

## From Mosaic Pieces to Large-Scale Patterns: Schenkerian Perspectives on the First Movement of Sibelius's Fifth Symphony and its Genesis

Olli Väisälä

In recent decades, Schenkerian-oriented analysis has emerged as a prominent trend in Sibelius research.<sup>[1]</sup> On the one hand, this is quite natural, since Sibelius never fully broke away from the organizational principles of traditional tonality addressed by the Schenkerian approach. On the other hand, Sibelius's *Satztechnik*, or compositional technique, also contains features removed from the traditional principles of harmony and voice leading. Hence Schenkerian Sibelius analysis is confronted not only with problems concerning the determination of structural hierarchy – which are always present in Schenkerian analysis – but with those concerning the underlying harmonic-contrapuntal syntax.

Previous Schenkerian studies of Sibelius have not usually focused on such problems,<sup>[2]</sup> let alone comprehensively charted them, which, indeed, would be a formidable task. One can hardly hope to find simple general solutions: like some other composers of his generation (e.g. Debussy),<sup>[3]</sup> Sibelius was a composer whose style was not based on uniform *Satztechnik*, but whose technique varied according to his variable expressive ends. In the following, I shall thus not attempt to offer general solutions to problems of Sibelius analysis but to focus on some problems that are pertinent to the first movement of the Fifth Symphony, illustrating both the descriptive power of Schenkerian analysis and some of its limitations. In addition, I shall consider some of the most significant differences between the first 1915 version and the final 1919 version of this Symphony, showing how Schenkerian perspectives help to illuminate some of Sibelius's main concerns in the revision process.

### The Opening: Static Oscillation within a Goal-Oriented Framework

Among the most fundamental norms of traditional harmony and voice leading are those of dissonance treatment. In this respect, the first problem in the Fifth Symphony is posed by its opening E $\flat$  major 6/4 chord. Traditionally, the 6/4 is dissonant by default, so to speak, but it may also be treated as a consonance by relating it with the bass of the corresponding 5/3 or 6/3 chord. For example, the second movement of Beethoven's Seventh Symphony opens with a 6/4 whose consonant status is clarified by the immediately following root-position tonic. Owing to its functional ambiguity, the use of the 6/4 as an opening chord lends itself to raising the listener's curiosity about subsequent events. Sibelius exploited this compositional resource in several works – such as *Finlandia*, *En saga*, the Violin Concerto and *Luonnotar* – subjecting the 6/4 to widely variable treatments. A worthwhile point of comparison for the Fifth Symphony is given by the slow third movement of its predecessor, *Il tempo largo* from the Fourth Symphony. Example 1 shows my Schenkerian interpretation of the opening of this movement. Going through the structural levels from (a) to (g) will demonstrate how the opening eight bars can be derived from a traditional resolution of the cadential 6/4 in the key of A major (whence the music then heads towards the main key of C sharp minor).<sup>[4]</sup> This resolution is subjected to extensive elaboration which, in itself, is a feature with traditional roots: classic solo cadenzas, for example, were customarily based on large interpolations that elaborate the 6/4–5/3 resolution. In *Il tempo largo*, however, Sibelius's elaborations involve radical chromatic transformations and enharmonic relationships, owing to which the musical surface becomes estranged from tradition, locally verging on atonality. Nevertheless, the indicated structure is supported, among other things, by the clear positioning of the structurally supportive elements at the most crucial moments of articulation (note especially the analogy between the A6–8 resolutions going over articulatory breaks). While we shall not go into the details of this example now, it will serve to give an idea of the complexity in which Sibelius was able to accommodate non-traditional elements into a traditional framework such as the V6/4–5/3.

Example 1. Fourth Symphony, III (*Il tempo largo*), structural derivation of bars 1–9.

(a) *antic.* N  
A: V I

(b) Diatonic basic model  
V<sub>4</sub><sup>♯</sup>:  $\frac{3}{3}$  I  
(auxiliary cad.)

(c) Sibelius's chromatic variant  
V<sub>4</sub><sup>♯</sup>:  $\frac{3}{3}$ :  $\frac{3}{3}^{\flat}$  I

(d) *antic.* A6 8  
E G# B $\flat$   
arpegg. of V<sub>3</sub><sup>♯</sup>?

(e) 1 2 3 5 7 8 9  
A6 8 A6 8 A6 8

(f) 1 2 3 5 7 8 9  
V<sub>4</sub><sup>♯</sup>: V<sub>3</sub><sup>♯</sup>:  $\frac{3}{3}$ :  $\frac{3}{3}^{\flat}$  I  
"summary"

(g) A: V<sub>4</sub><sup>♯</sup>:  
Fl. I, Fl. II, Cl., Ve. div., Vc., Cb., Vi. I, VI. II, Corni  
p, pp, f, dim., p, dolce, poco cresc.

The external contrast between the openings of *Il tempo largo* and the Fifth Symphony could hardly be greater. In the Fifth Symphony, the surface is fully diatonic and may at first sight seem rather conventional (Example 2a). However, it is by no means easy to explain the chordal behaviour on the basis of traditional syntactic norms. The opening 6/4 on the dominant is seemingly followed by a II chord above the tonic bass (or II<sub>4</sub>/2), which then alternates, or oscillates, [5] with a I chord for six bars.

Example 2. Fifth Symphony, opening, with alternative interpretations.

(a) Score reduction

(b) First interpretation: II stands for upper voices of V, displaced above I, 7 omitted

(c) Cf. Laufer's sketches

(d) Second interpretation: II<sup>2</sup> in m. 3 connects structurally with II<sup>2</sup> in m. 9, which resolves normally to V<sup>7</sup>

One conceivable way to interpret the opening on the basis on traditional norms has been proposed by Edward Laufer, whose relevant sketches are reproduced in Example 2c (Laufer 1992: Examples 7-1, 7-2, and 7-3). According to Laufer's reading, the opening chord functions basically as a dissonant cadential 6/4, but its resolution 5/3 is omitted, or – to put it more precisely – obscured by two features. First, as shown by slanted lines, the 5/3 is temporally displaced so as to occur above the tonic. Second, the third of the dominant chord, the leading tone (D), is omitted altogether, resulting in the apparent II chord.<sup>[6]</sup> The latter feature is shown by putting the D in parentheses in Example 2b, which is my sketch following Laufer's conception of 6/4 resolution, while interpreting the upper voices somewhat differently. (Since the opening horn signal is framed by the bb–bb' octave, which strongly associates with subsequent woodwind figures, I find it more justified to interpret the  $\hat{5}$  as governing from the outset.)<sup>[7]</sup>

While this reading of 6/4 resolution might seem far-fetched, we should note that it is based on features that are not foreign to Sibelius's style. The question of 6/4 treatment in Sibelius's music is remarkably complex; some additional illustration with related features is shown in Example 3. In these excerpts, the dominant is approached through the characteristically cadential  $\hat{3}-\hat{4}-\hat{5}$  bass-line ascent, which strongly points to the cadential function of the 6/4 above the dominant.<sup>[8]</sup> Example 3a, from the retransition of the Second Symphony, shows a temporal displacement which causes the resolution of the 6/4 to coincide with the tonic bass, a technique originating in Sibelius's predecessors such as Brahms.<sup>[9]</sup> Example 3b, a culminating chord progression from the Fifth Symphony, illustrates – among other aspects of complexity – the omission of the leading tone, which results in an apparent II chord assuming dominant function, or, more precisely, that of VII<sup>o</sup>4/3, as a chord leading to the tonic.<sup>[10]</sup> Finally, the Christmas Song passage in Example 3c combines temporal displacement with the omission of the leading tone, thus offering a straightforward correspondent for just the kind of treatment that Laufer proposed for the opening 6/4 of the Fifth Symphony.

Example 3. Special treatment of the cadential 6/4 in Sibelius (cf. Example 2b–c).

