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Abstract

Einojuhani Rautavaara (1928-2016) is one of the most significant Finnish composers to emerge after Sibelius, and his music has been highly acclaimed for its originality and accessibility. After experimenting with modernism in the 1960s, his more approachable recent style has often been misunderstood. This thesis will consider this music, and re-examine terms describing it, such as “mystical”, “neo-Romantic” and “postmodern”, which are used in a variety of music criticism and in some biographical accounts. As such, it offers a new understanding of Rautavaara’s idiom, its larger significance, and its relationship with broader, historical trends within the Long Twentieth Century.

This thesis addresses the larger, integrated role of modernism in Rautavaara’s music within the multi-stylistic context of contemporary composition. Modernism is examined both in technical, stylistic terms as well as a more general mentality of progress, arguing that both definitions have informed Rautavaara’s recent music more than has been acknowledged. After considering modernism in its broadest terms and in the more specific Finnish context, the thesis draws on the concepts of “reactive modernism” (J.P.E. Harper-Scott) and the “moderate mainstream” (Arnold Whittall) to argue that, in the late-twentieth century, Rautavaara continues an individualistic, critical approach that did not reject either “modern” or “anachronistic” techniques.

Musical analyses focussing on the eight symphonies, several of which have received no previous detailed discussion, support a new contextualisation of Rautavaara’s entire symphonic cycle as a major pillar of his output. These analytical chapters work inwards from differing experiences of global form, to surface-level thematic processes, to melodic and harmonic processes, in particular how Rautavaara reconciles dodecaphonic and tonal thinking. Issues of symmetry and duality occur throughout. From these close readings, contextual discussion assesses Rautavaara’s legacy, focusing on his mentorship of younger Finnish composers, as well as determining common and recurring compositional features.
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To the memory of my Dad
If an artist is not a Modernist when he is young, he has no heart. And if he is a Modernist when he is old, he has no brain.

Einojuhani Rautavaara¹

Contexts and approaches

Einojuhani Rautavaara (1928-2016) was one of the most prominent Finnish composers after Jean Sibelius, gaining an international reputation which has only continued to grow since his death. However, with a distinctive and multifaceted style, this composer has often been misunderstood, especially outside of Finland. Fixations on certain epithets such as “postmodern”, “mystical”, “Neo-Romantic”, “traditional”, “polystylistic” or “Nordic”, although undeniably present, can obscure the influence and continuation of modern elements that have shaped Rautavaara’s overall output. To redress this balance, his music requires careful examination.

Rautavaara’s relationship with modernism forms part of a larger quest to establish and advance his own musical personality, using traditional and various modern techniques to his own ends and crafting his ideas to the best of his ability. Drawing on Oscar Wilde, he commented that trying to be modern is dangerous as you quickly fall behind the times, adding: ‘I’m not entranced by the idea of winding up in a museum as one link in the evolutionary chain – I’d much rather be an evolutionary anomaly, or a dead-end.’ Here, then, is an interesting tension between following modernist techniques and writing music for modern times. Such a negotiation, it will be argued, persisted in Rautavaara’s music and, to a large extent, characterised it.

The accessibility of much of this music, arising from its Neo-Romantic gestures, references to non-musical subject matter such as angels and nature, as well as its neo-tonal sound world, has a mutually dependent relationship with his earlier experimentations with serialism, aleatoricism, and other engagements with the avant-garde. Such a synthesis is highly intriguing in the way it breaks down the binaries – undoubtedly still in currency – between “serious” art music and “popular” music, or between “complex” and “simple”, “accessible” and “inaccessible”, or “modern” and “traditional”. In his discussion of Erik Bergman’s international modernism, Björn Heile contrasts the former’s relative lack of international recognition with Rautavaara:

It is revealing that Bergman himself never acquired an international reputation on a par with that of his more traditional and nationalist contemporary Rautavaara, just as, in Argentina, Paz’s international reception never rivalled that of Ginastera.\(^3\)

In another chapter, Heile similarly contrasts Bergman’s ‘avant-gardism’ with Rautavaara’s ‘self-exoticism’.\(^4\) In fact, nationalism, internationalism, modernism, traditionalism and exoticism all combine in Rautavaara’s music, sometimes within one piece. To extract one or two of these from this context is not to acknowledge the true breadth of expression.

