

SIBELIUS FORUM

Proceedings from
The Second International
Jean Sibelius Conference
Helsinki, 25–29 November, 1995

Edited by
Veijo Murtomäki, Kari Kilpeläinen
and Risto Väisänen

Sibelius Academy
Department of Composition and Music Theory
Helsinki 1998

CONTENTS

<i>Veijo Murtomäki</i> Preface	ix
I Historical and Biographical Studies	
<i>Glenda Dawn Goss (University of Georgia)</i> New Light on Sibelius's Biography	1
<i>Sarah Menin (University of Newcastle upon Tyne)</i> Soap Bubbles Hovering in the Air: Why Jean Might Drink Spring Water with Alvar Not Cocktails with Eliel	8
<i>Erkki Salmenhaara (University of Helsinki)</i> Sibelius's "Imatra Symphony"	15
<i>Erkki Salmenhaara (University of Helsinki)</i> Jean Sibelius and the University of Helsinki	22
<i>George C. Schoolfield (Yale University)</i> Sibelius in Finland-Swedish Literature	27
<i>Eero Tarasti (University of Helsinki)</i> Sibelius and Europe	43
<i>Marc Vignal (Paris)</i> Sibelius dans le XX ^e siècle	52
II Reception, Interpretation and Performance	
<i>Olga Botchkariova (Petrozavodsk)</i> Ce que racontent les <i>Voces intima</i> e. Essai d'interprétation	57
<i>Laura J. Gray (Yale University)</i> "The Symphony in the Mind of God": Sibelius Reception and English Symphonic Theory	62
<i>Matti Huttunen (Sibelius Academy)</i> How Sibelius Became a Classic in Finland	73
<i>Joseph Kon (Petrozavodsk)</i> Poetik der Formel und der Reminiszenz in epischer Symphonik	82
<i>Lorenz Luyken (Gummersbach)</i> Warum ist Sibelius' Musik so schwer verständlich?	87
<i>Maris Männik-Kirme (Tallinn)</i> About Sibelius's Unknown Performances in Tallinn	94
<i>Melinda Scott (USA)</i> Performance and Contextual Issues Within Selected Sibelius Violin and Piano "Salon" Pieces Lecture and Performance	100
<i>Gunnar Sundberg (Stockholm)</i> Sibelius's Poetical Transfiguration in His Music	105

Published by
Sibelius Academy
Department of Composition and Music Theory
P.O. Box 86, FIN-00251 Helsinki, Finland
Tel +358-9-4054 585
Fax +358-9-4054 755

ISBN 952-9658-62-1

© 1998 by the authors and Sibelius Academy

Printed in Finland by

Hakapaino Oy, Helsinki

<i>Eila Tarasti (University of Helsinki)</i> The Impact of Sibelius on the Style of Helvi Leiviskä	108	<i>Tapio Kallio (Sibelius Academy)</i> Metrical Structures in Sibelius's Works	276
<i>Helena Tyrväinen (University of Helsinki)</i> Sibelius at the Paris Universal Exposition of 1900	114	<i>Friedhelm Loesti (Bonn)</i> Die Zehn Klavierstücke op. 58 von Jean Sibelius	282
<i>Risto Väisänen (Sibelius Academy)</i> Problems in Performance Studies of Sibelius's Orchestral Works	129	<i>Ruwim Ostrovsky (Petrozavodsk)</i> Some Remarks on Sibelius's Treatment of Genre and Cycle in His Piano Impromptu Op. 5	293
III Nationalism, Kalevala and Russia		<i>David Pickett (Indiana University)</i> Reflections in a Glass of Pure Spring Water: Sibelius's Sixth Symphony	297
<i>Joseph Kraus (University of Nebraska)</i> The 'Russian' Influence in the First Symphony of Jean Sibelius: Chance Intersection or Profound Integration?	142	<i>Joachim Schwarz (Heidelberg)</i> Structural and Formal Principles in Sibelius's <i>Lemminkäinen</i> Suite	303
<i>Veijo Murtomäki (Sibelius Academy)</i> Russian Influences on Sibelius	153	<i>Marc Vignal (Paris)</i> The Seventh Symphony as a One-Movement Work	311
<i>Leo Normet (Tallinn)</i> The <i>Kalevala</i> as Reflected in the Symphonies of Sibelius	162	<i>Timo Virtanen (Sibelius Academy)</i> <i>Pohjola's Daughter</i> in the Light of Sketch Studies	315
<i>Tina Karina Ramnarine (London)</i> An Encounter with the Other: Sibelius, Folk Music and Nationalism	166		
<i>Maria Roditeleva (Russian History of Arts Institute, St. Petersburg)</i> Jean Sibelius – Seen by Russian Musicians	174		
IV Analytical Studies			
<i>Juhani Alesaro (Sibelius Academy)</i> Sibelius's Op. 75 No. 4 – "Hardly Pianoforte Music At All"?	180		
<i>Irina Baranova (Petrozavodsk)</i> Sibelius's Musical Form as Process and Result	185		
<i>Tatjana Gellis (Petrozavodsk)</i> Klangfarben als Symbol bei Jean Sibelius	190		
<i>Daniel M. Grimley (King's College, Cambridge)</i> <i>Lemminkäinen and the Maidens of Saari</i> , Op. 22/1: Acculturation, Italy and the Midsummer Night	197		
<i>Natalia Grodnizkaja (Petrozavodsk)</i> Shakespeares <i>Sturm</i> in der Musik von Sibelius	208		
<i>James Hepokoski (University of Minnesota)</i> Structural Tensions in Sibelius's Fifth Symphony: Circular Stasis, Linear Progress, and the Problem of 'Traditional' Form	213		
<i>Tim Howell (University of York)</i> Sibelius's <i>Tapiola</i> : Issues of Tonality and Timescale	237		
<i>Timothy L. Jackson (University of Toronto)</i> <i>The Maiden with A Heart of Ice</i> : "Crystallization" and Compositional Genesis in Sibelius's <i>Pohjola's Daughter</i> and Other Works	247		
<i>Nors S. Josephson (Neustadt)</i> Intervallic and Linear Designs in Sibelius's <i>Tapiola</i>	271		

Höhepunkt des fünften Aufzuges gespielt werden muss. In der Ouvertüre, die nach der Entscheidung des Regisseurs die erste Szene des Dramas ersetzt, und die tatsächlich eine dramatische Rolle spielt, beruhigt sich das tobende Element plötzlich, es wird durch eine Musik geändert, die als Bild der Totenstille, des Abgrunds, der Leere empfunden wird. Die Introduction des 5. Aufzugs stellt einen fürchterlichen Abfall, den absoluten Zusammenbruch vor. Nach dieser Musik kann man bestimmen, wie Sibelius Prospero gesehen hat.

Nach Tawaststjernas Meinung kann der Shakespearesche Zauberer mit dem Komponisten identifiziert werden. Damit kann man freilich einverstanden sein, aber mit einer erweiterten Analogie. Hinter der Gestalt des Prospero sehen viele Forscher die Gestalt von Shakespeare selbst. So wird Prospero zum Verbindungsglied zwischen dem großen Dramatiker und dem großen Komponisten erhoben. Diese Parallele dürfte kein Zufall sein, wenn die Syntagmen des Schaffens beider Künstler lyrische Stimmung, epische Grundlage und Dramatik bestimmen.