(a) Symphony No. 2, bars 257–262: upper voices of V displaced above I

(b) Symphony No. 5, bars 60–64: II<sup>b</sup> stands for VII<sup>4</sup><sub>3</sub> (7 omitted)  
Simplified score (strings mostly omitted)

(c) Christmas song op. 1/5, mm. 10–12: "II" stands for upper voices of V, displaced above I, 7 omitted; similar to Ex. 2b–c except for the b<sup>6</sup>

While such 6/4 treatment seems thus, in itself, quite plausible in Sibelius, there are other reasons for questioning Laufer's reading, or that in Example 2b. The most important reason concerns the articulatory position of the I chord that supposedly completes the V6/4-5/3-I progression. This is a consideration that has – or at least should have – crucial significance for the determination of Schenkerian hierarchy.<sup>[11]</sup> In the excerpts of Example 3, the I chord clearly marks the phrasal closure, confirming its structural function as a closing tonic. In the opening of the Fifth Symphony, by contrast, the I chord in bar 4 does not close any meaningful articulatory unit but participates in an extended passage of II-I oscillation, in which the II chord appears at both framing points (bars 3 and 9). The II chord is also initially accentuated by dynamics and a fermata (end of bar 2),<sup>[12]</sup> and remains hypermetrically strong throughout. Hence, while the I chord in bar 4 may momentarily suggest a reading such as Laufer's (or Example 2b), it fails to be confirmed as a closing tonic owing to the recurrence of the emphatic II.

A smaller detail in which the excerpts in Example 3 differ from the opening of the Fifth Symphony is the  $\flat\hat{6}$ , which turns the apparent II into a diminished chord in (b) and (c). This is not inconsequential since both the  $\flat\hat{6}-\hat{5}$  semitone and the dissonant sonority intensify the pull of the  $\text{II}^{\flat}$  towards the tonic, rendering it more convincing as a replacement for a V or a VII than the diatonic II in the Fifth Symphony.

Whereas the I chord in bar 4 fails thus to be confirmed as a closing tonic in the harmonic syntax, the accentuated II chord eventually behaves quite according to its traditional syntactic function, as its  $6/5$  form leads and resolves to  $\text{V}^7$  in bar 10. As indicated by the arrow above Example 2a, there is a sense in which the syntax continues from the point where it was left at the beginning of the II–I oscillation – as if this oscillation formed as an extension of the fermata, a contemplative interpolation delaying the syntactically decisive events. Completing the syntax, an authentic cadence leads from the  $\text{V}^7$  to I in bar 11. In this case, the structural status of the closing tonic is amply confirmed by the cadential preparation and by its articulatory position. While the tonic is immediately destabilized by the substitution of a sixth and a flat third for its normal inner voices, this will not suffice to cancel the structural function of the V–I bass motion.<sup>[13]</sup>

These observations suggest an alternative reading for the opening, as sketched in Example 2d. In this reading, the fermata II, prevailing up to the  $\text{II}6/5$  in bar 10, prolongs the surrounding V, and the opening  $6/4$  ultimately resolves regularly to the  $\text{V}^7$  (bar 10). Among features that support this reading, we should note the striking use of the timpani for articulating the bass for both the opening  $6/4$  and the cadential  $\text{V}^7$ , which points to their linkage in a readily perceptible way. Moreover, the unity of the span framed by these chords (bars 1–10) is enhanced by the top voice’s registral process, which starts from the  $\flat\flat-\flat\flat$  frame of the opening horn signal (bars 1–2), proceeds one octave higher above the subsequent II–I alternation (bars 3–9), and reaches its goal through the flute’s  $\flat\flat-\flat\flat$  leap above the cadential dominant (bar 10).

Example 4 illustrates the structural derivation of this reading, neutralizing registral transfers. The underlying framework is an *auxiliary cadence*, in which the  $\text{V}6/4-5/3-\text{I}$  harmonic progression supports neighboring motions around the tones of the tonic triad.<sup>[14]</sup> While the opening  $6/4$  does not establish the tonic harmony, its upper voices anticipate those of the tonic.<sup>[15]</sup> Among other things, this anticipatory relationship helps to illuminate the timpani’s opening  $\text{B}\flat-\text{E}\flat$  interval, which mimics the V–I progression as a ‘misfired cadence’, to use Hepokoski’s (1993: 62–63) expression.<sup>[16]</sup> While the timpani  $\text{E}\flat$  does not establish the tonic harmonically, it represents the tonic as a registally transferred anticipatory upper voice. (This registral transfer can be vividly perceived by focusing on the imitatory relationship between the  $\text{B}\flat-\text{E}\flat$  intervals in the opening horn part and in the timpani; see brackets in Example 4d.)

Example 4. Fifth Symphony, structural derivation of bars 1–11 (cf. Example 2d).

Whereas the tonal framework, the auxiliary cadence, lends itself to a Schenkerian interpretation, the interpolated II–I oscillation, manifesting a less traditional aspect in Sibelius’s *Satztechnik*, illustrates some limitations in the descriptive power of Schenkerian notions. While the II is the governing harmony in bars 3–9, in the sense that it connects with the larger syntax, it is questionable whether we can account for the intervening I chords as generated by the *composing-out* or diminution (figuration) of II, in accordance with basic Schenkerian principles. While it is ‘technically’ possible to identify the I chords as neighbours of II,<sup>[17]</sup> their more obvious function is to refer contemplatively to the tonic – and to the *governing* elements of the larger neighboring figures ( $\text{E}\flat-\text{F}-\text{E}\flat$  and  $\text{B}\flat-\text{C}-\text{B}\flat$ ) – without establishing it structurally.

Hence it seems best to regard the II–I oscillation as an interpolation *outside* the framing tonal syntax, a notion conveyed by the large parentheses in the graphs of Example 2d and 4.[\[18\]](#)

The II–I oscillation and its non-traditional features deserve further attention, especially since it forms a central recurring element in this movement, and also belongs more generally to Sibelius’s vocabulary of chord usage. The excerpt in Example 5, from the development section of the Second Symphony, is in several respects interesting as a point of comparison for the Fifth Symphony. Bars 236–239 show II–I alternation with parallel 6/5 chords, a chord form typical of this usage. In the Fifth Symphony, there are no explicit 6/5 chords prior to bar 10, but, as illustrated by beams in Example 6b, the figuration suggests 6/5s already in bars 3–9. This suggestion is confirmed by later occurrences of the opening subject with explicit 6/5s, such as the *scherzo* variant shown in Example 6d (see also the B major passage in bar 106 ff., Example 8a below). Moreover, as shown in Example 6c, the first version of this Symphony employed explicit 6/5s at the very outset, pointing to their underlying significance for Sibelius’s compositional idea – and opening interesting perspectives on the revision process, which will be taken up presently.

Example 5. ‘II6/5–I6/5’ oscillation in the Second Symphony, bars 236–239.

The musical score for Example 5 consists of two systems. The first system covers bars 236 to 239. The top staff is for Strings (+ fl.), the middle for Winds, and the bottom for Timpani. The key signature is D major. The score shows a transition from a 6/5 chord (II6/5) to an I6/5 chord (I6/5). The strings play a melodic line with a crescendo, while the winds play a rhythmic pattern. The timpani play a pattern of eighth notes. The score is annotated with dynamics like *p*, *mf*, *f*, and *cresc. poco a poco*. Bar numbers 235, 240, and 245 are marked. Chord diagrams are shown below the staff, indicating the II6/5 and I6/5 chords.

The second system covers bars 240 to 245. The top staff is for Strings (+ fl.), the middle for Winds, and the bottom for Timpani. The key signature is D major. The score shows a transition from a 6/5 chord (II6/5) to an I6/5 chord (I6/5). The strings play a melodic line with a crescendo, while the winds play a rhythmic pattern. The timpani play a pattern of eighth notes. The score is annotated with dynamics like *più f*, *f*, *molto cresc.*, and *ff dim. p poco f*. Bar numbers 240 and 245 are marked. Chord diagrams are shown below the staff, indicating the II6/5 and I6/5 chords.