**Aims and approaches**

This thesis is primarily an analytical study of the symphonies of Einojuhani Rautavaara, but this analysis is also a springboard for contextualising this composer as fully as possible, with a particular focus on his relationship with both the traditional and the modern. The main purpose will be to argue that Rautavaara’s symphonic output is marked by an individual response to modernism in the late-twentieth century and will not, therefore, involve a detailed discussion or reformulation of modernist theory. That being said, this opening chapter will consider those existing frameworks of musical modernism that form an important part of the relevant research context. Rautavaara’s early experimentation with the avant-garde prompted a creative crisis and a subsequent stylistic change, but this experience also crystallised for him a personal reaction to modernism that directly shaped his later music. This fact of course brings into question the usefulness of the term “modernist” and the analysis of his work should remain wary of convenient labels, especially when their over-use makes them somewhat inconvenient. Nevertheless, modernist aspects that will be unravelled in this thesis must be considered as part of gaining a complete understanding of this music, while remaining open to the complex ways in which modernism, tradition and individual preference cohere to form an individual style. Another aim, therefore, is to understand in precise terms what makes Rautavaara’s idiom so characteristic given its compelling confluence of modern and traditional aspects. Finally, the way in which his music contains both modernist and older stylistic traits, and appears to sway between these in consecutive pieces, means the question of old versus new has informed his reputation and legacy.

---


Relationship to previous literature

As well as being the first study to examine Rautavaara’s symphonic cycle in its entirety, this thesis builds on, and in some cases departs from, previous literature in various ways. Much earlier work has broken his music down into separate stylistic periods. To a large extent, this view is well-justified, as he went through phases where certain techniques, genres or aesthetics were more prominent at particular chronological stages in his development. These stylistic phases include an early Neo-Classicism, followed by his first serial period. Creative crisis, centred on serialism, led to a reassertion of neo-tonal harmonies and broad phrasing that have led to the label of Neo-Romanticism. There then followed a second serial phase, which falls under a larger “synthesis” period. This late style has also been described as ‘mystical’ or ‘postmodern’. From a practical perspective, these periods are necessary for those summarising the key directions and stylistic diversities in Rautavaara’s extensive output, especially in the larger context of Finnish music. Both Kimmo Korhonen and Mikko Heiniö have taken this approach.\(^5\) But there is also slight inconsistency in such labelling between different authors. Kimmo Korhonen, for example, states that Rautavaara’s music from the 1990s onwards has been more coherently Neo-Romantic,\(^6\) whilst Wojciech Stępień regards the music since 1994 as being in a “mystical” style.\(^7\) It is consequently productive to look beyond these boundaries.

Such categorisations also only show one side of the coin. This study therefore aims to trace the consistencies in Rautavaara’s intention to arrive at a style that was his own and of which he was in complete control. This approach means looking for the commonalities running between these stylistic shifts to understand how the various stylistic decisions influenced each other in a complex way. Korhonen describes Rautavaara as a textbook example of ‘postmodernism’, owing to the outward stylistic variety that can be striking when experiencing his music for the first time.\(^8\) Heiniö also points out the pluralism and postmodern features in his music.\(^9\) While these writers acknowledge that modern and
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\(^8\) Korhonen, Inventing Finnish Music (Jyväskylä, 2007), 147.

traditional elements are combined in Rautavaara’s later music, the relationship between them, and the way their synthesis creates something new, is of central importance to the present study.

Tim Howell takes a different approach to Korhonen and Heiniö in giving an overview of Rautavaara in the context of a larger study on Finnish music, drawing out collective issues arising from eight Finnish composers working after Sibelius. Because of this scope, Howell does not look for one continual line of development or ‘neatly-labelled category’, and emphasises the striking stylistic diversity. As well as discussing the different solutions in the Third and Fourth Symphonies, he analyses three works, including the Fifth Symphony, uncovering stylistic differences and similarities, which leads him to highlight the importance of “balance” in Rautavaara’s idiom.