Structural Tensions in Sibelius's Fifth Symphony: Circular Stasis, Linear Progress, and the Problem of 'Traditional' Form

I

It is well known that Sibelius originally conceived the initial movement of his Fifth Symphony as two separate movements in its first, 1915 version. There it had consisted of a curiously truncated opening movement followed by a complementary scherzo based on the same themes. The version that we commonly hear today – that is, the final, 1919 version (preceded in this respect by a second, 1916 version, which is only partially recoverable) – presents revised forms of these two 'E♭ major' movements but joins them with a climactic bridge that includes a powerful structural downbeat on 'B major' (m. 106, four bars before N). Notwithstanding the final version's closely-knit bar-to-bar coherence and its apparent provision of a 'recapitulation' that may be heard simultaneously as a 'second-movement' scherzo, its overall shape is not easily reducible to the standard sonata-form structural categories, as virtually all analysts have discovered.¹ As one tries to reassess conceptually the 'structural-puzzle' posed by this movement, there seem always to be pieces that do not fit: extra pieces, or pieces that seem to be from an altogether different sort of puzzle. Among the movement's challenging features, at least if we wish to comprehend it under the categories established by traditional *Formenlehre* terminology, are:

1) The simultaneously single- and double-movement function of the whole structure. This ambiguity has led to the much-discussed question of whether the Fifth as a whole is to be understood as being more fundamentally in three movements or four. (Obviously, from contrasting perspectives the piece may be construed as being in either. The perennial question amounts to a debate over the legitimacy – and, conceivably, the utility – of granting either perspective a priority over the other.)

2) Its apparent 'double-exposition,' which, if accepted as such, is an anomaly in Sibelius's works up to this point (as it would also be in most of the symphonic works of others around by the late nineteenth century): as a rule, Sibelius had generally avoided explicit references to expositional repeats in his 'sonata-based' works up to this point. Still,

¹Although many writers have dealt with the Fifth Symphony, the following analyses or summary descriptions of the work may be taken as representative: Tovey (1981: 496–500), who, rather surprisingly, concluded that in the first movement of the Fifth "we ought not to expect the remotest connexion with sonata ways of moving" (p. 498), a view echoed, with some nuances, by Abraham (1947: 28–30) ("Structurally, its opening movement is, at first glance, the most puzzling of all Sibelius's first movements"); Ringbom (1954: 135–40); Parmet (1959: 63–75); Tanzberger (1962: 112–114); Layton (1978); Pike (1979); Tawaststjerna (1978); Simpson (1979: 207–13); Jalas (1988: 77–83, 127); Murtoimäki (1993: 142–74); and Howell (1989: 43–63). Simpson, Tawaststjerna, Howell, and Murtoimäki outdistance their predecessors and provide particularly thoughtful discussions of the piece. For the elaboration of a different view – one that is the basis of much of this essay – see Hepokoski 1993.

we might be tempted to grant this second, or 'counter-exposition' status to mm. 36–71, which follow immediately on the heels of the first and unfold in a thematically parallel manner. The tonal regions visited, however, are unusual: while the first exposition had moved from $E\flat$ to what is usually described (though inadequately) as 'G major', mm. 36–71 begin with this 'G' and cycle back to restate the subsequent ideas and conclusion in the tonic $E\flat$. In short, this presumed second exposition seems to close the tonal argument that expositions are supposed to open. For a few commentators this early 'resolution' of the tonal problematic has been sufficient to deny this second section expositional status at all. Ringbom (1954: 137–8), Parment (1959: 71–2]), and Simpson (1979: 208–09), for example, have argued that it is much less a second exposition than an immediate recapitulation; in this view what follows in mm. 72ff (up to the scherzo) must be interpreted as a coda. But this interpretation may not be embraced without encountering serious problems: it argues on behalf of an extraordinarily ill-proportioned, short-winded 'sonata' structure; and it accounts neither for the 'recapitulatory' quality of the scherzo nor for the broad, single impulse that leads from the movement's opening bars to its actual conclusion much later, at the end of the scherzo.

3) If one accepts the 'double-exposition' view to avoid the discomforts just described, one must then confront the movement's presumed 'development', which would presumably extend from m. 72 up to whichever point we choose to identify as the onset of the 'recapitulation' (see no. 4 below). But strictly speaking, this central section – however we might delimit it – is not particularly developmental in any traditional (that is, *Formenlehre*) textural or harmonic sense.

4) Along the lines of no. 3 above, one must similarly deal with the vexing issue of determining the moment at which the 'recapitulation' begins. But in fact the recapitulatory signs are ambiguous. Does one agree, for example, with Tanzberger (1962: 114) and Jalas (1988: 127) that it begins with the grand fortissimo shift to B major – with the change of the key signature to five sharps and the powerful return of the first theme (m. 106)? But since this thematic return in m. 106 becomes manifestly 'transitional' within only a few measures (preparatory, that is, through its *accelerando* into the *Allegro moderato*), one might hear the recapitulation as starting slightly later, after the music stabilizes into the the B-major 'second-movement' scherzo proper (m. 114): and surely, this does impress the listener as a 'new beginning' of sorts. (With a more nuanced view of the structure, Murtomäki, identifying the whole movement as an example of "fusion form" identifies this as "the beginning of the recapitulation in the form of a scherzo on the 'wrong' level" [1993: 164].)

Or perhaps, on purely tonal grounds, one should locate the recapitulation shortly thereafter, as briefly suggested by Layton (1978: 50), at the point of the return to the tonic $E\flat$, along with the re-establishing of the three-flat signature (m. 158, which Murtomäki calls the 'repetition of the beginning of the recapitulation on the tonic level' [1993: 165]). Or should one agree with Abraham (1947: 30) and Tawaststjerna (1978: 378–379), who would defer the recapitulation to a point far into the scherzo (m. 298, the return, in scherzo guise,

of the 'second theme' of the original exposition)? Or, contrarily, should one be tempted into the compromise recently proposed by Tim Howell, in which the grand sonority of m. 106 initiates a large "counterstatement" to the "statement" that has filled the first 105 bars (itself subdivided into a first and second exposition) – a counterstatement that for the remainder of the movement somehow fuses the functions of development and recapitulation (1989: 47; Ex.14) and thus elides the problem altogether?

The question to be asked of all of these analyses, of course, is: once we have finished with our labeling, what have we gained? Not much, I would suggest, unless the formal categories are harnessed to larger concepts of meaning and purpose. And as one might suspect, the actual problem at hand in the Fifth Symphony lies in our desire for reductive terminology and capsulized descriptions, not in the movement's actual structural processes. What is needed is a careful contextual placing of the architectonic problem that Sibelius was addressing in this work. Unless the structural issue is broadly and persistently historicized, we are likely to err by lurching into irrelevant terminological abstractions.

As an initial step toward such a historicizing, it might be observed that the Fifth Symphony and its immediate predecessors, *The Bard* (1913, rev. 1914), *Luonnotar* (1913), and *Aallottaret* or *The Oceanides* (1914), are among the composer's first major works written not merely in Sibelius's habitual state of *Alleingefühl*, but in painful, post-Fourth-Symphony awareness of now being irrevocably out-of-phase with the most explosive new developments in European music, and, more alarmingly, of the continuing prospect of being marginalized out of the modernist conversation altogether. From Sibelius's point of view, the most galling problem was one of reception. The European public that he had hoped to address (the public concerned with legitimating and institutionalizing 'modernism' in the arts) had repeatedly refused to perceive his more recent symphonic works in categories commensurate with his musical thought. Listeners and critics – with the influential Walter Niemann perhaps first among them – had often collapsed him into a mere 'nationalist,' an epigone of Tchaikovsky and the Russians, the exotic composer of the cold North, and so on (Tawaststjerna-Layton 1986: 138, 160, and *passim*; Hepokoski 1993: Chs. 1–3). Under such categories, all of which had permitted those employing them to consign his music to the periphery, Sibelius's more recent music – puzzling in its acerbic character, markedly strained, and decidedly 'difficult' – was subject not only to be radically misconstrued but also, in practice, to be casually dismissed.