Example 6. ‘II6/5–I6/5’ oscillation in the Fifth Symphony.

(a) Bars 3–6, score reduction

Score reduction for bars 3–6. The top staff shows woodwinds: Flute (ob.), Flute (clarinet), Oboe, and Clarinet. Dynamics include *poco f* and *mf*. The bottom staff shows strings: Flute (ob.), Flute (clarinet), Oboe, Clarinet, and Timpani. The woodwinds play a rhythmic pattern of eighth notes, while the strings provide a harmonic accompaniment.

(b) Figuration suggesting 6/5 chords

Figuration suggesting 6/5 chords. The top staff shows woodwinds: Flute (ob.), Flute (clarinet), Oboe, and Clarinet. Dynamics include *arp.?* and *IN*. The bottom staff shows strings: Flute (ob.), Flute (clarinet), Oboe, Clarinet, and Timpani. The woodwinds play a rhythmic pattern of eighth notes, while the strings provide a harmonic accompaniment.

(c) Original version, opening!

Original version, opening! The top staff shows woodwinds: Flute, Oboe, Flute, and Oboe. Dynamics include *p*. The bottom staff shows strings: Flute (ob.), Flute (clarinet), Oboe, Clarinet, and Timpani. The woodwinds play a rhythmic pattern of eighth notes, while the strings provide a harmonic accompaniment. Chord symbols  $\text{II}_6^5$  and  $\text{I}_6^5$  are indicated below the staff.

(d) Final version, bars 174–189 (strings omitted)

Final version, bars 174–189 (strings omitted). The top staff shows woodwinds: Flute, Oboe, Flute, and Oboe. Dynamics include *p*. The bottom staff shows strings: Flute (ob.), Flute (clarinet), Oboe, Clarinet, and Timpani. The woodwinds play a rhythmic pattern of eighth notes, while the strings provide a harmonic accompaniment. Chord symbols  $\text{II}_6^5$ ,  $\text{I}_6^5$ ,  $\text{V}_2^4$ , and  $\text{I}_6$  are indicated below the staff.

Another noteworthy feature in the excerpt from the Second Symphony (Example 5) is that the  $\text{II}_6^5$ – $\text{I}_6^5$  oscillation is coordinated with the surrounding tonal progression in a way that adumbrates the opening of the Fifth Symphony. In this case, too, a hypermetrically strong  $\text{II}_6^5$  alternates with  $\text{I}_6^5$  before assuming its traditional tonal function as a predominant chord (bars 240–244). However,  $\text{II}_6^5$ – $\text{I}_6^5$  oscillation by no means always relates with such a tonal context in Sibelius's music.<sup>[19]</sup> By itself, this usage contrasts with the tonal tradition with respect to both chord syntax and dissonance treatment, and also with respect to its static and non-hierarchical orientation.

Following Juhani Alesaro's (2008) discussion, the  $\text{II}_6^5$ – $\text{I}_6^5$  oscillation can be identified as a modal rather than tonal usage, characteristic of the Ionian mode in Sibelius. To be sure, this usage is not unrelated with tonal progressions such as  $\text{II}_6^5$ – $\text{V}_4^2$ – $\text{I}^6$  – which Sibelius playfully juxtaposes with the  $\text{II}_6^5$ – $\text{I}_6^5$  combination in bars 174–189 of the Fifth Symphony (Example 6d). As illustrated in Example 7, it is possible to 'derive' the  $\text{II}_6^5$ – $\text{I}_6^5$  oscillation from  $\text{II}_6^5$ – $\text{V}_4^2$ – $\text{I}^6$  in terms of temporal displacements. It would be questionable, however, to infer that the former can be meaningfully analyzed as 'standing for' the latter. The  $\text{II}_6^5$ – $\text{I}_6^5$  alternation assumes independent significance in Sibelius's music and can be readily perceived in its own terms as parallel motion. Moreover, as several of the present Examples (2a, 5, 6d) illustrate, when this usage is combined with tonal idioms, an essential part of its significance resides in the contrast it offers for such idioms.

Example 7. Tonal derivation of 'II<sub>6</sub><sup>5</sup>–I<sub>6</sub><sup>5</sup>' oscillation?

$\text{II}_6^5$   $\text{V}_4^2$   $\text{I}^6$

$\text{II}_6^5$   $\text{I}_6^5$   $\text{II}_6^5$   $\text{I}_6^5$

The opening of the Fifth Symphony can thus be regarded as a prime example of Sibelius's capacity to synthesize contrasting principles of organization. Utilizing twofold treatment of the  $\text{II}_6^5$  chord, Sibelius introduces a static and contemplative modal idea as a window, as it were, within the goal-oriented tonal framework.<sup>[20]</sup> For a glimpse of the wide range of Sibelius's synthetic capacities, it is illustrative to return to Example 1 and compare the opening of the Fifth Symphony to that of *Il tempo largo*, likewise based on the elaboration of the  $\text{V}_6^4$ – $\text{I}_6^5$  framework. As noted above, delaying the  $\text{V}_6^4$ – $\text{I}_6^5$  resolution through extensive elaborations or interpolations is a compositional resource with traditional roots. In these examples, however, Sibelius seizes the traditional resource for cultivating two brands of non-traditionalism: extreme (almost atonal) chromaticism in *Il tempo largo* and non-standard (modal) diatonicism in the Fifth Symphony.

As far as the Fifth Symphony is concerned, there is documentation that the way in which Sibelius created the synthesis was far from instantaneous. As shown in Example 6c, the first version of the symphony started directly from  $\text{II}_6^5$ – $\text{I}_6^5$  oscillation. Originally, there was no  $\text{V}_6^4$  to precede this oscillation, and neither was there any  $\text{V}^7$ – $\text{I}^6$  cadence to follow it. Moreover, a large number of extant sketches testify to Sibelius's struggles in formulating the opening two bars (Hepokoski 1998: 231–233). Sibelius thus created the modal vision first and only later, while revising the symphony, incorporated it within a tonal framework. As the subsequent discussion will confirm, this manifests a very characteristic trend in the revision process. While the first and the final version consist of largely similar surface material, Sibelius attached it much more firmly to tonal goal-oriented frameworks in the final version, thus attaining a more solid sense of larger direction. One might, of course, view this trend as a step away from modernism, but it would be naive to interpret it merely as reactionary or regressive. Through the ingenious synthesis of the traditional and the non-traditional, Sibelius endowed both aspects with fresh and unforeseen significance.

### The 'Breakthrough': Triggering the *Uralmie* Descent

Schenkerian analysis lends itself to describing not only the opening framework but also its relationships with subsequent events. In several respects, the most crucial of such events is the *tutti* and *fortissimo* return of the opening idea in B or C flat major in bar 106 (Example 8a; bars 106–113 correspond with 3–10). According to Hepokoski (1993), this passage brings along a 'breakthrough' deformation of sonata form; it leads to *scherzo* character and to the acceleration that extends up to the conclusion of this movement. It was also a breakthrough for the compositional process, as it afforded Sibelius a magnificently effective way to bridge two movements that were rather clumsily separated in the original version.

Example 8. The return of the opening subject as 'breakthrough'.



(a) Annotated score reduction

The image displays three systems of musical notation with various annotations. The first system (bars 106-111) features a treble clef staff with notes and rests, and a bass clef staff with chords. Annotations include  $G^\# = A^\flat$  and  $F^\# = G^\flat$  with a  $\hat{4}$  and  $\hat{b}3$  above them, and a note  $\hat{b}3$  labeled "[anticipatory announcement]". A dashed line indicates a "fifth-descent from  $G^\#$  to  $C^\#$ ". Dynamics include  $mf$ ,  $f$ ,  $cresc.$ ,  $mp$ ,  $marc.$ , and  $dim.$ . Instrument parts for winds, strings, and woodwinds are indicated. Chord symbols below the staff include  $B = C^\flat: II_2^6$ ,  $(I_2^6)$ ,  $II_2^6$ ,  $I_1^6$ ,  $II_2^6$ ,  $II_2^6$ ,  $V_2^4$ , and  $I^6 (=P)$ . A note "Bass line descends in thirds from E to..." is written below the first system.