Technical studies have dealt with specific issues of Rautavaara’s music. Kalevi Aho’s analytical book on the first five symphonies provides significant insight into his relationship with the genre up until 1986, and therefore leaves a gap for further discussion on Symphonies 6 to 8. Anne Sivuoja-Gunaratnam has analysed Rautavaara’s first serial period and placed this in a detailed context of Finnish musical modernism at that time. Additionally, both she and Ivan Moody shed light on the musical workings of the operas – a genre that overlaps with the symphonies. Wojciech Stepień finds a different, semantic focus in his inquiry into Rautavaara’s “Angel Series”, seeking to understand and interpret how angelic qualities emerge. Analyses of the Seventh Symphony have been undertaken by Samuli Tiikkaja in a Masters dissertation, and in a doctoral thesis by James Leatherbarrow. Further analytical dissertations include Donald Gregory Lovejoy’s

13 See Anne Sivuoja-Gunaratnam, Narrating with Twelve Tones: Einojuhani Rautavaara's first serial period (ca. 1957-1965) (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1997).
15 See Wojciech Stepień, The Sound of Finnish Angels.
analysis of Rautavaara’s wind music, while Kari Henrik Juusela has explored pitch class sets in relation to his orchestration.

Other work has also looked for consistencies in Rautavaara’s music, especially concerning the notion of symmetry. Brandon Paul discusses this concept in relation to the physical layout of the piano as a basis for symmetrical relationships in harmonies and melodies. Matthew Ming Li also discusses the importance and uses of symmetry in the piano music. Samuli Tiikkaja’s recent doctoral thesis examines some of the consistent harmonic processes and symmetry. Tiikkaja’s symphonic case studies are Symphonies 5 and 7 and, because he covers a larger range of music, he does not consider Symphonies 6 and 8. The present study has similarities with that thesis in that it discusses harmonic and melodic processes that reach beyond functional tonality, but has a different agenda in seeing how these fall into the larger contexts of Rautavaara’s idiom and his relationship with modernism. It also takes some alternative analytical perspectives. Tiikkaja has also discussed self-quotation, a topic that finds a different perspective in this thesis, which investigates the full impact of integrated self-quotations on large-scale form in the symphonies. This study will also explore the significances of how Rautavaara has two versions of the same material as counterparts – one within an extended, symphonic form, and those that are more self-contained. A study by Kimberly J. Scott looks at both the diversity in Rautavaara’s works for piano but also the unity created from his intertextuality.

While these previous studies have shown that symmetry and self-quotation are recurring stylistic traits, this thesis discusses the larger integration of elements within a consistent mentality of experimentation.

19 See Kari Henrik Juusela, ‘Pitch Class Sets and their Relationship to Orchestration in the Angel Series of Einojuhani Rautavaara’, (masters dissertation, Georgia State University, 1988).
A symphonic focus

The eight symphonies comprise a representative and focused body of work for this investigation, with Symphonies 5 to 8 being the principal cases for detailed analysis. Symphonies 6 and 8 have so far received no real analytical attention, but they are significant and highly representative works. The eight symphonies form a central pillar of Rautavaara’s output and there is considerable interaction between these works and other orchestral pieces, including operas, concerti and orchestral works. The intention to channel compositional content into a symphonic way of thinking is also a crucial part of his ambitions and international impact. The combination of these factors makes the symphonies one of the best genres to examine the context surrounding this composer.

The symphonies also provide a wealth of material, demonstrating the diversity of Rautavaara’s approach, whilst also providing the necessary focus to draw out the significances and broader conclusions. Whilst this thesis discusses Symphonies 1 to 4 at various points, the last four symphonies were written after Rautavaara cultivated his “synthesis” technique. Although synthesis can be found in works throughout his career, a particular emphasis on the assimilation of old and new and various compositional techniques and aims began in the late-1980s, with Symphony No. 5 and the opera Thomas drawing something of a line in the sand. Symphony No. 5 marked the end of a 23-year hiatus from both serialism and symphonies. This gap was caused by Rautavaara falling into a creative crisis with regard to serialism and his efforts to reconcile it with symphonic thinking. The Fifth Symphony succeeds in uniting these elements in a different way, as he developed his earlier engagement with modernism.

