darcy 1997. The Medial Caesura and Its Role in the Eighteenth-Century Sonata Exposition. – *Music Theory Spectrum* 19/2, pp. 115–154.
- Hepokoski**, James, Warren Darcy 2006. *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late Eighteenth-Century Sonata*. New York [et al.]: Oxford University Press.
- Klein**, Michael L. 2005. *Intertextuality in Western Art Music*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Koball**, Michael 1997. *Pathos und Groteske: Die deutsche Tradition im symphonischen Schaffen von Dmitri Schostakowitsch*. *Studia slavica musicologica* 10, Berlin: Verlag Ernst Kuhn.
- Kopp**, Karen 1990. *Form und Gehalt der Symphonien des Dmitrij Schostakowitsch*. Bonn: Verlag für Systematische Musikwissenschaft.
- Lofthouse**, Charity 2014. *Rotational Form and Sonata-Type Hybridity in the First Movement of Shostakovich's Fourth Symphony*. Ph.D. diss., City University of New York.
- Longman**, Richard M. 1989. *Expression and Structure: Processes of Integration in the Large Scale Instrumental Music of Dimitri Shostakovich*. New York: Garland.
- Monahan**, Seth 2007. 'Inescapable' Coherence and the Failure of the Novel-Symphony in the Finale of Mahler's Sixth. – *19th-Century Music* 31/1, pp. 53–95.
- Monahan**, Seth 2008. *Mahler's Sonata Narratives*. Ph.D. diss., Yale University.
- Monahan**, Seth 2011. Success and Failure in Mahler's Sonata Recapitulations. – *Music Theory Spectrum* 33/1, pp. 37–58.
- Orlov**, Genrikh 1961. *Simfonii Shostakovicha*. Leningrad: Muzgiz.
- Ottaway**, Hugh 1975. Looking Again at Shostakovich 4. – *Tempo* 115, pp. 14–24.
- Ottaway**, Hugh 1978. *Shostakovich Symphonies*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Roseberry**, Eric 1989. *Ideology, Style, Content, and Thematic Process in the Symphonies, Cello Concertos, and String Quartets of Shostakovich*. New York: Garland.
- Sabinina**, Marina 1976. *Shostakovich – simfonist: Dramaturgiya, estetika, stil'*. Moskva: Muzyka.
- Sollertinsky**, Ivan 1932. *Gustav Maler*. Leningrad: Muzgiz.
- Taruskin**, Richard 1997. *Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutical Essays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mahleri tsitaadid, temaatiline dramaturgia ja sonaativorm Šostakoviči neljanda sümfoonia I osas

Charity Lofthouse
(tõlkinud Kerri Kotta)

Dmitri Šostakoviči neljandat sümfooniat (1936), mis ületab helilooja varasemaid sümfooniasid nii pikuselt kui ulatuselt, on peetud tema sümfooniate seas üheks kõige „mahlerlikumaks”. Selle põhjused ulatuvad teose mastaapsusest, orkestratsioonist ja rahvamuusika kasutamisest mahlerlike assotsiatsioonide ja tsitaatideni, mida on teoses läbivalts kasutatud. Lisaks temaatilistele ja harmoonilistele sarnasustele Gustav Mahleri sümfooniatega on kõnealune teos sonaativormi konventsioonidega dialoogis viisil, mis tekitab küsimusi teemade identifitseerimisel ja struktuursel määratlemisel: sümfoonia I osa erinevad käsitlused on selles leidnud peegelpildi, kolmest teemast moodustuvat ekspositsiooni ja isegi sonaativormi kui sellise täielikku eitamist. Eelnevates analüüsides on ühtlasi osutunud probleemiks kõrvalteema täpse asukoha määratlemine, sest see näib erinevates maskeeringutes kummitavat I osa läbivalts.

Käesolevas artiklis pakutakse välja tõlgendus, mis seostab Šostakoviči neljanda sümfoonia I osa mahlerlike tsitaatide ja allusioonidega, temaatilise dramaturgia ning iseloomuliku vormikujundusega. Neljanda sümfoonia temaatilist ja vormilist arengut vaadeldakse ühtlasi Mahleri esimese sümfoonia ja James Hepokoski sonaaditeooria valguses (Hepokoski, Darcy 2006). Kahes sümfoonias kasutatud sarnased tehnikad lubavad väita, et taktis 263 algav „kõrvalteema” on tegelikult modifitseeritud Mahleri tsitaat, mis funktsioneerib katsena kehtestada uut kõrvalteemat, kompenseerimaks sellele eelnevat ja vähearendatud kõrvalteema fragmenti taktides 47–159.