The second system (bars 115-129) shows a treble clef staff with notes and rests, and a bass clef staff with chords. Annotations include "tentative design change", "return", "tentative change repeated", and "return and continuation". A note  $\hat{b}3$  is labeled "(4[reminder])". Dynamics include  $f$ ,  $mp$ , and  $p$ . Instrument parts for woodwinds, strings, and (Vc. pizz.) are indicated. Chord symbols below the staff include  $V_2^4$ ,  $I$ ,  $V_2^4$ ,  $I (=P)$ , and  $V_2^6$ .

The third system (bars 135-140) shows a treble clef staff with notes and rests, and a bass clef staff with chords. Annotations include "permanent design change" and a note  $\hat{b}3$ . Dynamics include  $pp$ . Instrument parts for (Cb. pizz. e Fag.) and (Corn) are indicated. Chord symbols below the staff include  $V_2^6$  of VI, "(attempted cadence)  $(II_2^6 V)$ ",  $V_2^6$  of VI, "(actual cadence)  $(II_2^6 V)$ ", and  $I$ . A note "...F\*", which triggers the cadential progression." is written below the staff.

Before further analysis, a remark is needed about enharmonic notation. While most instruments (all except the clarinets, horns, and trumpets) are notated in B major, functionally this passage is in C flat major, relating to the main key as the key of  $bVI$ .<sup>[21]</sup> In the Examples, I use B major notation in Example 8 for easier reading, but switch to C flat major in subsequent examples for showing how the passage relates with the larger context.

The alternating high trumpet tones of the restated opening idea (bars 106–111) are thus, functionally speaking,  $A^\flat$  and  $G^\flat$ , standing for  $\hat{4}$  and  $\hat{b}3$  in the main key. This points to yet another aspect in which this passage brings about a breakthrough: from the Schenkerian perspective, it suggests the beginning of the *Urlinie* descent. Indeed, one can hardly imagine a clearer way to signal that it is time to proceed in the fundamental top-voice line than such a prominent thematic return whose  $\hat{4}$ – $\hat{b}3$  motion establishes a parallelism with the opening  $\hat{5}$ .

Despite the prominence of this  $\hat{4}$ – $\hat{b}3$  alternation, there are reasons to read the first  $F^\#$ / $G^\flat$  (bar 107) not as the actual establishment of the *Urlinie*  $\hat{b}3$  but as an anticipatory announcement of the upcoming event. Just as in the original II–I oscillation, the hypermetrically weak I chords in this B/ $C^\flat$  major (or Ionian) passage – explicitly in 6/5 form in bars 107 and 109 – refer to but fail to establish the local tonic.<sup>[22]</sup> The II–I oscillation (bars 106–111) is followed by a more traditional II $6/5$ –V $4/2$ –I progression (bars 112–113), but the metrically weak I clearly assumes a passing character in a chain of outer-voice tenths, leading to the V $4/3$  in bar 114. This V $4/3$  seems to resolve to the tonic in bar 118 and repeatedly in bar 126, but these tonics are once again attenuated by their hypermetric weakness (within 8-bar units) and – more significantly – by the tentative character of the concomitant design change. While these tonics (bars 118–121 and 126–129) toy with a new *scherzando* variant of the opening motive,<sup>[23]</sup> this variant is more permanently

established in bar 142, where the B or C flat major tonic is also confirmed by an authentic cadence (the first cadence since bar 11). One gets the impression that the event begun in bar 114 is twice taken up (bars 122 and 130) and then brought to completion through the ensuing cadential progression.

All this suggests that the B/C $\flat$  major tonic and the *Urlinie*  $\hat{b}\hat{3}$  it supports are only established by the cadence in bar 142. In the prolongational hierarchy, the preceding I chords are subordinate to the large prolongation of II $\flat$ 6/5, as illustrated by the annotations in Example 8a and more schematically in 8b. As in the opening, however, the Schenkerian hierarchy by no means conveys the whole truth of chord significance. Even though some of the non-structural I chords can be perceived as passing or neighbouring chords, they refer in advance to the upcoming tonic. While such references cross the borders of Schenkerian hierarchy, they help to prepare the structural event, thus reinforcing its experiential effect and, ultimately, that of the most background Schenkerian paradigm, the *Ursatz*. From the compositional perspective, the various surface replications of the  $\hat{4}\text{--}\hat{3}$  motion (apart from bars 106–112, see bars 116–118 in Example 8a) testify to this motion's significance as a crucial impulse for the 'breakthrough'.

Example 9a depicts the *Ursatz* in its entirety. The highest staff indicates thematic and motivic parallelisms that support the  $\hat{5}\text{--}\hat{4}\text{--}\hat{3}$  descent, including features in the *largamente* passage (bars 92–105) that leads to the 'breakthrough'. The 'breakthrough'  $\hat{4}$  holds a parallelistic relationship not only with the opening  $\hat{5}$  but also with its restatement in the *largamente*. Example 9b, which combines musical excerpts on the upper staff with analytical notation on the lower, illustrates the latter parallelism in greater detail, also showing a noteworthy rhythmic feature. The d $\flat$ –e $\flat$ –b $\flat$  figure at the beginning of the *largamente* (bar 93) refers to the opening idea or first theme through its pitches (cf. bar 4) but employs a syncopated rhythm that originates in the second theme (bar 20 ff.). This rhythmic modification is preserved in the 'breakthrough's' c $\flat$ –d $\flat$ –a $\flat$  figure (bar 106), whose primary function is to signal the return of the first theme. [24]

Example 9. *Ursatz* progression, with clarifying thematic-motivic parallelisms.

(a) Musical score showing the *Ursatz* progression. The top staff is annotated with thematic and motivic parallelisms, including the  $\hat{5}\text{--}\hat{4}\text{--}\hat{3}$  descent. Key moments are labeled: "Largamente: see (b)", "Breakthrough", and "New theme marks Urlinie 1". Bar numbers 11, 93, 103, 106, 142, 158, and 218 are marked. The bottom staff shows the harmonic structure with Roman numerals: I, C $\flat$ :II $\flat$  $\frac{6}{5}$ , (V), II $\flat$  $\frac{6}{5}$ , V, I, V, I.

(b) Detailed view of the "Breakthrough!" section. The top staff shows musical excerpts with annotations: "VI. I, II", "Tr. I", and "NB: 1st theme (cf. m. 3) restated with the syncopated rhythm of 2nd theme, confirming the parallelism between bars 93 and 106". The bottom staff shows the harmonic structure: I, V $\frac{3}{4}$ , I $\frac{6}{5}$ , C $\flat$ :II $\flat$  $\frac{6}{5}$  (=V $\frac{3}{4}$  / (=VII $\flat$  $\frac{6}{5}$  / II $\flat$  $\frac{6}{5}$ ), V, II $\flat$  $\frac{6}{5}$ .

In the harmonic structure, the B/C flat major harmony, or  $\flat$ VI, functions as an upper neighbour to the structural dominant (bar 158). The *Ursatz* is completed by a perfect authentic cadence in bar 218, through cadential events that transpose the previous ones from B/C flat to E $\flat$  major. The closure of the *Ursatz* is not the end of the movement, but it is marked by a new trumpet theme (also shown in Example 9a), with whose development the remaining events are largely occupied.