Analytical counterparts

Throughout this thesis, it is made clear that issues of duality, symmetry and balance form a pivotal part of Rautavaara’s music. It is only fitting, therefore, that the structure of this investigation should be similarly inclusive. As there are frequently two different, sometimes opposing, perspectives on the same analytical issues, Chapters 3 to 8 proceed in pairs, with each topic explored from two angles. A complete understanding of Rautavaara’s idiom depends on examining how such potentially paradoxical readings can be reconciled. These complementary approaches show how he assimilates opposing elements, rather than simply combining them, drawing them into one unified process.
Introductory chapters also adopt this symmetry, as this first chapter sets out broader, historical issues of modernism that will help this argument, while Chapter 2 focuses on specific features in Rautavaara’s music. This dialectic structure continues inwards towards the detailed musical workings. Chapters 3 and 4 look at global form. Whereas Chapter 3 discusses the continuation of dynamic, linear formal processes, Chapter 4 looks at other formal approaches, built on non-linearity, as well as examining the significance of visual influences of light and colour. The next pair of chapters examines musical processes on the surface – in particular, motivic or thematic processes. These investigations engage with the compelling motivic narratives at work, achieving a particular symphonic experience, emphasising temporal, as opposed to spatial, elements. Chapter 5 looks at how motivic development is approached in a contemporary context, while Chapter 6 addresses Rautavaara’s prominent use of self-quotation, with a focus on thematic processes. This chapter pairing therefore addresses both the need to perceive individual symphonies in their own right as well as the equally pressing question of how his works relate to each other, as ideas from previous pieces are recast into larger and unified symphonic forms. Beginning with Chapter 7, the third pairing looks at those occasions where dodecaphonic approaches have been continued, questioned and refined within the context of Rautavaara’s style. Chapter 8, meanwhile, addresses the persistent emphasis on harmony and neo-tonality and, through an examination of his fascination with timbre and broader characteristics of sound, why these factors might be so renewable.

**Approaching modernism**

Modernism is difficult. The term is elusive but its impact on the course of twentieth- and twenty-first-century music is huge. Musical modernism cannot be limited to one definition, time period or set of compositional techniques. It is therefore necessary to find a way through the somewhat daunting range of ideas, approaches and perspectives that fall within this phenomenon, given its impact on the Long Twentieth Century. As mentioned earlier, this thesis will not be re-defining modernism or proposing a new theoretical framework, but a consideration of existing theories can help in understanding modernism relative to Rautavaara’s idiom, which does not fall into neat categories.

Modernism can be seen from various perspectives: as a time period, a specific musical style, or as a mind-set of progress or experimentation. These three perspectives can overlap, or not, to different extents. There are some grounds to associate the crystallisation of modernism with a time period. The first two decades of the twentieth
century brought social, political and technological change so rapid that the equally fast
changes in music – especially the rejection of tonality – can be regarded as a point of
departure. Using musical techniques that look back to before these developments would
appear partially to reject a teleological narrative of music and might be seen as
reactionary. A narrative of modernism as birth-crystallisation-decline is therefore easily
evoked and, like many stories, there is a foundation in truth. But it is also true that the new
musical language and syntax, as well as the broader call to write music that is, as Leon
Botstein says, ‘adequate to and reflective of the contemporary moment’, had a lasting
resonance.

In terms of musical style, specific compositional techniques can embody
modernism, in that they are comparatively recent developments that can nevertheless also
become dated. Musical techniques of pitch, such as atonality and serialism, new uses of
texture, or new temporal and formal schemes and methods of organisation are modern in
comparison with functional tonality and formal designs that were prominent in previous
centuries. To many, atonality and complexity are modern and regarded as less accessible
or meaningful than the familiar sound of tonal, triadic or diatonic structures, as well as
conventional instrumental choices and a coherence driven primarily through melody and
harmonic progression. Attached to modernism is a feeling that such music, because of its
complexity, newness and integrity, is to be appreciated by a small, but sufficiently
“educated”, group of listeners. This issue remains relevant today and Botstein argues that
even if modernism becomes peripheral, ‘it has consistently framed and shaped the debate
about the nature and future of high art composition.’