Neljanda sümfoonia I osa esimene Mahleri tsitaat, trioosil põhinev „põrgumotiiv” helilooja esimese sümfoonia IV osast, ilmub taktis 132 pärast vähearendatud kõrvalteema viie meloodilise fragmendi nelja kordust. Järgnevas fagotiteemas (alates taktist 263) ilmuvad kõik need fragmendid koos, olles ühtlasi ühendatud ka „põrgumotiivi” tsitaatidega. Väidan, et mainitud fragmentide hilisemad kordused, mida sageli seostatakse „tegliku” kõrvalteema tulekuga, on hoopis Mahleri esimese sümfoonia IV osa töötluse nn. läbimurdeteema (*Durchbruch*) tsitaadid. Šostakoviči teemat alustav arpedžokäik, teema meloodiline kontuur ja rütm vastab alates taktist 263 Mahleri läbimurdeteemale nii kolmkõnaliselt täidetud ja harmoonia kvinte ühendava oktavikäigu, laadi teist astet rõhutava abihelikäigu kui ka peale arpedžot laadi kolmandale astmele tagasilikumise poolest. Järgmise fraasi meloodiline kontuur on sarnane Mahleri esimese sümfoonia IV osa läbimurdeteemale järgneva koraalteemaga: mõlemad sisaldavad kahte laskuvat kvardimotiivi, mis lõpevad tõusva septimihüppega.

Edasised temaatilised ja tekstuaalsed tsitaadid viitavad Šostakoviči ja Mahleri teoste töötlusosade vormilisele vastavusele. Pärast seda kui fagoti täiendavad läbimurdeteema teostused seotakse Mahleri tsitaatidega taktides 335, 372 ja 428, viitab dramaatiline *stasis* taktis 853 Mahleri esimese sümfoonia I osale (Mahler tsiteerib seda veel IV osa töötluse lõpus). Šostakoviči töötlus jätkub laskuva meloodiaga taktides 864–872, mis peegeldab tõusvat „tagasivaateteemat” Mahleri IV osa töötlusest, ja oktoonilise lõpuosaga taktides 898–906, mis on peaaegu identne Mahleri IV osa töötluses kõlava kõrvalteema materjalil põhineva lõpuosaga. Mainitud vastavuste valguses näib Šostakoviči tsiteerivat Mahleri esimese sümfoonia IV osa neid kohti, mis on omakorda mainitud sümfoonia I osa tsitaadid: võib öelda, et nii Šostakoviči neljanda sümfoonia I osa kui ka Mahleri esimese sümfoonia IV osa põhinevad samal etalonil, Mahleri esimese sümfoonia I osal, peegeldades mainitud eeskuju vormilise ruumi sarnastes punktides.

Temaatilised tsitaadid, läbimurdemotiiviga seonduvad muusikalised sündmused ja vormiline vastavus Šostakoviči neljanda ja Mahleri esimese sümfoonia vahel peegeldavad ühtlasi sonaativormi kontekstis n.-ö. ootuspäraste vormiosade mitterealiseerumise üldisemat ideed. Šostakoviči lüürilist „kõrvalteemat” (takt 263) võib interpreteerida unistava, varasema „luhtunud” kõrvalteemat (taktid 47–159) kompenseeriva variandina või paradisiisnagemusena, mis oleks sellisena pidanud realiseeruma juba mainitud „luhtunud” kõrvalteemas. Mainitud kompenseeriv žest avaldub ühtlasi töötluses kõlavate realiseerumata kõrvalteema arvukate „lubadustena”: killustamine, fantaasiapildid ja temaatilised asendusvõt-

ted kulmineeruvad töötluse lõpus mainitud teema brutaaelses taasilmumises, sarnaselt Mahleri esimese sümfoonia IV osa repriisi algust artikuleerivale läbimurdemotiivile.

Šostakoviči omase temaatilise arenduse seostamine Hepokoski sonaaditeooria ja rotatsioonilise vormi printsiipidega toob nähtavale „luhtunud” kõrvalteema kasutamise temaatilised ja vormilised tagajärjed ning pakub võimalust seostada teos nii vormi kui ka sisu poolest Mahleri esimese sümfooniaga. Kui kõrvalteema lõplik saabumine taktis 263 ka on selle esimene sidus ilmumine, üritab käesolev analüüs demonstreerida rotatsioonilisi seoseid ja sellest tulenevat draamat kõrvalteema mõlema võimaliku variandi vahel. Taktis 263 algab kõrvalteema, mis retooriliselt, temaatiliselt ja vormiliselt oleks sellisel kujul pidanud kõlama juba oma esimesel ilmnemisel. Selle võimaluse mahamängimine hakkab paratamatult rõhutama teema kompenseerivat rolli ning kriipsutab alla nii varasemate kõrvalteema fragmentide rotatsioonilist tähtsust kui ka teekonda teema algsest „luhtumisest” selle retooriliselt markeeritud avaldusteni töötluses ning peaaegu militaarse *telos'*eni, nii pea- kui ka kõrvalteema meloodilise hegmoonia üksteist varjutava kokkulangemiseni mahlerlikus repriisis. Iga järgnev rotatsioon peab taas rinda pistma dilemmaga, mille põhjustajaks oli kõrvalpartii esimene, fragmentaarne algus; retooriline draama ehitub siin rotatsiooniliste ootuste pidevale „nurjumisele”, aga ka rotatsioonilise arengu loogikast tulevale pidevale meenutusele suurematest vormilistest protsessidest, mida kirjeldatud temaatiline lagunemine alati ähvardab. Seega ehitatakse Šostakoviči neljandas sümfoonias üles suur Mahlerile omane vormidraama, mis viimase esimese sümfooniaga ka suuresti haakub.