Because of both the exclusionary traditions of 'progressive'-oriented criticism and historiography and the synchronic subtleties of the actual historical situation at hand, this aspect of Sibelius's career has been among the most elusive to grasp. It is true, for instance, that in 1911 both Sibelius and his close friend Axel Carpelan had referred to the newly composed Fourth Symphony as a "protest" against modern tendencies in music (Tawaststjerna-Layton 1986: 172; Hepokoski 1993: 14–15). The protest in question, however, could not have been further from that of the conservative-traditionalist, particularly if we accept Dahlhaus's description of this aesthetic posture as definable by a

lobbying on behalf of "mute submission to the authority of all that used to be" (1981: 67). Rather, the composer had clearly intended the Fourth Symphony to be a viable contender in the ongoing 'modernist' conversation (Dahlhaus 1989: 368; Murtomäki 1993: 85–141). Assuming the guise of aphoristic utterance and extreme formal compression, its "protest", seems to have been launched rather as one of challenge and defiance. It was a protest, on the one hand, against what he was judging to be the expansionism, hypertrophism, and theatrical or sensational musical effects in such composers as Strauss and Mahler, and, on the other, against the often-blinkered institutional networks of support and publicity into which these and other Austro-Germanic composers were connected. From Sibelius's perspective, the Fourth Symphony was to be one of his most uncompromising 'modern-classical' statements: above all, it was to strive for psychological, spiritual, formal – even 'ethical' concentration (Hepokoski 1993, Ch. 1–4). In short, precisely in its "protest" Sibelius could still hope that the Fourth Symphony would be construed as progressive, even 'risky.' On certain fundamental levels it was indeed individualistically in dialogue with what Adorno, no supporter of Sibelius, would later call the "inherent tendency of [the] musical material" (1980: 32–37).

In terms of its initial reception history, however, the Fourth Symphony was a failure. Unwilling sufficiently to scandalize, the most common response that it elicited, with few exceptions, was one of bafflement (Tawaststjerna-Layton 1986: 169–75, 203, 214–15, 233–34, 239–40, etc.). It thus seemed ominously to signal that the gap between Sibelius and his preferred audience had become unbridgeable. This perception of a now-permanent estrangement from the new reception categories of institutional modernism seems to have been the driving force of the remainder of his career, and it was one that would be soon picked up – to the detriment of Sibelius's later reception – by his more emphatically traditionalist Anglo-American champions. Perhaps even more important, his own sense of this estrangement was doubly enhanced by the convulsive stylistic developments that were occurring in European music at about this time.

To cite one example: According to currently available information – and although it seems clear that he was familiar with Schoenberg's music a few years before this – Sibelius's first documentable references to the ideas of Schoenberg date from 8 May 1912, about a year after the premiere of the Fourth Symphony. Although these references were essentially skeptical, it is evident that the composer was troubled by the wave of New Music in general, and eleven days later we find him worrying about the disappointing reception of his symphonies: "How little, infinitely little understanding have my symphonies met with in the world at large!" On the next day, 20 May, his diary entries show an increasing concern about his stature and historical position vis-à-vis contemporary composers. (Some relevant extracts may be found in Tawaststjerna 1971: 290; Tawaststjerna-Layton 1986: 216, 218; Hepokoski 1993, Ch. 2.) Perhaps the most crucial event, however, was his month-long trip to Berlin in early 1914, which brought an encounter with a wide variety of new music (including that of Debussy, Schoenberg, and

others) within the clear context of the Germanic neglect or rejection of his own work. It is here that Sibelius seems to have reconfirmed – once and for all – both that his music was destined to have little impact on the Continent and that the language, style, and characteristic problems of the symphonic tradition (that is, his own tradition) had been arraigned and, in effect, judged obsolete. As Sibelius was later to remark to Karl Ekman, as reported by Parmet (1954: 133): "I wasn't sure whether I should begin the Fifth Symphony or not... In fact I suffered a good deal through my persistence in writing symphonies at a time when practically all composers had gone over to other genres. My obstinacy became a thorn in the flesh to many critics and conductors."

The 'isolated' aspect of Sibelius's work from about *The Oceanides* onward can scarcely be overstressed. He was now obliged to rethink the trajectory of his career, not in terms of his own production aesthetic but rather in those of its de facto reception, and to conclude that in some crucial respects he had failed. For whatever reason, he had not contended adequately within the reception aspects of the sub-institution of pan-European modernist art, and his subsequent career, if it were to be continued at all, would have to be carried on in full awareness of being outside that enclave of privilege. In this post-Fourth-Symphony process of redefining his 'selfhood' as a composer, he now withdrew psychologically from the 'modernist' arena into a sustained, private contemplation of musical problems that the most influential partisans of high modernism no longer considered *au courant*. *The Bard*, *Luonnotar*, *The Oceanides*, and the Fifth Symphony are the initial members of a series of works of private brooding, concerned, among other things, with the mortality of their own obsolescing language and with the near-insolubility of the problems that they set out to address. That the primary audience that they did eventually manage to attract – again, apart from the Scandinavian countries, essentially a traditionalist Anglo-American audience blissfully unaware of the real aesthetic problems that were being faced in the works – only added to the bitterness of the irony. The agonized compositional history of the three versions of the Fifth Symphony – "wrestling with God," Sibelius called it in 1919 (Tawaststjerna 1978: 328) – aptly illustrates the intractability of these problems.

II

As I have suggested elsewhere, among the most important of these problems, within his most immediate tradition, was the near-delegitimizing of several linchpins of the symphonic system (and, equally important, of the liberal-bourgeois social institutions that had sustained it). Called into question on the 'technical' side of things, for example, were such procedures as emphatic cadential resolution, 'teleological' root progressions by fifths, and more or less symmetrical reprises, particularly when coupled with the generic appeal to reified *Formenlehre* structures, however freely treated. More broadly, the new aesthetic challenges extended to the point of questioning the whole compositional enterprise of undertaking an earnest, non-ironized quest for a grand sonority and monumentality that was in some way 'philosophically reflective.' By the 1910s, if not even earlier, all of these things

had to answer to the charges of having declined to the level of clichés – aesthetic defaults or lapses that lowered the tension of progressive musical 'thought.' And yet they were all central to the symphonic process as traditionally conceived: all were genre-defining. Although these problems had certainly occupied Sibelius before, in the post-Fourth-Symphony period they became crises. After the public advent of the New Music, with its more radicalized, dissonant acoustic surface, Sibelius's decision to cling both to an increasingly suspect, endangered triadic language and to the very concepts of 'symphony' and 'symphonic poem' themselves guaranteed his increasing social and aesthetic isolation from the younger, New-Music elite and its aggressive supporters.

In this context of increasing withdrawal from the institutions of continental European musical power, Sibelius, now resigned, undertook a new quest. This was the elemental rethinking of 'form' – and of 'musical sound' itself (*Klang*). This was to be a deep-sinking into the 'pure essences' of motivic and Klang-materials, both of which, as his diaries reveal, he would now regard with a virtually mystical reverence. Consequently, after the Fourth Symphony Sibelius concentrated increasingly on the problem of creating new or ad hoc musical structures that would be supported less by the horizon of expectations provided by the *Formenlehre* tradition than by the idiosyncratic, quasi-intuitive inner logic of the musical materials selected for any given piece. He repeatedly referred to this planned new method of treating the musical materials in his diary entries from April, May, and August 1912, during which time we also find him confronting the challenge of Schoenberg (Tawaststjerna 1978: 54; Tammaro 1982: 139; Hepokoski 1993: Ch. 3). In brief, he now declared that new, idea-adequate structures were realizable only by listening to the inner volition of the musical ideas themselves, by letting them determine their own form. The act of composing was now considered to be that of meditating on these ideas and attending to them as though they were volitional subjects to some extent external to his compositional will.