The enduring view of “high art”,
“serious” composition and a focus on the musical processes, often results in the implicit
value attached to the control and authorial authority of the composer.

Viewed as a mindset, modernism has an ultimate goal of progress, to challenge or
sever ties with what has come before and experiment with new, different techniques.
Consequently, this attitude can be separated from established modernist styles, which it
could either develop or react against, but still be, in one sense, modernist. This perspective
informs Arnold Whittall’s view that a new kind of modernist expressionism in works by
five British composers in the late-twentieth century looks back to that found in the early

https://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/groove/music/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-
9781561592630-e-0000040625?rskey=ddSoYJ#omo-9781561592630-e-0000040625-div1-0000040625.3
27 Botstein, ‘Modernism’.
works of Arnold Schoenberg.\textsuperscript{28} Such composers were reacting against what “mainstream” modernism had become and, as such, this also saw the development of Neo-Romanticism and the re-assertion of the symphonic genre under composers like Wolfgang Rihm.\textsuperscript{29} On similar grounds, a modernist attitude can be identified in movements reacting against high modernism, such as experimentalism, minimalism and spectralism. The relationship between avant-garde music and worldly events has also been a topic of debate. Robert Adlington discusses the tensions between the presentation of post-war avant-garde composers as focused on ‘compositional development and the creation of novel sound worlds’ and the ‘involvement of many avant-garde musicians in the tumultuous cultural and political developments of the sixties.’\textsuperscript{30} Such issues highlight the balance between notions of “ivory-tower” compositional establishments and a subverted front line that seeks to challenge political, as well as artistic, conventions.

**Moderate modernism in the late-twentieth century**

The extent to which composers adopted modernist techniques such as the emancipation of dissonance is varied, giving rise to the concept of “moderate modernism”. This framework is useful in navigating the multifaceted ideas of modernism. In such cases of moderation with the avant-garde, the pursuit of progress was nevertheless still evident, but its exponents also did not wish to abandon traditional elements. As this thesis argues that Rautavaara continues modernist techniques and aesthetics in a critical and individual way, it is useful to draw upon existing ideas surrounding moderate modernism by Arnold Whittall and J.P.E Harper-Scott. In his recent chapter, Harper-Scott identifies “faithful” and “reactive” modernists. Calling for a perspective beyond the binary of “progressive” and “reactive”, he argues for:

an aesthetic, intellectual and political middle ground for “reactive” music, between the poles of a “faithful” modernism which confidently asserts the possibility of a new, post-tonal artistic configuration, and an ‘obscure’ response to modernism which utterly rejects


\textsuperscript{29} Paul Griffiths, Modern Music and After, 3\textsuperscript{rd} edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 265.

the abandonment of tonality and willingly submits to the aesthetic blandishments of the pure commodity.\textsuperscript{31}

This concept of a broad middle ground between the faithful avant-garde and mainstream accessibility can be used in understanding Rautavaara in his own context. The importance of individualism in late-twentieth-century musical composition is also linked with Arnold Whittall’s notion of the ‘moderate mainstream’, which he argues was a complement to the more radical ‘modernist mainstream’.\textsuperscript{32} His notion that ‘it was, and remained, an essential facet of twentieth-century musical multivalence that moderate and modernist mainstreams were not mutually exclusive’\textsuperscript{33} resonates with the idea presented here that modernism in the late-twentieth century enters into a multifaceted nexus of older and newer compositional influences. This kind of perspective assists in viewing composers who do not easily fit within the modernist mainstream as important contributors to the broader world of modern music on their own terms. The individual perspective of such composers allows them to approach traditional concepts such as tonality with considerable freshness, owing to their willingness to look beyond their immediate context, looking both forwards and back, and allowing modern directions to inform or reinvent their ideas of tradition. This spirit of moderation to achieve progress in relation to recent, radical musical techniques – and considering the larger history of tonality and “old” genres such as the symphony – has continued in recent times.