The coordination of the *Ursatz* with thematic aspects of form deviates pervasively from conventional sonata-form models. In the harmonic structure, the decisive departure from the tonic does not occur within the (double) exposition (which closes on I in bars 65–68) or even within the first part of the development (which reestablishes 15/3 in bar 90), but only at the ‘breakthrough’ (bar 106), which thematically signals the beginning of the recapitulation. Whereas these circumstances are, of course, familiar from previous analyses, the closure of the *Ursatz* at the trumpet theme of bar 218 has formal implications that are less evident in previous literature. To be sure, one may question whether it is appropriate to call this structure an *Ursatz*, as a large and significant portion of the movement remains to be heard after its completion. This is partly a question of definition; if this is not an *Ursatz*, then it is an ‘*Ursatz*-like structure’ triggered by the ‘breakthrough’ and reaching its completion at the trumpet theme. In any case, the point identified here as *Ursatz* closure is a crucial harmonic-contrapuntal point of arrival. In fact, the harmonic significance of this moment can be observed even without any Schenkerian orientation, since it is the point in which the tonic harmony returns after the ‘breakthrough’ departure from it.<sup>[25]</sup> Prominent features do, however, support the perception that the primary harmonic-contrapuntal structure is completed here, in accordance with the *Ursatz* analysis. The music remains firmly anchored to the tonic in bars 218–368, with a tonic pedal prevailing in bars 218–271 and 344–368. And while the ensuing rapid chromatic progressions depart from the tonic, culminating eventually at V/V (bar 487) and a brief V with a suspended fourth (bar 497),<sup>[26]</sup> no harmony in this restless stretch of music appears to be established as solidly as in the preceding I–bVI–V–I framework.

The trumpet theme (bar 218) marks not only a point of arrival in the harmonic–contrapuntal organization but a point of departure in the thematic organization: for the most part, the ensuing process of acceleration is based on the development of this theme.<sup>[27]</sup> These considerations suggest that the trumpet theme has more weight in formal articulation than is evident in some previous analyses. For one example, James Hepokoski (1993: 67) identifies the trumpet theme passage as a ‘trio’ or ‘interpolation’ within ‘rotation 4’, a large concluding section that starts from the ‘breakthrough’ and combines features of ‘scherzo’ and ‘recapitulatory space’.<sup>[28]</sup> Reversing this conception, the trumpet theme can be perceived as a crucial juncture, which completes the preceding harmonic-contrapuntal structure and opens the final formal phase, within which the relatively brief recapitulatory reminiscences appear as interpolations. By bringing up this alternative formal view I do not, however, wish to suggest that it invalidates previous conceptions drawing on sonata-form or rotational schemes. While the trumpet theme marks a more significant moment than some analysts have recognized, this does not entirely cancel the connection between the surrounding recapitulatory elements. It is highly characteristic of this movement that different organizational aspects bear different formal implications, which result in less clear-cut formal articulation and thus contribute to the sense of continuity that so strongly characterizes the process of acceleration from the ‘breakthrough’ to the conclusion.<sup>[29]</sup>

For considering the compositional significance of the *Ursatz*, a key observation is that *none of its crucial elements were included in the first version of the first movement*: originally there were no opening establishment of the I and the  $\hat{5}$ , no  $\hat{4}$ – $\hat{3}$  ‘breakthrough’ and no bass arpeggiation (I–V–I). These elements only emerged during Sibelius’s revision of this symphony, which suggests that the *Ursatz* has descriptive power not only for the music as a finished product, but also for the compositional process. It appears that Sibelius’s quest to coordinate the largely non-traditional and static surface materials with a goal-oriented tonal framework also concerned the largest scale organization. Was Sibelius perhaps subliminally yielding to the demands of the *Ursatz* as a prerequisite for ‘masterworks’, in accordance with the dogma that Schenker was to postulate some years after the composition of this symphony?<sup>[30]</sup> Such a claim would be exaggerated. Sibelius employed widely variable compositional principles in his works, including ‘masterworks’, and a Sibelius analyst would do well not to start from the presupposition that a well-articulated *Ursatz* is indispensable for their coherence. But Sibelius was well rooted in tonal tradition and remained able to exploit as compositional resources the tonal archetypes that Schenker described, and – what is most remarkable – to endow them with renewed significance as foils to non-traditional elements.

## The Second Theme: The Characteristic Clash and its Large-Scale Implications

Above I have discussed the coordination of traditional and non-traditional features, and Schenkerian perspectives on the former, as far as that they relate to the opening idea, or the first theme, and its prominent B/Cb major return. For approaching the main contrasting idea, or the second theme, we might first note two prominent aspects of surface relationships between these subjects (more or less familiar from previous analyses). The first is motivic: both themes feature leap-step combinations, in which leaps are originally fourths but are occasionally enlarged to fifths. Hence, for example, the first three tones of the second theme, Ab–Eb–D (bar 20) can be perceived as holding a retrograde relationship with the opening (Bb)–Eb–F–b figure.<sup>[31]</sup> The second relationship is harmonic: as illustrated in Example 10, the second theme also features a II–I combination, but the peacefully contemplative II–I oscillation of the first theme is replaced by a more acute conflict. This is effected by the chromatic, ‘Neapolitan’ inflection of the II and by the

initial introduction of its representants  $A^b$  and  $E^b$ , without harmonic support, as appoggiaturas against the local G major tonic. This yields two biting, or bitter-sweet (*sempre dolce*), half-step dissonances at the beginning of the theme (bar 20), and further dissonances result from the coincidence of their resolutions, G and D, with the accompanying  $VII^{\circ}$  (bar 21).<sup>[32]</sup> As illustrated in Example 10, two of the dissonances,  $\hat{1}-\hat{3}$  and  $\hat{7}-\hat{1}$ , are already implicit in the  $II_6/5-I_6/5$  alternation of the first theme (and become explicit in its later occurrences), but the dissonance is greatly intensified in the second theme.

Example 10. ‘ $II_6/5-I_6/5$ ’ oscillation compared with the second theme.

While the appoggiaturas ( $A^b$  and  $E^b$ ) resolve by step according to traditional principles, their blatantly unprepared introduction is a characteristic surface feature removed from tradition. As if to illustrate this removal, Sibelius next incorporates the A flat and E flat within a more traditional progression as factors of the Neapolitan sixth chord ( $bII$ -passing  $6/4-V-I$  in bars 24–25); see Example 11a–b. One gets the impression that  $A^b$  and  $E^b$  are first introduced so as to clash with the G major and then gradually integrated to it. Also noteworthy is the subtle process of emergence that leads to this clash. The second theme is rhythmically anticipated by the woodwind figures in bars 17–18, above a locally tonicized B or  $C^b$  major ( $C^b$  in functional terms).<sup>[33]</sup> In this harmonic context, the woodwinds’  $D-D\#$  motion at the beginning of bar 18 will be perceived as a resolution of a chromatic appoggiatura:  $D-E^b$  in terms of  $C^b$  major. The surprising string entrance with G major  $6/3$  turns this E flat immediately into a dissonance, compelling it to resolve to D. The subtle rivalry between D and  $E^b/D\#$  continues in the ensuing string chords, whose highest voice echoes the  $D-E^b$  woodwind appoggiatura. While the  $E^b/D\#$  will in this context be readily heard as subordinate to the surrounding G major  $6/3$ s, it helps to sustain the tension associated with this rivalry until the appearance of the second theme proper (bar 20). While this is the moment in which the clash between  $bII$  and  $I$  becomes acute, its influence is thus felt in both preceding and subsequent events. Example 11c is a somewhat provisional sketch, which models the recurring  $E^b-D$  and  $A^b-G$  resolutions in terms of a special kind of unfolding that consists of two overlapping arpeggations ( $E^b-A^b-E^b$  and  $D-G-D$ ), so as to convey the sense in which the tension and resolution are not strictly localized but spread over a larger span.<sup>[34]</sup>

## Example 11. Second theme with analytical sketches

(a) Reduced score of bars 17–26

(b) Analytical interpretation

(c) Bars 18–41 (provisional sketch)

(d) Connection with the opening (mm. 1–41)

S.