Sibelius thus found himself moving toward the experimental production of increasingly intuitive or ad hoc forms. I have called these post-Fourth-Symphony structures "content-based forms", and one of their main purposes was to merge traditional symphonic principles with the expressive freedom of the fantasia – particularly, it seems, with that concept of the fantasia that had been envisioned and described by A. B. Marx as the ultimate end-point and final point of liberation for the entire *Formenlehre* system. And in fact, throughout the rest of his compositional career we find Sibelius trying to decide whether to call several of his major compositions – including the Fifth Symphony – 'fantasies' or 'symphonies'. (Hepokoski 1993: 21–23, 39–41, 57.) Still, this merging or intermixture only presented additional compositional challenges. Chief among them was that anything labeled as a 'symphonic poem' or 'symphony' was still to be perceived as in dialogue with the traditions of its genre. For this reason one practical and immediate problem seems to have become: could one write a symphonic movement that, for instance, both minimized cadential language and suppressed the generically obligatory, but aesthetically redundant, reprise, but

one that still conveyed some sense of the resolution of the initial thought? One of Sibelius's first solutions, anticipated in such works as the scherzo of the Fourth Symphony, seems to have been to lop off the reprise entirely or to replace it with an extremely brief coda or mere tonic-gesture.² We find this 'recapitulation-free' strategy, for example, in the unusual first movement of the B^b minor Sonatina for Piano, Op. 67, No. 3 (completed in July 1912, at the height of his intellectual crisis with Schoenberg) and, more elaborately, in the final version of *The Oceanides*.

In both the Sonatina and *The Oceanides* we encounter early instances of Sibelius's content-based forms, and it seems advisable to rely on non-traditional terminology, at least in part, to describe their events. Both seem conceived as what I have termed "rotational" structures, by which I mean a set of cyclings, often varied, through a given musical pattern. Moreover, some of Sibelius's most ambitious rotational forms – which become increasingly important at least from the Third Symphony onward – from the mid-1910s cycle through patterns that subdivide into two tonally and thematically contrasting sections, that is, through patterns that initially suggest those of a sonata-exposition. In some respects, then, the rotational pattern is reducible neither to a mere 'double variation,' for it is constructed in a way that also invites us to hear it as in dialogue with the expectations of a sonata, even though it significantly overrides some of a sonata's most important features. At least in part, therefore, these rotational structures are often also very free sonata deformations.³

The Oceanides (1914), for instance, unfolds as a succession of four events. (Despite Sibelius's title for an early, and differently structured, version of the piece, "Rondo of the Waves", the usual description of the final version of the piece as some sort of a *Formenlehre* rondo is, in my view, both insufficient and highly misleading – as is its usual [mis-]characterization as an 'impressionist' work.)⁴ The first two events comprise a double-rotation through a bipartite 'exposition' (that is, a pattern that seems to invoke the generic gestures of a sonata exposition). Of these two rotations, the second suggests a varied, more intense 'second exposition' (or better, 'complementary rotation') at different pitch levels, spun away from the tonic D. The third event (or freer, 'culminatory rotation' of the

²The aesthetic issue at stake, bluntly put, is this: at the moment of tonal resolution (the moment of a *da capo* or the beginning of the recapitulation within a sonata), the 'progressive' aesthetic thought, which had been gaining in tension – or had been 'in ascent' – up to that point, now loses its *raison d'être* with the attaining of its goal. Subsequently, the reprise or recapitulation threatens to degenerate into a "mere" restatement or a loosely strung-out sequence of variations. To touch upon the moment of resolution thus threatens to disperse the compositional energy and bring the piece either to an abrupt conclusion or into banal redundancy.

³I have introduced the concepts of 'sonata deformation', 'rotation', teleological genesis, and so on, in a number of earlier writings. For more on this terminology, see Hepokoski 1993: "Fiery-Pulsed Libertine," 1992; and "Structure and Program", 1992.

⁴I refer here to the so-called second version of *The Oceanides*, whose structure is markedly different from either the first or the final (third) versions. The manuscript for it, which I have studied and transcribed, is currently housed in the library of Yale University. With regard to the connotations of the word 'rondo', it is also possible at this point Sibelius may have used it loosely to refer to the process that I am referring to as 'rotation'. On some of the flaws of the appeal to 'impressionism', see Hepokoski 1993: 97, n. 11.

materials) continues the ascending tension in a cumulative, developmental process (here a representation of a sea-storm as the sonorous climax of the piece – driving to an emphatic telos perhaps also shot through with manifest sexual implications). The fourth event is perhaps best not considered a separate rotation in its own right: rather, it is a brief coda that reattains the D-major tonic but soon brings the piece to an abrupt close.

In the first movement of the 1915 version of the Fifth Symphony Sibelius experimented with a similar structure. The movement began with a first rotation through a bipartite exposition-pattern usually described as moving from E \flat to G major. This was followed by a second, more developmental rotation through the same pattern: a texturally more active "counter-exposition", which builds tension through increased inner rhythmic motion despite its return to the initial E \flat . (I shall return to this tonal point below.) The second rotation, whose 'developmental' aspect was far clearer in the 1915 than in the 1919 version, then launched a freer section of chromatic ramification and dissolution (event three). This third rotation, though, was not culminating; rather, it was destabilizing, although it did eventually manage to cycle back to, or at least to bring into focus, an E \flat 'tonic' chord, at the touch of which the first movement was immediately liquidated – even more severely than in *The Oceanides*, for here we are not even given a brief coda. Clearly, the original second movement was to provide the missing balance to this perilously attenuated structure, and in fact, although the succeeding scherzo unquestionably faced the danger of redundancy, it is difficult to avoid concluding that even during the early stages of the drafting of the score this scherzo – among Sibelius's first sketch-ideas for the symphony – was to function as the recapitulatory space that would be pointedly lacking in the first movement. (The essential content of the scherzo, that is, seems to have been conceptually prior to the writing of the preceding first movement.)⁵

For the 1916 version – and for the 1919 version, with which we shall be concerned from this point onward – Sibelius, doubtless disturbed by the original structure's asymmetry, bridged it to the second by suppressing its E \flat conclusion and creating an unforeseen move into the powerfully articulated B-major 'breakthrough' (shown in Example 6 below). This 'breakthrough' transforms the symphony's opening, gathers together a renewed strength, and channels itself directly into the recapitulation-scherzo, which now begins in B major before being drawn back into E \flat some forty-five bars later. The pattern provided by the 1916 and 1919 versions is that of the not unfamiliar *Durchbruch* ('breakthrough') sonata deformation, which had been employed, for example, by Strauss in *Don Juan* and *Death and Transfiguration* and by Mahler in a number of his symphonies (Hepokoski 1992; 1993: 6). In a *Durchbruch* sonata deformation a previously unglimped,

⁵This recapitulatory function, obvious enough in the 1919 version, is even more evident in the 1915 version of the scherzo, which opens with a transformation of the material with which the first movement had begun. In other words, Sibelius was proposing to solve the problem of the redundancy of the recapitulation by also giving it a second, 'separate-movement' function. Reductions of extracts of several key passages of the first version of the Fifth Symphony may be found in Tawaststjerna 1978: 142–46 and Hepokoski 1993: Ch. 4. Evidence for the priority of the scherzo in Sibelius's conception of the work may be found in Hepokoski 1993: 34–35.

momentous event (often one, however, with motivic connections to what has preceded) breaks into the fabric on the work's 'musically logical' or immanent integrity. Normally it erupts within a portion of the space traditionally reserved for development – or at the onset of the recapitulation – and thereby renders a default, symmetrical recapitulation inappropriate. A 'breakthrough' is one characteristic, late-symphonic strategy used to justify a radical rethinking of an otherwise conceptually redundant recapitulation.

One advantage of privileging this freer, rotational/sonata-deformation approach to the overall architecture (in addition to profiting from the distance that it gives us from traditional, more rigid symphonic categories), is that it permits us to address other enigmatic features of the movement, particularly that of the so-called 'double-exposition' that recycles back prematurely to the tonic E \flat . The proper way to address this matter, I think, is to call attention once again to the rotational aspect of the form and to emphasize especially the more general feature of contemplative recursion, circularity, or oscillation. Although this feature had certainly been a characteristic trait of Sibelius's style before, it seems to become from about the time of *The Bard*, *Luonnotar*, and *The Oceanides* onward the animating principle of his major orchestral works.⁶ A case may be made, for example, that in the Fifth Symphony – as had been the case, for example, in the extraordinary finale of the Third – Sibelius puts contemplative recursion so emphatically and consistently at its center as deeply to problematize the resulting form. Consequently, despite the Fifth's affirmative character (Sibelius's response, surely, to the troubling reception that the more 'negative' Fourth was receiving), it makes an even more radical break with tradition than had the Fourth.