The composers discussed by both Harper-Scott and Whittall include those whose music aligns to some extent with modernist techniques, such as atonality, whilst continuing aspects of the tonal past and traditional genres, thereby employing newer ideas with moderation. Such figures (including Igor Stravinsky, Dmitri Shostakovich and Benjamin Britten) often demonstrate individuality in a musical context where others were committed to more radical fringes of the avant-garde, where independent decision-making with recourse to the past was limited. They occupied a fertile region, where traditions could be continued and modified through contact with more radically different modern compositional techniques. Through recourse to a framework such as tonality, motivic development or genre, a more moderate progress often has a wide range of potential


\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 371.
options available. The critical conception of reactive modernism allows reconsideration, rather than persistently following one particular direction of the avant-garde. An important element here is also the renewal of notions such as consonance and dissonance. These composers also therefore act to some extent as intermediaries, as their music contains properties of both the modern and the traditional, meaning they often communicate with a broader range of audiences.

For Whittall, the moderate mainstream focuses on the ‘accommodations achieved between conservatism and progressiveness, the former renewing itself through limited contact with the latter.’ Of particular interest to the present discussion, however, is how a reactive modernist perspective does not only reveal how the traditional is renewed, but how retaining elements of the tonal and symphonic past can then quietly lead modern techniques into new directions. In late-twentieth-century moderate modernism, modernist techniques can become dated. Therefore, modern music – as a time period – is concerned with the future application and modification of these techniques. Rautavaara’s position is different from those of many earlier “reactive” or “moderate” composers in that he embraced modernism fully in his earlier music but his style moves overall towards a similar moderate modernism. This is evident, firstly, in the way he goes on to use modern techniques with moderation, selectivity and with a strong degree of liberty and, secondly, in his view of progress through synthesis. He explores connections and compatibilities and has a dialogue between approaches from both the near and more distant past.

A significant collection of research has made the “modernist” case for early-twentieth-century composers and such literature is directly relevant to the aims of this argument. Such studies, which have considered individuals such as Sibelius, Nielsen, Elgar and Vaughan Williams, also overlap with frameworks of moderate modernism. A common element between these composers is that they come from outside central-Europe and therefore could be said to occupy the “periphery” of continental developments. They are also significant players in the continuations and transformations of the symphony in the twentieth century. The interaction of their symphonic thinking alongside their responses to continental modernist changes not only energised and reconfigured the genre but also challenged any linear narratives of modernist development. In relation to late-twentieth-century music, the image of the composer at the periphery cannot be ignored. Finnish composers of Rautavaara’s generation had to go abroad to learn about modern

34 Whittall, ‘Individualism and accessibility’, 367.
techniques – a tradition that continues – and Rautavaara was influenced by the musical, historical and cultural elements of his home country in addition to continental techniques. The national and international dimensions therefore comprise a complex balance.

Several writers have re-addressed the image of Sibelius as a provincial and traditional composer and argued that his awareness and confrontation of avant-garde trends helped formulate an alternative idiom to certain branches of modernism. In addressing the fact that Sibelius’s music suffered from its accessibility and popularity – a fate that has also befallen that of Rautavaara – Tim Howell identifies those progressive elements in Sibelius’s symphonies and tone poems (notably found in thematic and formal processes) that challenge the notion that his music represents an ‘anachronism’. The present argument has much in common with Howell’s investigation into a personal response to modernism that does not fit easily under labels, but which benefits from knowledge of various trends in adapting the symphonic genre. Tomi Mäkelä presents the biographical image of Sibelius as a constellation, reaching beyond any narrow idea of provincial “Finnishness”. Mäkelä observes how Sibelius was a victim of the modernist idea of development and progress and that his music ‘compels us to reflect critically on the multidimensional nature of the present.’ The evidence of a ‘multi-lateral’ modernism, where composers break new ground whilst avoiding extremities, goes to the heart of the “moderate modernism” framework. For James Hepokoski, the progressiveness of Sibelius’s symphonic music lies in various ‘sonata-deformation’ procedures that challenge previous approaches to large-scale symphonic form. Hepokoski’s distinction between early ‘modernists’ (including Sibelius, Elgar, Mahler, Strauss and Glazunov) and the ‘New Music’, found in the more radical movements of Stravinsky and Schoenberg, reveals a modernist stance that sought musical evolution reflective of its time, but which also has dialogic contact with more revolutionary, avant-garde developments.