The dissonant clash that characterizes the second theme also relates interestingly to the larger structure. The beginning of the second theme (bar 20) associates with the first theme through motive, register, and instrumentation. While the strings establish the G major 6/3 in the low and middle register from bar 18 onwards, the subsequent high-register woodwind entrance (A $\flat$ –E $\flat$ ) may still be heard as referring to the E flat major opening, almost hinting at bitonality for a moment. A particularly striking association connects the registral apex of the opening progression, the b $\flat$  in the first flute in bar 10, with the a $\flat$  in the same instrument in bar 20. This suggests conceiving of the A $\flat$  as a boldly unsupported passing tone between B $\flat$  and G, as sketched in Example 11d. While the connection between the first-theme B $\flat$  and the second-theme A $\flat$  may, of course, appear speculative, it gains some noteworthy corroboration later in the developmental *largamente* passage. As noted above (Example 9b), this passage reestablishes the *Kopfton*  $\hat{5}$  through the D–E $\flat$ –B $\flat$  reference to the first theme (bar 93). This reference is immediately followed by a second-theme fragment, A $\flat$ –E $\flat$ –D, which renders the B $\flat$ –A $\flat$  relationship palpable, as if to confirm the connection that these subjects hold in the composer’s mind – or in the ‘floor of heaven’, to use the Sibelius’s metaphor (which will be quoted below). Example 12a illustrates this relationship, and Example 12b sketches the entire *largamente* section, showing how its initial B $\flat$ –A $\flat$  motion relates with the larger context.<sup>[35]</sup> It appears that the *largamente* reactivates the striving for the  $\hat{5}$ – $\hat{4}$  motion by referring to the themes in which this striving was first manifest, so as to set the stage for the ‘breakthrough’  $\hat{4}$ , which finally fulfills this striving.

Example 12. First-theme and second-theme fragments in the *largamente* section.

(a)

(1st theme) (2nd theme)

4 Fl. I Woodw. 21

92 Strings largamente

col 8 *f* e patetico

90 97

5/5 4/4 5/3 4/4 5/3 4/4 5/3

(b) Voice-leading sketch of bars 90–106 (cf. Example 9b)

90 93 97 101 103 106

5/5 4/4 5/3 4/4 5/3 4/4 5/3 4/4 5/3 4/4 5/3

Breakthrough!

\* Tr., tbn. \* Tr., tbn. reappear

Within the exposition, the notion of a  $B\flat$ – $A\flat$ – $G$  passing motion is buttressed and extended by the subsequent events, which go on to  $F$  in bar 41, accompanied by the main-key dominant. As illustrated in Example 13, the  $G$ – $F$  motion is clearly supported by a parallelism of first-theme fragments played in dialogue by the flute and the trumpet at the beginning of the second part of the double exposition (bars 38–42). The subsequent second-theme statement, in which the  $F\flat$ – $E\flat$  appoggiatura corresponds to the original  $A\flat$ – $G$ , suggests a further continuation to  $E\flat$ . However, since this statement occurs in harmonically and texturally unstable circumstances, this  $E\flat$  has an anticipatory character in relation to the one that closes the double exposition on a more stable  $I^{\flat}$  (end of bar 64; cf. Example 3b).<sup>[36]</sup> All in all, Example 13 illustrates that the entire double exposition displays a  $B\flat$ – $A\flat$ – $G$ – $F$ – $E\flat$  fifth-descent on a  $I$ – $VI_6/1\sharp$ – $V$ – $I^{\flat}$  harmonic framework, an initial *Ursatz*-like structure that precedes the actual *Ursatz* discussed above (Example 9a). The prominent return of the *Kopfton*  $\hat{5}$  at the end of this initial fifth-descent (cf. Example 3b above) contributes to the impression of its preliminary character, as does the use of  $I^{\flat}$  instead of  $I5/3$  at this point.<sup>[37]</sup>

Example 13. Initial fifth-descent and its coordination with the thematic articulation in the double exposition.

First exposition  
First theme

Second theme

(a)

(2) 10 20 30 (tutti)  
Fl. Fl., ob. Ob., cl. Tr. à 3 Timp.  
Corno Corno Fag. Strings

Second exposition  
First theme

(a)

(38) 41  
Fl. Tr. Vle., vc. Fag. Timp.  
simile

Second subject

(a)

(54) 64 (See Ex. 3b)  
Woodw., cor. Strings Tr. à 3  
(etc.)

(b) antic

Just as in the overall organization, Sibelius thus seems to have resorted to a Schenkerian archetype of traditional tonality for coordinating the largely non-traditional local events within the double exposition. As Example 13a illustrates, thematic disposition and parallelisms offer pervasive support for the fifth-descent, testifying to its compositional significance. This initial fifth-descent also relates to observations of compositional process that accord with the trend in Sibelius's revisions described earlier. Even though the first version includes elements corresponding to most of the local events that participate in this descent, the clarity of the large-scale voice leading relies on features that

only emerged during the revision. In particular, the second theme was originally scored for the strings; hence the instrumentation gave no support to the connection between B $\flat$  and A $\flat$ . As for the harmony, the original version not only lacked tonic establishment at the opening but did include a strong tonic at the beginning of the second exposition; removing this tonic enabled Sibelius to unite the two parts of the double exposition into a single harmonic progression.

The recognition of traditional archetypes' pertinence to large-scale organization should not, of course, make us neglect the various non-traditional features of *Satztechnik* on a more local scale. This topic is by no means exhausted by the above discussion of the first-theme and second-theme areas in the first exposition, nor will I attempt to treat it comprehensively here. As an additional example, however, it may be worthwhile to take a glance at the passage that leads from the first to the second theme in the second exposition, or from F to the anticipatory E $\flat$  in the initial fifth-descent (bars 41–58). Example 14 shows my provisional attempt at a Schenkerian sketch of these events. What seems clear is that the V chord (B $\flat$  major) is replaced by a common-tone diminished seventh (bar 47; 49, latter half), which is elaborated by parallel  $\circ 7$ s (bars 50–51) and from which the music finds its way, after the appearance of the G bass, to the I $\flat$ . The motion from V to the diminished seventh leads the top-voice F to F $\flat$ , preparing, in some sense, the F $\flat$  appoggiatura of the second theme (bar 54). However, in other respects the sketch does not seem fully satisfactory; the events leading from the diminished seventh to the I $\flat$  appear problematic from a Schenkerian or from any traditionally based perspective. I will consider here only one problematic element, the G–C $\sharp$  tritone, which first emerges in higher strings (end of bar 49) and then prevails in the low register (double basses and bassoons, bars 52–56). As indicated in Example 14, it is possible to interpret this tritone as being eventually transferred to the high E–G–C $\sharp$  string chord and resolving there to VII $\flat$  (F–A $\flat$ –D), which still prolongs the V above an anticipatory G pedal.<sup>[38]</sup> However, there is not much explicit support for such transference, since the E–G–C $\sharp$  chord does not stand out in any specific way from the series of 6/3 string chords beginning in bar 51 (not shown in Example 14). This observation suggests that the function of the G–C $\sharp$  tritone relies only weakly on traditional dissonance treatment and thus comes close to that of a self-sufficient, or 'emancipated' sonorous element, reflecting general tendencies of early 20th-century modernism.

Example 14. Fifth Symphony, bars 41–58, attempted Schenkerian reading.

The image displays a Schenkerian sketch of the musical passage from Sibelius's Fifth Symphony, bars 41–58. It consists of two systems of staves. The first system covers bars 41 to 54, and the second system covers bars 54 to 58. Circled bar numbers 41, 45, 48, 50, 51, 54, 57, and 58 are placed above the staves. The sketch includes annotations such as '(parallel °7s)', 'second theme', and 'antic.'. A dashed line with a question mark indicates a problematic transition. At the bottom, a Schenkerian reduction shows a V<sup>8-</sup> chord, a (common-tone °7) chord, and an I<sup>6</sup> chord, with an 'antic.' label above the °7 chord.





both the traditional and the non-traditional gained unforeseen significance from their coordination with each other. While Sibelius can be hailed both as an inventor of original non-traditional moments and as one of the last able to exploit traditional archetypes for large-scale organization, his most distinctive achievement in the composition of this movement is to be found in the unique synthesis of these contrasting tendencies.