III

Although space does not permit a full treatment of contemplative recursion in the Fifth Symphony here, we may obtain a sense of what is at issue by glancing at a few examples of characteristic passages of local oscillation, although the principle pervades the piece at deeper levels as well. For instance, in Example 1, we may see that the 1915 version of the piece began with four oscillations between two $\frac{5}{4}$ sonorities, one over the subdominant ('ii $\frac{5}{4}$ ') and one over the mediant ('I $\frac{5}{4}$ ') within the E \flat diatonic collection: these the are generating sonorities of the piece.⁷ The 'subsequent thematic module,' too (mm. 20ff; Example 2a: this and all subsequent examples are drawn from the final version), is made to swirl recursively

⁶Although the technique of 'circular' repetition had unquestionably been evident in his earlier works (as, for example, in *Lemminkäinen's Return*, the second theme of the Second Symphony's finale and the important finale of the Third Symphony), after 1912 Sibelius tipped the balance even further in its direction, thus encouraging it to become a dominating principle and, consequently, allowing it to generate new, rotational forms. One might hear them as 'meditative forms' that are still recognizably symphonic.

⁷I should like to thank the Sibelius family who, through Mr Erkki Virkkunen, granted me permission to reproduce this material, as well as the sketch and autograph-score material found in Example 9. Thanks are also due to Laila Koukku of the Helsinki University Library for assistance with this material.

around the dominant and tonic pitches of 'G-major.' Significantly, the theme's later transformation in the scherzo-recapitulation (mm. 298–323: Example 2b) is expressly associated with harmonic recursion as well: here it appears over six oscillations of the initial theme's 'I \sharp ' and the Neapolitan 'II \flat '⁵. (This transformation thus fuses important aspects of both the first and second thematic modules.)

Example 1: 1915 version, mvmt 1, bars 1–13

Example 2a

Example 2b

Similarly, the closing thematic gesture of the exposition, mm. 31ff (Example 3a) cycles 'gravitationally' around G, while its lower voices sway back and forth through a non-cadential, circular, and purely static voice-exchange, one which also refuses emphatically to confirm the 'G major' implications of that which precedes it. One might also note in passing, as suggested in Example 3b, that the voice-exchange pattern of mm. 31ff already anticipates certain oscillating aspects of the third movement's second theme (Tawaststjerna's "keinuva

teema", "swinging theme" 1978: 368), the goal toward which the entire symphony may be understood to move. (I prefer Axel Carpelan's term "Swan Hymn" as a designation for this finale-theme: see Hepokoski 1993: 35–37.) Examples of such features could be easily multiplied here, but once one recognizes the centrality of 'non-progressive' circularity or recursion (which also informs the tonalities – or better, as will be seen, diatonic collections – visited in the first movement, E^b, G, B, and E^b, obviously based on an interval cycle of major thirds), it becomes clear that the 'double-exposition' cycling back into the tonic expresses that rotational principle on a broader structural level.

Example 3a

Example 3b

Working together with circularity and stasis are Sibelius's characteristic pedal points and the abundance of neighbor-note activity. Chord-to-chord connections within the Fifth Symphony (and particularly within its pre-scherzo portion) are normally made not through propulsive or resolving dominants and tonics. (Again, dominant-tonic progressions are

endangered as clichés by the second decade of the twentieth century.) Rather, the connections are often made through a logic of harmonic 'color-transformation' accomplished by stepwise voice-leading. One of the most frequent methods of achieving this harmonic 'tinting' is to shift freely from a $\frac{3}{4}$ sonority above the bass to various shades of a $\frac{3}{4}$ or $\frac{4}{4}$ sonority or vice-versa. Example 4a, for instance, shows mm. 11–18 of the first movement, in which the previously implied E^b-major tonic is altered first to become an incomplete diminished seventh on E^b (6–43, m. 11 – completed with an a¹ in m. 12 in the manuscript and in the first printed edition of the score, which has been used as the basis for the transcription in Example 4a, although the a¹ does not appear in Paavo Berglund's new edition of the Fifth).⁸ This sonority is then shifted up a half-step with some internal alterations (second half of m. 12, an incomplete diminished seventh over e – or, if one prefers, merely a diminished triad) in order to be tilted, quasi-cadentially with the introduction of a redefining 'root' F#, toward B major (m. 13). Sibelius blurs the 'B major' in m. 13 by refusing to resolve most of the pitches of the preceding dominant seventh chord; and subsequently, in m. 14, he freezes the preceding chord-seventh, e, as a pedal and raises up a step the fifth above the B bass, momentarily producing a # $\frac{4}{4}$ sonority, a foreign 'E' (which also, when referred back to the initial E^b tonic, suggests some of the Neapolitan color to come, as, for example, that found in the 'second thematic module,' shown in Example 2a–b). A similar process follows in mm. 15–17, only this time the 'foreign' sonority generated, in m. 18, is $\frac{3}{4}$ above the bass, a 'G⁶' triad.

Example 4b summarizes the implied color-shifts, not all of which are fully realized as triadic sonorities in the passage itself. This is the technique used to produce the contrasting tonal area of the first exposition, which first appears with the *forzando* string entrance in m. 18. Prior published commentaries have referred to this contrasting area as being in G major, but in fact this key is neither stabilized in root position nor confirmed with a cadence. The second-theme area is therefore better characterized as a prolonged $\frac{3}{4}$ sonority over a bass-B than as 'G major' per se. Indeed, although it obviously shares its diatonic collection, this second-theme area has little to do with 'G major' in any functional sense. The 'tonal area' evoked in this passage is better described as a meditation on, or a circling around and through, a single, prolonged $\frac{3}{4}$ sonority. (Similar situations occur frequently in Sibelius's

⁸To clarify: In the autograph score, currently located at the University of Helsinki Library, and in the first printed edition (Copenhagen: Wilhelm Hansen, 1921) the parallel thirds in the second oboe last throughout the first two beats, thus producing an a on the fifth semiquaver of the second beat: as in Example 4a the unisons begin only with the triplet figure on the third beat of the measure. The same pattern is also found in the clarinets in mm. 14 and 15. Berglund's recent score (Hansen, [1974]) emends these measures in such a way that the parallel thirds in the woodwinds in mm. 12, 14, and 15 are maintained only for the first nine semiquavers in each measure, not through twelve: semiquavers 10 through 12 now appear in unison. Berglund's justification for this as follows: "The composer made some alterations to the music after the first edition was published. . . . [And] later, he asked his son-in-law, Jussi Jalas . . . to make a few additional alterations and these too have been included. . . . The most important differences are to be found on page 5 of the score. The first edition follows the original manuscript but after publication Sibelius changed the second oboe and second clarinet in bars [12, 14, and 15], erasing the last three semiquavers of the second beat (B . A . B), rejoining the stems to the notes of the first oboe and first clarinet. . . ."

music. Consequently, we might be advised to be cautious when referring to its presumed 'keys,' particularly in the middle and later works: such 'keys' might not in fact be fully realized.)