The impact of a Nordic cultural-geographical placement and critical individualism has also been explored by Daniel M. Grimley in his study of Carl Nielsen. Grimley addresses the ‘idea of modernism’ in relation to Nielsen’s music with a particular focus on the tensions between his cosmopolitanism and his “Danishness”, which present the Dane

\[36\] Tomi Mäkelä (trans. Steven Lindberg), Jean Sibelius (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2011), 38
\[38\] Hepokoski, Sibelius: Symphony No. 5, 4-9.
as a “double man”. For Grimley, Nielsen’s peripheralisation ‘is not so much a technical or aesthetic deficiency, an inability to meet the demands of a particular modernist musical agenda, but a challenge to received notions of musical development and authority.’

Arguments for non-binary manifestations of modernism also form an important trend within research into British music. Alain Frogley re-addresses commonly-held reactions to Vaughan Williams, observing how such works as the Fourth and Sixth Symphonies do not easily align with such terms as ‘English’, ‘pastoral’ and ‘folksong’. Highlighting Vaughan Williams’ experimentalism and knowledge of contemporary developments abroad, Frogley argues that the national characteristics of his music have ‘consciously or unconsciously, been selectively manipulated.’ Such a perspective provides a useful model for approaching the symphonies of Rautavaara, whose reception has, to a certain extent, over- emphasised and distorted particular traits and therefore obscured less obvious responses to modernism.

In his opening chapter to British Music and Modernism, Matthew Riley sets out the problematic response to modern music by liberal music critics in the early-twentieth-century British art music context, thereby revealing the ‘anxieties’ about cultural and artistic change. Following this introduction, other chapters in this volume reveal complex confrontations with European trends in British music, thereby avoiding a narrow definition of modernism. By uncovering progressive formal strategies associated with such first-generation modernists as Strauss, Mahler, Elgar and Sibelius, Daniel M. Grimley’s chapter on Vaughan Williams’ Pastoral Symphony challenges the notion that this work is in an exclusively English idiom, but rather is an exemplar of ‘the modern European symphonic tradition’. Similarly, Stephen Downes argues that Frank Bridge’s The Sea demonstrates both the influence of late-Romanticism as well as the ‘structural subversiveness and psychological anxieties’ characteristic of continental modernism, which looks ahead to Bridge’s more radical music. Finally, in his monograph study of

40 Grimley, Carl Nielsen, 21.
Elgar, Harper-Scott finds this composer’s modernism in his ironic and pessimistic deconstruction of Beethovenian symphonic formal practice, which is more understated than other ‘more radical-sounding’ modernists of the time.⁴⁷ He goes on to say: ‘To change minds, a composer requires other people to listen to his or her argument. It is sometimes better to argue suavely than abrasively, although both have their merits and Elgar prefers the former.’⁴⁸ A position that avoids extremities, without abandoning new compositional arguments, is one that can reach across the twentieth century.

**A dialectical view**

A moderate modernist perspective gives rise to a dialectical view of modernism. Paul Griffiths points to the current stasis of modern music caused by the lack of a radical movement in recent years.⁴⁹ During this period of relative stasis where, thanks to technology, the full range of recorded music is more consumable than ever, modernist techniques have been taken up to various extents in a wide range of directions. It therefore makes sense to see modernism as a point of reference that can be built upon or reacted to in the music of today. Composers can take up elements, compare them with others, and assimilate them as part of a broader set of stylistic influences. Being free to choose which elements to challenge is an important factor in the late-twentieth century. In this regard, it is useful to bear in mind Björn Heile and Charles Wilson’s view of modernism as a ‘series of family resemblances whereby different members of the family may share certain features but none is common to all of them, and where distant members may be connected by a chain of resemblances without sharing a single feature in common.’⁵⁰ This genetic view of modernism allows for constant, fertile shifting of the relationship between contemporary music and music of the past.