### Works Cited

Alesaro, Juhani. 2008. 'Sibelius – “a composer made for modes”.' *Musurgia* vol. 15/1–3, 7–16.

Hepokoski, James. 1993. *Sibelius: Symphony No. 5*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hepokoski, James. 1998. 'Structural Tensions in Sibelius's Fifth Symphony: Circular Stasis, Linear Progress, and the Problem of “Traditional” Form.' In *Sibelius Forum* (Proceedings from The Second International Jean Sibelius Conference, Helsinki, 25th–29th November, 1995), eds. Veijo Murtomäki, Kari Kilpeläinen, and Risto Väisänen, 213–236. Helsinki: Sibelius Academy.

Laufer, Edward. 1999. 'On the first movement of Sibelius's Fourth Symphony: a Schenkerian view.' In *Schenker Studies 2*, eds. Carl Schachter and Hedi Siegel, 127–159. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Laufer, Edward. 1992. 'On Sibelius, and the Seventh Symphony in Particular.' A paper presented at the Second International Schenker Symposium, Mannes College of Music, New York, 28th March, 1992.

Laufer, Edward. 2010. 'On the fourth Symphony'. In *Sibelius in the Old and the New World. Aspects of His Music, Its Interpretation and Reception*, eds. Timothy L. Jackson, Veijo Murtomäki, Colin Davis & Timo Virtanen 2010 (= Interdisziplinäre Studien zur Musik, eds. Tomi Mäkelä & Tobias R. Klein, Band 6), 185–198. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang.

Murtomäki, Veijo. 1990. *Sinfoninen ykseys*. Helsinki: Sibelius-Akatemia.

Murtomäki, Veijo. 1993. *Symphonic Unity*, trans. Henry Bacon. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.

Pastille, William. 1979. 'The Development of the *Ursatz* in Schenker's Published Works.' In *Trends in Schenkerian Research*, ed. Allen Cadwallader, 71–86. New York: Schirmer Books.

Ryynänen, Teuvo. 1989. 'The “Domino-principle” in the symphonies of Sibelius.' *Musiikki*, vol. 19/1–4, 208–213.

Schachter, Carl. 1987. 'The Gavotte en Rondeaux from J.S. Bach's Partita in E Major for Unaccompanied Violin.' *Israel Studies in Musicology* vol. 4, 7–26.

Schenker, Heinrich. 1979. *Free Composition*. Trans. Ernst Oster. (German original *Der freie Satz* 1935). New York: Schirmer Books.

Sibelius, Jean 2005. *Dagbok 1909–1944*. Ed. Fabian Dahlström. Helsinki: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland.

Tawastsjerna, Erik. 1978. *Jean Sibelius IV*. Trans. Erkki Salmenhaara. Keuruu: Otava.

Väisälä, Olli. 2006. 'New Theories and Fantasies on the Music of Debussy: Post-Triadic Prolongation in *Ce qu'a vu le vent d'ouest* and Other Examples.' In *Selected Essays from the Third International Schenker Symposium*, ed. Allen Cadwallader, 165–196. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Väisälä, Olli. 2007. 'Harmonia ja äänenkuljetus Jean Sibeliuksen IV sinfonian *Il tempo largo* -osassa.' *Musiikki* vol. 37/1, 3–42.

Väisälä, Olli. 2008. 'The coordination of tonal, modal, and “modernistic” elements in *Il tempo largo* from Sibelius's Fourth Symphony: A Schenkerian view.' *Musurgia* vol. 15/1–3: 141–158.

[1]The most significant pioneers in this orientation are Murtomäki (1990, 1993) and Laufer (1992, 1999). Both Murtomäki (1990, 1993) and Laufer (1992) treat the movement under discussion here, but my analysis differs in numerous respects from theirs.

[2]However, Laufer (1999) discusses at length some ‘typically “Sibelian” techniques’ as based on ‘the bold manner in which Sibelius expanded... harmonic techniques’ such as ‘elision..., oblique relationship... and anticipation’, suggesting thus how some apparently non-traditional features can be interpreted on a traditional basis.

[3]See for example my discussion (Väisälä 2006) of contrasting structural roles for similar harmonic elements in Debussy’s Preludes such as *Ce qu’a vu le vent d’Ouest* and *La fille aux cheveux de lin*.

[4] I discuss this analysis and its justification extensively in Väisälä 2007 and 2008, also comparing it with Edward Laufer’s very different reading (published in Laufer, 2010).

[5]In using the expression ‘oscillation’ for the characteristic II–I alternation, I follow Hepokoski (1993: 68 ff.).

[6]While Laufer’s sketch (Example 2c) states ‘5/3 omitted’, the slanted line between the bass B $\flat$  and the upper-voice F indicates that the 5th is not entirely absent but occurs in a temporally displaced position. (Such slanted lines illustrate the ‘oblique relationship’ mentioned in note 2 above.)

[7]Whereas Laufer shows, after the opening G–F motion, the  $\hat{5}$  as governing from bar 3 onwards (Example 2b), Murtomäki (1993, 146) goes further in emphasizing the role of  $\hat{3}$ , stating that ‘[t]he *Kopftön* of the symphony turns out to be G, the third’, a contention for which I find little justification in the actual music. As regards bars 1–2, the G–F motion is more weakly evident in the actual horn parts than the E $\flat$ –F shown in Example 2b.

[8]Consider, however, the beginning of Romance, Op. 78 No. 2, in which a  $\hat{3}$ – $\hat{4}$ – $\hat{5}$  bass line (a–b $\flat$ –c) leads to a 6/4, which is followed simply by the tonic without any indication of 6/4–5/3 resolution. This raises the question whether the 6/4 should be interpreted as a dissonant cadential 6/4 with omitted resolution (standing for V) or as turning out to be consonant (standing for I) despite the cadential preparation, in which case the progression would be essentially plagal (I–II–I). The latter alternative would seem to be supported by registral features (we can hear a registral uniform  $\hat{3}$ – $\hat{4}$ – $\hat{3}$  [a–b $\flat$ –a] neighbouring figure and a descending a–c–F arpeggiation) and by the general significance of plagal progressions in the Romance (bars 4, 10, etc.).

[9]See, e.g. Brahms’s Piano Sonata, Op. 5, fourth movement, bar 27. As regards Example 3a, the 6/4 might be alternatively interpreted as turning out to be consonant, standing for I (cf. the note on the Romance, Op. 78 No. 2 above). My reading relies on the registral connection between the first half of bar 260 and the second half of bar 261.

[10]As a kind of compensation, the VII $^{\circ}$ 4/3 appears repeatedly in its complete form right after this progression, resolving to I above a pedal G (bars 65–68).

[11]Väisälä 2007 and 2008 contain more extensive discussion of analytical criteria relevant to Schenkerian hierarchy.

[12]For the sake of simplicity, the II is indicated at the downbeat of bar 3 in the analytical graphs of Example 2.

[13]Comparable destabilizing inner-voice replacements occur, for example, in some closing cadences of Bach’s works; see, e.g. Fugue in C $\sharp$  minor from *The Well-Tempered Clavier I*, bar 112.

[14]Whereas these neighbouring motions are clearly manifest in the instrumental parts, the conventional figured-bass symbols 8/6/4–7/5/3 under Examples 2b, 2d, 4b–d are more ‘theoretical’, i.e. not strongly represented in actual part-writing.

[15]For illuminative discussion of auxiliary cadences and their anticipatory implications, see Laufer 1999.