Example 4a

Example 4b

Strong dominants are lacking also at all of the other major points of tonal articulation in the piece. The earlier stages of the move back toward the E^b diatonic collection in the second rotation (or developmental counter-exposition) are shown in Example 5 (mm. 39–51). Having just heard the principal motive 'on G^b' (that is, implying the G-diatonic collection, mm. 36–37; see Example 3a), we encounter it here sequentially 'on C' over the oscillating voice-exchange now increased in speed (mm. 38–40), whereupon by a chromatic inflection of the voice-exchange figure (e is changed to eb) and by the planting of a new bass (mm. 41–42) the motive is sounded 'on B^b.' This could be used as the dominant of E^b but it is not immediately resolved as such. Instead, the motive bobs back up onto C – now a C-minor chord above the B^b pedal (6/4/2, m. 43) – and proceeds sequentially (cyclically) two notches down the circle of fifths: Sibelius's suggestion, obviously, is that of regaining

the desired B^b dominant – the second notch – by means of an applied dominant-seventh chord (m. 44). But instead of recycling directly back onto that B^b chord, in m. 45 he permits the sonority to lapse instead (with lingering traces of the preceding applied dominant-seventh) into the diminished-seventh first heard in m. 11 (cf. Example 4a; as before, not all elements of the chord are always present), and, as in m. 11, the diminished seventh is pushed up a half-step (second half of m. 46; cf. m. 12). There follow several measures of chromatic color-transformations, which pause notably in m. 48 on a 'foreign' $\frac{3}{2}$ above D^b (produced by coloristic shifts above the diminished-seventh's D^b; cf. the production of the 'E' in m. 14, Example 4a). We may also note that these transformations center particularly around the diminished-seventh chord containing the 'lost dominant,' B^b, a pitch retained to in the timpani, perhaps as a reminder of the dominant-function that has now been obscured. Ultimately this diminished-seventh permits the placing of a G in the bass (mm. 50–51), which, following further color-shifts, will eventually stabilize in the second-theme area as the foundation for its defining $\frac{3}{2}$ 'sound-object' (in a manner analagous with the first exposition, more 'E^b6' than 'E^b major').

Example 5

Sibelius treats the remaining two principal tonal articulations of the piece, the fortissimo B major of the *Durchbruch* connecting the two original movements and the return ('resolution?') to E^b, in a similar way. Considered as a whole, the B-major, climactic passage in mm. 106ff (simplified to its essentials in Example 6a) is indeed immediately preceded by its dominant – the G^b chord in the second half of m. 105. But in fact, at the moment of its sounding that G^b chord is not likely impress us as a strong dominant at all. In its immediate context it is more likely to seem, if anything, a major ('modal') subdominant within an only dimly glimpsed D^b ('Dorian') minor. But this tonal center exists only as a transient possibility: merely touched on with the at the downbeat of m. 105, it is preceded by a tonally ambiguous collection of ascending, essentially parallel seventh chords (in various inversions) to which Sibelius has added some pointed melodic dissonances. The underlying chord succession here, without the melodic dissonances (and with a free treatment of the actual voice-leading and doubling patterns), is suggested by the bare, ascending chords in Example 6b. Moreover, this thickly chordal 'sound-sheet lift' seems explicitly to recall the similar – though perhaps even murkier – 'slow-elevation' effect in the

tremolo strings in the first rotation's 'G⁶' passage, mm. 18–27. To reach for a striking metaphor, both passages can affect us as the slow, mysterious rising of a fog- or darkness-curtain – the majestic, yet inscrutable strain, perhaps, of *natura naturans*, through which glimpses of 'comprehensibility' (a clearer potential tonality) occasionally appear at unpredictable intervals; both suggest the struggle required to reconjure up (or recover) the lost normatively diatonic. One might further notice that, in certain hearings of the passage, the D^b suggestion (passed through in $\frac{4}{4}$ position in m. 105) actually prepares the arrival not of the new tonic, B major, but of B major's 'ii' chord, whose 'root' is, enharmonically, C[#]. The tonal ambiguities of the entire passage repay study.

Example 6a

Example 6b

In any event, this bringing forth of what will prove to be a sudden, unforeseen, and extraordinarily potent dominant (m. 105), one reinforced by striking timbres and swelling dynamics – not to mention the illusion of 'modal brightening' that occurs here – is the source of the immense power of the passage, its 'revelatory' effect. Up to the moment of its arrival the B major 'sun' is hidden or veiled behind thick, ambiguous chordal clouds. And, again, the 'B major' thus produced is not one defined by a strong, root-position 'tonic,'

instead Sibelius releases the energy of the prior 'dominant' onto three and one-half oscillations of $6/5/3$ sonorities over the subdominant (ii_2^6), then the mediant (I_3^6) of the B-major diatonic collection. It may also be noted that this passage is a heavily rescored recycling of the opening measures of the 1915 version of the first movement (shown in Example 1), a passage that was considerably altered in the final version. This reinforces its claims to being the beginning of some sort of thematic (but not 'tonal') 'recapitulation', although it might be preferable to describe it – with a less confining 'sonata'-connotation – as the beginning of a new, enhanced 'rotation' of the materials, one that will undergo further developmental rotations in the scherzo to come. (This rotation will also remain in dialogue with certain aspects of the 'recapitulation' principle, one whose parameters [melodic, tonal, etc] are presented here in staggered fashion). The far simpler cycling-back to the E^b collection in mm. 140–64 by chromatic 'slippage' in m. 158 is shown in Example 7.

Example 7

The point of these examples is simply this: at all of the crucial tonal junctures of the piece, Sibelius avoids a strong articulation of dominant to root-position tonic, and he often shies away from even the suggestion of such a progression. It is important to notice, however, that with the onset of the B-major, *Allegro moderato* (ma poco a poco stretto) scherzo (m. 114) – even before Sibelius 'corrects' its key into E^b – the 'banished' language of

cadences begins to return, doubtless admitted here as part of the 'resolution-function' or grounding process of recapitulation. The first two cadences to appear are rather weak, with the third in the upper voice in mm. 118 and 126 (5 and 13 mm. after the beginning of the *Allegro moderato* in m. 114), but, the composer provides us with a more decisive, but still somewhat blurred, cadence in m. 142 (m. 29 of the scherzo – the third measure of Example 7 above) and initiates the unstable passage that will be attracted back into the E^b collection. As I have suggested elsewhere (1993: 68), one might therefore conclude that with the dominant-effect of the earlier, powerful *Durchbruch* passage (Example 6a), although its dominant does not lead to an immediate root-position tonic resolution, Sibelius triggers not only the ensuing recapitulation-scherzo but also makes available once more (albeit on a limited basis) the banished language of cadences, which he will then emphatically reaffirm at the end of the movement. In some respects, then, the first movement as a whole may be heard not only as a carefully phased *accelerando* of rhythmic subdivision, from the initial stillness into the final whirlwind, but also as an inexorable fall from the initially weak, recursive harmonic language into the gravity-forces of the (by 1915) problematized cadential language. This is an end-accented fall that self-destructs (or 'implodes') both at the point of maximal inner motion (the whirlwind) and also at the point of the strongest cadence.

The more general non-availability of cadences, at least up until the scherzo and within extensive stretches of it as well, is forecast in the opening two measures of the final version of the piece (Example 8 provides the first four measures), which, among other things, illustrate how difficult it will be in this piece to state a simple cadence. Here a linear dominant and tonic are provided in the timpani, but no clear dominant chord emerges above the B^b , despite its initial, 'expectant' $\frac{4}{4}$ sonority, nor is the E^b permitted to support a tonic resolution. Sibelius's post-1915 decision to open the work with a two-bar 'misfired' cadence leading to a 'reflective' pause serves at least two harmonic functions: it measures our distance from the lost world of simple dominants and tonics; and it sets into motion the succeeding measures, which are cast in the recursive language of contemplative oscillation, which may be construed as a substitute for the endangered or cliché-ridden cadential language. (A parallel 'misfired' cadence – one that refuses to clarify the vertical sonority over a presumed new 'tonic' – occurs on B in mm. 12–14 and 15–18 [see Example 4a]).

Example 8

Curiously, several earlier versions of these measures exist among the post-1915 sketch and autograph materials for the revision of the Fifth Symphony. To judge from them it would seem that determining these measures' precise content – or the delicacy of their nuances – was among Sibelius's most vexing problems as he revised the work following the 1915 premiere. Examples 9a–c show the relevant portion of three sketches for this opening (all are found on the bifolio identified as A/0335 in Kilpeläinen 1991; in the examples all of the sketches are transposed to the actual sounding pitch level; it is unclear whether the order of writing was 9a–b–c or, possibly, 9a–c–b). None of these first three examples, 9a–c, contain a cadence at all: the 'misfired' quality of the opening, in other words, seems not to have been part of the earliest available sketches for these measures. Example 9a, the least developed, shows a single horn (one presumes), noted without dynamics, leading merely to an 'ii⁶' chord in m. 2 – a chord, we should observe, that is not yet sustained with a fermata. Example 9b is a reduction of the opening of a ten-measure orchestral sketch located directly below that in 9a. It is similarly 'undeveloped': it opens only with a $g-e^b$ dyad in Horns 3 and 4. No underlying timpani part appears in the sketch, and now it brings in the first two horns with the motive that again leads to the 'ii⁶' chord, this time with the crucial fermata above. (There are also numerous changes of mind regarding dynamics on this much-tinkered-with sketch, most of which are not shown in the example.) Still another orchestral sketch on a different leaf of the bifolio, transcribed in Example 9c, provides us with an experiment in substantially different timbres. Here, in a sketch laid out to cover an entire eighteen-stave page (as if Sibelius were beginning to write out a full score), we do encounter the $\frac{4}{4}$ laid out at the opening – only in the cellos, divisi (!) and with a surprising mezzo forte attack with *diminuendo* – above which a single horn enters with the 'bucolic signal', now starting precisely on the second beat of the measure. Here, too, the V–I motion in the timpani is completely lacking – at least it is not entered into this sketch – and once again the goal is the complete 'ii⁶' chord (whose f1 is doubled in the sketch by the entering second violins); horns 2, 3, and 4 also enter at this point to sound the complete chord, which is held by a fermata.

Even by the post-1915 autograph-score stage – and by this point, although we cannot know this for certain, the timpani part was likely now to have been included (the central element of the 'misfired cadence') – these two measures were not yet fixed. Example 9d includes a reconstruction of an earlier (but post-1915) version of the horn parts discernible in the autograph score of the final version (A/0330, Kilpeläinen 1991): at present these horn parts are pasted over with a non-removable revision-slip, but these 'underlying' parts are recoverable by shining a strong light through the paper. In Example 9d (might this recapture the opening of the 1916 version?) notice in particular the lack of the initial $\frac{4}{4}$ (although the passage might have begun with the timpani sounding a B^b on the first beat – the timpani line

is omitted in my transcription),⁹ the simultaneous entry of all four horns on the third beat of the measure, their mezzo forte dynamics (with crescendo – a rich, resonant opening), and the continued retention of the full 'ii⁶' above what may have been the timpani's \ominus on the last beat of m. 2. Finally, Example 9e transcribes a reconstruction taken in part from the paste-over slips, which themselves were later subjected to some erasures and deletions: Example 9e, that is, shows the four horn parts but for horns 3 and 4 takes an early reading on the paste-over slips that was later altered. Here at last the c¹ disappears from the 'ii⁶' chord above the \ominus (not indicated in Ex. 9e); but even at this late stage the initial $\frac{3}{4}$ does not appear until the middle of the first measure – as the four horns enter together, though their entrance has been shifted, once again, to the second third of the second beat. (The next stage of composition was the final one, shown in Example 8.)

Example 9a (Kilpeläinen 1991, A/0335)

Example 9b (Kilpeläinen, A/0335)

Example 9c (Kilpeläinen, A/0335)

⁹The timpani part, of course, is perfectly visible on the first page of the autograph score. What is uncertain is whether it was a late addition to the score – perhaps at a stage later than that represented by the horn parts in Exx. 9d and e.

Example 9d (Autograph score: restoration of early version)

Example 9e (Autograph score: restoration of early version)

IV

To restate in summary: Much of the most characteristic language of the Fifth Symphony's first movement is one of stasis, circularity, and neighbor-note activity. These procedures are fundamentally opposed to 'the principle of teleological progression' that had underpinned the traditional Germanic symphonic repertory (Dahlhaus 1989: 307). Instead of dwelling on the obsolescing fourth- or fifth-dominated language of linear progress, Sibelius first thematizes the difficulties associated with any unreflective embrace of it, then repeatedly privileges static pools of circularity that counter the forward press of time itself on both local and broader levels. The historical roots of such procedures – counter-currents to forward motion – are not difficult to find. They lie in certain repetitive aspects of Bruckner and the Russian symphonists, and, above all, in the "Waldweben"-like 'nature' or 'landscape' music of the nineteenth century – in what Carl Dahlhaus (1989: 307) called 'the sound-sheet, or *Klangfläche*, outwardly static but inwardly in constant motion.' This language, 'riveted to the spot motivically and harmonically,' often strikes one as the "definite negation"

of the character of musical form as a process,' as in certain passages in Beethoven (Sixth Symphony), Wagner, Verdi (*Aida*), and Gounod (*Mireille*)."

But, as has been pointed out by virtually all commentators on Sibelius's music, the principle of developing musical 'process' – the 'profound logic' of motivic and harmonic development, and so on – lies at the heart of his thought. We might thus formulate the central compositional problem that Sibelius came to face. On the one hand, he strove to explore with increasing intensity the language of the static sound sheet – a language whose natural utterance is the non-processual, the static, or the circular. Within any composition conceived in a system that encouraged music's claims to ultimacy or transcendence – the first postulate, of course, of the late-Romantic symphony – this hypnotically cyclical language could be used to suggest (at least to the 'believer' in the system) a contemplation of sound-essences, a heightening or 'discovering' of the ontological presence of the Klang-object itself. Moreover, to judge from the contemporary entries in Sibelius's diary, we would be justified in suggesting that, at least personally, he identified these sound-essences with the essences that he intuited in 'elemental' nature and nature-sounds – swans in graceful flight, cranes, geese, spring sunshine, and so on – particularly as experienced in solitary contemplation.¹⁰ (One might further note, as I have written elsewhere (1993: 27) that this drive toward ontological essences – not to be equated with an interest in mere 'programmatic' representation, metaphor, or allegory – finds a remarkable parallel in the concurrent phenomenology of Husserl and especially, later, that of Heidegger, as found, for example, in the latter's celebrated 1935–36 essay, *Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes* ["The Origin of the Work of Art."]. In Sibelius, however, the urge to uncover phenomenological essences is shot through with a lingering, pan-Romantic nature-mysticism of a distinctly nineteenth-century cast.)

On the other hand, such an embrace of contemplative circularity was to be made emphatically processual. In other words, it was to be conjoined with an 'organicism' that pursues its own sense of linear inevitability, for example, through the logic of motivic change, textural accumulation, emerging harmonic/tonal clarity, and 'revelatory' sonorous arrival. Sibelius retained this developmental procedure, surely, to suggest the impression of an ever-deeper sinking into the phenomenological 'being' of the chosen sound-object (and, one may suppose, into whatever ontological resonances Sibelius might have considered that sound-object to have had in nature itself). Moreover – and most problematically – this entire process was also to be made to engage in a dialogue with traditional generic

¹⁰See especially the diary entries from 18 to 22 April 1915, most notably that of 21 April 1915: 'Today at ten to eleven I saw 16 swans. One of my greatest experiences! Lord God, that beauty! They circled over me for a long time. Disappeared into the solar haze like a gleaming, silver ribbon. Their call the same woodwind type as that of cranes, but without tremolo. The swan-call closer to the trumpet, although it's obviously a sarrusophone sound. A low[-pitched] refrain reminiscent of a small child crying. Nature mysticism and life's Angst! The Fifth Symphony's finale-theme: [at this point Sibelius wrote down in musical notation a version of the 'Swan Hymn' or 'Swinging Theme'] Legato in the trumpets!! . . . That this should have happened to me, who have so long been the outsider. Have thus been in the sanctuary today, 21 April 1915.' (Tawaststjerna 1978: 103; Tammaro 1982: 156–57; trans. Hepokoski 1993: 36). Cf. the similar, later diary entries, surrounding the cited passages.

structures: the 'resolving,' teleological structures, associated with the symphony and the symphonic poem, that, by 1914, were being eclipsed by new problems and new currents in music.