[16]What is lacking in Hepokoski’s description is the connection between the initial ‘misfired cadence’ and the actual cadence in bar 11, in which the timpani reappears.

[17] Alternatively, one might conceive of the F–E<sub>b</sub> alternation as arpeggiation within the prolonged II (II<sub>4</sub>/2 becoming II<sub>6</sub>/5), a conception that might not be implausible in this context, since the E<sub>b</sub>–F interval is strongly accentuated as a verticality by the fermata in bar 2 and since, as illustrated in Example 6b, the F–E<sub>b</sub> motion can be heard as arpeggiation also at the surface in bars 3, 5 etc.

[18] However, parenthetical tonics are not unheard of in Schenkerian analysis of more traditional music either. (See, for example, Schachter's [1987] analysis of Bach's *Gavotte en Rondeau* from Partita III for solo violin, concerning the tonic in bar 66.)

[19] In fact, I am not aware of other examples showing similar coordination. For a very different example, showing the reverse metric circumstances, see Sixth Symphony, first movement, bar 160ff.

[20] In Väisälä 2008: 149–151, I discuss a very different but equally imaginative way of coordinating a static modal window with a goal-oriented tonal framework in *Il tempo largo* from the Fourth Symphony (bars 57–63).

[21] Notational enharmonic changes are obvious in the part-writing of bars 105–106 and 157–158.

[22] Laufer (1992: Example 9-4), however, marks  $\hat{4}$  and  $\hat{3}$  in bars 106–107, reading the latter already as part of the prolongation of the C<sub>b</sub> harmony. (Laufer's sketches do not make it evident whether he considers these  $\hat{4}$  and  $\hat{3}$  as *Urlinie* tones.)

[23] Distinctive features of this variant include the uniform trochaic rhythm and an additional upward leap (e.g. D $\sharp$ –F $\sharp$  in bar 118) in the first bar of a four-bar hypermeasure, preceding those in the four-note opening motif (e.g. F $\sharp$ –B and C $\sharp$ –F $\sharp$  in bars 119–120).

[24] The brackets in Example 9b indicate an extension of this parallelism: the 'breakthrough' C<sub>b</sub>–D<sub>b</sub>–A<sub>b</sub> provides a delayed supplement for the preceding F–C–D<sub>b</sub> figure (bar 104), forming a correspondent for the four-note G–D–E<sub>b</sub>–B<sub>b</sub> figure in bar 93.

[25] While the  $\flat$ VI–V motion (bar 158) is followed by some apparent I chords (e.g. bar 167) before the V–I cadence (bars 217–218), they are clearly unstable. (Interpreting both local details and larger hierarchy in bars 158–218 is by no means straightforward, but it would seem that the I in bar 167 prolongs the cadential 6/4 in bars 158–161.)

[26] This suspension raises questions of resolution that resemble those discussed in connection with the opening 6/4. I would suggest that the suspended E<sub>b</sub> resolves belatedly above the tonic to the D in the A<sub>b</sub>/F–G/E<sub>b</sub>–F/D–G/E<sub>b</sub> parallel-third figure (reiterated in the woodwinds in bars 499–554), which thus represents the V<sup>7</sup> as a triple suspension (D, F and A<sub>b</sub>).

[27] The trumpet theme and its derivatives prevail first in bars 218–273, which is followed by varied reminiscences of the second theme. As early as bar 324, however, material derived from the trumpet theme takes over again. In bars 354–371 and 372–389, a chromatic variant of this theme (heard previously in bar 258 ff.) transforms into rapid crotchet figuration, which prevails until bar 486, in combination with a first-theme fragment in bars 455–462 and with the closing part of the second theme in bars 471–486, which then becomes alone predominant.

[28] Murtomäki (1993: 153ff.) also calls the trumpet theme passage a 'trio'. On the other hand, Tawastsjerna (1978: 59, 359), drawing on Sibelius's sketches, identifies two 'trio themes', the first occurring in bar 114 ff. and the second being the trumpet theme.

[29] Cf. Hepokoski's (1993, 67) related observation: 'The four defining "recapitulatory" features... – theme, tempo, scherzo character, and "tonic colour" – are set into place not simultaneously but one after another. This staggering of the recapitulation signals permits a smooth, transitional gliding into the second portion of the movement and blurs our awareness of where any "recapitulation" might actually begin.' It appears that Hepokoski overlooks one crucial form-defining signal, namely, the reattainment of the tonic harmony (not just 'colour'), which this takes place only at the trumpet theme, after the four features he lists. Consequently, the 'transitional gliding' or 'blurred' formal articulation goes on further than what is evident in Hepokoski's description.

[30] While the clearest postulation of this dogma occurs in Schenker 1979 (published originally in 1935), the notion of *Ursatz* starts to appear in Schenker's writings from 1923 onwards (Pastille 1990: 79).

[31] In bars 25–26 one can almost discern the original four-note motif D–G–A–D, which then reappears at this transpositional level in bar 36.

[32] It is not quite clear whether the D and G in the first half of bar 21 already stand for resolutions or whether they function as passing tones, as shown by lines and arrows in Example 11b. The analogous tones in the first half of bar 25 clearly participate in a passing 6/4.

[33] The connection between bars 18 and 20 (which I regard as beginning the actual second theme) is a fine example of Sibelian *domino* principle (Ryynänen 1989).

[34] Schenker 1979 identifies comparable overlapping unfoldings in Fig. 43c, 4–5.

[35] Interpreting the structural hierarchy in the *largamente* is by no means straightforward. The indicated weight of the events in bar 103 (V4/3 and I6<sup>b</sup>/5<sup>b</sup>) is supported by the melodic halt on the b<sup>b</sup> ( $\hat{5}$ ), by the parallelism between bars 92–93 and 102–103 (bars 92 and 102 prepare analogously subsequent bars), and by the preceding re-entrance of the trumpet and trombone group. Bar 104 sounds at first analogous to 103, but its latter half is devalued owing to the continuation of the db until the 'breakthrough' (bar 106). As shown by asterisks in Example 12b, these events are triggered by the trumpet and trombone group's resumption of the 4/3 chord on E (E–G–A–C<sup>#</sup>), which appeared enigmatically, without clear dissonance treatment, just before *largamente* (bars 90–92).

[36] The I–V–I progression in bars 50–65 resembles an auxiliary cadence, but with I replacing the root-position tonic at the conclusion.

[37] The upper voices focus alternately on  $\hat{5}$  and  $\hat{1}$ :  $\hat{5}$  at the end of bar 64,  $\hat{1}$  in bars 65–68,  $\hat{5}$  in the horns in bars 68–70,  $\hat{1}$  in the clarinets in bars 70–72; finally, from bar 71 onwards, a 'fugato' activates both  $\hat{5}$  and  $\hat{1}$ .

[38] The E–F motion causes an additional complication by conflicting with the thematic F<sup>b</sup>–E<sup>b</sup> appoggiatura (bars 54–55).

[39] However, that this is not a simple plot of a 'failed' and 'successful' attempt is indicated by the fact that there is a normal major  $\hat{3}$  in the first "failed" descent and a minor b  $\hat{3}$  in the *Uralinie*; c.f. this with Kerri Kotta's article in the present volume.

[40] The motion from C<sup>b</sup> major to G major 6/3 involves real functional enharmonics, which should be kept distinct from the notational enharmonics evident in the partial notation of the C<sup>b</sup> major as B major.

### Olli Väisälä

Olli Väisälä has studied composition, theory, and piano at the Sibelius Academy, becoming Master of music in 1992 and gaining doctorate in 2004 with the dissertation "Prolongation in Early Post-Tonal Music: Analytical Examples and Theoretical Principles." He has taught Music Theory and Analysis at the Sibelius Academy since 1992. His articles on post-tonal music, Bach's music, Sibelius's music and other topics have been published in Finnish Journals and International Journals such as *Music Theory Spectrum* and *Journal of Music Theory*.