Finally these considerations suggest that by the time of the Fifth Symphony two basic tendencies within Sibelius's compositional style had begun to pull so aggressively in opposing directions that any resolution of them became extraordinarily difficult. The first was his obsession with the static-contemplative and its corresponding language of circularity and recursion. The second was his traditional concern for both linear-classical' and developmental-teleological structures. Charting the profound tensions between the opposing tendencies is another way of approaching the 'new form' of the Fifth Symphony's first movement and the processes that generate the symphony as a whole. In that work a meditative process whose character is concentric, centripetal, or, better, 'vertical' – a sinking into ontological essences – was to be projected onto a 'horizontal' axis, that is, onto a linear, expansive 'real-time' dialogue with recognizably symphonic conventions.

Written between 1914 and 1919, the Fifth Symphony shows that at that time Sibelius still considered solutions to this dilemma possible. For all of its anguished, non-normative structures, the symphony is still one with generic traditions very much on its mind. But in subsequent, post-Fifth-Symphony years his concerns seem to have become even more contemplative, more circular, more 'vertical' – in short, less compatible with the linear symphonic tradition. As they did, they gave rise to proportionally graver dangers. For example, one extreme consequence of exploring this meditative verticality (or ontological circularity) could be the centripetal collapsing of the musical ideas into themselves in the manner of a 'black hole' – the inability to project the vertical idea into the horizontal time within which real composition needed to unfold.

The enormous difficulties that Sibelius encountered in composing major works during the final period of his compositional career may well stem, at least in part, from the nearly insurmountable problem of trying to unite fundamentally opposed conceptions of the musical process. And, once again, all of this was to be carried out in a musical world – now, after the Fifth Symphony, the neoclassical and chamber-music oriented 1920s – whose leading figures no longer saw these 'symphonic' problems as relevant. Considerations along these lines might help us to understand certain aesthetic/technical features of Sibelius's growing compositional despair, along with the eventual extinction of his will to compose.

Bibliography

- Abraham, Gerald. 'The Symphonies', in *The Music of Sibelius*, ed. Gerald Abraham (New York: Norton, 1947), pp. 14–37.
- Adorno, Theodor W. *Philosophy of Modern Music*, trans. Anne G. Mitchell and Wesley V. Blomster (New York: Seabury, 1980).

- Berglund, Paavo. 'Preface' to [orchestral score] *Sibelius, Symphony No. 5 for Orchestra, Op. 82* [revised edition, No. 2086] (Copenhagen: Wilhelm Hansen, 1974).
- Dahlhaus, Carl. *Foundations of Music History*, trans. J. B. Robinson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).
- Dahlhaus, Carl. *Nineteenth-Century Music*, trans. J. Bradford Robinson (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).
- Hepokoski, James. Fiery-Pulsed Libertine or Domestic Hero?: Strauss's *Don Juan* Reinvestigated, *Richard Strauss: New Perspectives on the Composer and His Work*, ed. Bryan Gilliam (Durham: Duke University Press, 1992), pp. 135–175.
- Hepokoski, James. *Sibelius: Symphony No. 5* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- Hepokoski, James. Structure and Program in *Macbeth*: A Proposed Reading of Strauss's First Symphonic Poem, *Richard Strauss and His World*, ed. Bryan Gilliam (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), pp. 67–89.
- Howell, Tim. *Jean Sibelius: Progressive Techniques in the Symphonies and Tone Poems* (New York and London: Garland, 1989).
- Jalas, Jussi. *Kirjoituksia Sibeliuksen sinfoniaista: Sinfonian eettinen pakko* (Helsinki: Fazer, 1988).
- Kilpeläinen, Kari. *The Jean Sibelius Musical Manuscripts at Helsinki University Library: A Complete Catalogue* (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1991).
- Layton, Robert. *Sibelius*, revised edition (London: Dent, 1978).
- Murtomäki, Veijo. *Symphonic Unity: The Development of Formal Thinking in the Symphonies of Sibelius*. (Studia Musicologica Universitatis Helsingiensis, 5, Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Dept. of Musicology, 1993).
- Parmet, Simon. *The Symphonies of Sibelius: A Study in Musical Appreciation*, trans. Kingsley A. Hart (London: Cassell, 1959); first publ. 1955 (in Swedish and Finnish).
- Pike, Lionel. Beethoven, *Sibelius and the 'Profound Logic': Studies in Symphonic Analysis* (London: Athlone, 1978).
- Ringbom, Nils-Eric. *Jean Sibelius: A Master and His Work*, trans. G. I. C. de Courcy (Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1954); first publ. 1948 (in Swedish).
- Simpson, Robert. *Carl Nielsen: Symphonist*, revised edition (London: Kahn & Averill, 1979).
- Tammaro, Ferruccio. *Le Sinfonie di Sibelius* (Turin: Giappichelli, 1982).
- Tanzberger, Ernst. *Jean Sibelius: Eine Monographie* (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1962).
- Tawaststjerna, Erik. *Jean Sibelius*, 5 vols. (Helsinki: Otava, 1965–88; vol. 1, rev. 1989) (Trans. into Finnish from the original Swedish by Tuomas Anhava, Raija Mattila, and Erkki Salmehaara).
- Tawaststjerna, Erik. *Sibelius* (slightly abridged trans. of the above – from the original Swedish – by Robert Layton), 3 vols. (London: Faber and Faber, 1976, 1986, 1997).
- Tovey, Sir Donald Francis. [Sibelius:] *Symphony in E Flat Major, No. 5, Op. 82*, in *Symphonies and Other Orchestral Works* [reprint of materials from *Essays in Musical Analysis*] (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

Sibelius's *Tapiola*: Issues of Tonality and Timescale

I

My interest in *Tapiola* is a longstanding one and amounts to something of a fascination for the extremes of expression that are compressed into a single expanse of music. This final tone-poem raises the paradox of time and timelessness in a most acute manner since the vastness of such music, its aural expansiveness, is the direct product of a reductionist philosophy. Somehow, the piece is bigger than the sum of its component parts and although performances may only amount to a mere 15 minutes of clock time, for the listener, this experience is a disproportionately large one. *Tapiola* has been described (by my former supervisor, Arnold Whittall) as "structurally concentrated" and "emotionally paralysing", and whilst there is certainly a degree of structural concentration on my part, it remains to be seen as to whether this generates emotional paralysis for you! In its extreme concentration on a single idea – and I'm referring to the piece now, and not this paper – *Tapiola* encapsulates issues of time and space in its depiction of a frozen landscape. Through the obsessive variation of one pitch collection, the ascending melodic minor scale on B-natural, a unique musical form emerges as the direct product of its inherent compositional potential. By providing differing perspectives on a single construct, Sibelius is able to produce an organic process form, which raises issues about the control of musical time. How we perceive and how we analyse this process are questions that need to be addressed.

To return to my original fascination with *Tapiola* in fact forces me back some 15 years to the completion of a Masters' thesis in 1980 where I produced a voice-leading graph of the entire work. This is not a strictly Schenkerian analysis, but uses an adapted form of Salzerian method instead. Examining this graph reveals that it unfolds to some 22 feet of score paper (actually, we're metric in England now – so some 6.71 metres) and, obviously, one possibility today was to take you through this – centimetre-by-centimetre, note-by-note – in a vain attempt to discover the underlying unity behind the pitch organisation of the work. But, to be perfectly honest, this is not a good idea. Indeed, in a piece so directly inspired by the forests of Finland, the English idiom of 'barking up the wrong tree', or that of 'not being able to see the wood for the trees' would best describe the effect of such an approach. Instead, it is time to branch out (if you see what I mean), since we really should keep our feet on the ground (all 22 of them) and metre out the findings of this analysis in an alternative manner; merely discussing a voice-leading graph would seem to be a rather futile process.

However, I am not going to dismiss such work entirely, since the exercise remains of interest in a number of ways. Firstly, it emerged from a view that I still retain – that *Tapiola* is not a tonal piece, in the conventional sense of that term; it simply does not function in