Elring E. Guldbrandsen and Julian Johnson argue that musical modernism is ‘an attitude of musical practice’ that involves an increased awareness of its historical position and is subject to perennial transformation.⁵¹ As well as supporting the frameworks of Harper-Scott and Whittall, this approach admits a wider view of the possibilities of modernism which, as they attest, ‘simply involves a heightened consciousness of the
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relations between present and past, between present and future and between continuity and discontinuity in music. This ‘long view’, which takes many different musical forms, helps in identifying music that is progressive in its time but which also has an inextricable relationship with the past. It is also necessary, therefore, to distinguish between compositional technique and a mentality: a composer might have a modernist outlook, even if they themselves see modernism as a matter of compositional materials. Gulbrandsen and Johnson’s perception of modernism as ‘processes of gradual transformation taking place from within’ helps illuminate subtle, personal engagements with this phenomenon.

Many of the characteristics of modern music that might be listed (atonality, the avoidance of melody, fragmentation, abstraction, complexity, the avoidance of direct repetition, constructivism) can be challenged by an opposing example from music that is still indisputably modern. Mark Hutchinson challenges the notion that recent music is defined by fragmentation and discontinuity by proposing different manifestations of ‘coherence’; in particular, he emphasises the ‘bringing together of diverse elements in a stable whole.’ Similarly, the direct evocations of non-musical subject matter in music by such composers as Kaija Saariaho or James MacMillan problematise the notion that modern music can only be about itself. In this sense, modernist music has vitality, as music engages with the context of its time and of its recent past, and is energised by the amount of options available. This dialogue, questioning what is old and new from individual perspectives is what makes music current, building on and reacting to the introduction of radical new techniques.

Given the range of stylistic and aesthetic approaches available in late-twentieth-century/ early-twenty-first-century music, critical individualism has become ever more significant. The notion of following modernism – working after the event – opens another Pandora’s Box: postmodernism. Again, this term holds many different meanings and agendas, but can also be helpful for this reason. Postmodernism can enter into this dialectic pattern, being a critical response to modernism but also a continuation of modern techniques and attitudes. In this sense, the “post” element – coming after modernism – has some relevance. Another significant aspect of Gulbrandsen and Johnson’s edited collection, as they acknowledge, is the relative absence of the term ‘postmodernism’.
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which they see as part of the inherently contradictory nature of modernism.\textsuperscript{55} Viewing postmodernism partly as a movement that could seek to build critically on modernist techniques and enter into a mixed idiom, whilst incorporating other inputs, removes the need to segregate it as a separate time period.

**Finnish Musical Modernism**

The sheer amount and diversity of music that has emerged from Finland in the last century brings many of the issues outlined above into a particular focus. A dialogue between new and old is present here too, although condensed into a smaller timescale. The relatively late arrival of a collection of modernist techniques in Finland led to their considerably concentrated adoption and an intense productivity.\textsuperscript{56} In this environment, Finland had a balance between the continuation of modernist techniques such as serialism and the fostering of individualism.

A relative delay in taking up modernist techniques also happened in Scandinavia, in particular Denmark and Norway, although not to the same extent as in Finland. The relative distance from musical developments in Central Europe and the weight of nationally significant composers such as Nielsen and Grieg undoubtedly contributed to this latency. This slight delay led to relative independence, as individuals negotiated a range of newer ideas. This was the case, for example, with the generation of young Danish composers such as Per Nørgård (b. 1932).\textsuperscript{57} There was also often an acute tension between international and national outlooks. While individuals from both Denmark\textsuperscript{58} and Norway\textsuperscript{59} broke away from National Romanticism earlier on, it was not until after the Second World War that musical developments from Central Europe really became more widespread during the 1960s.\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{56} For further details of this compressed timescale, see Anne Sivuoa-Gunaratanam, *Narrating with Twelve Tones*, 42-46, as well as Howell, *After Sibelius*, 114 and ‘Narrating with Twelve Tones: Einojuhani Rautavaara’s First Serial Period (ca. 1957-1965)’ by Anne Sivuoja-Gunaratanam, *Music and Letters* 80, no. 3 (1999): 491.
\textsuperscript{57} Jan Christensen, ‘New Music of Denmark’, in *New Music of the Nordic Countries*, 35.
\textsuperscript{59} Arvid O. Vollsnes, Reidar Sevåg and Jan-Petter Blom, ‘Norway’. *Oxford Music Online. Grove Music Online*, accessed 4th February 2020, 
\textsuperscript{60} Christensen, ‘New Music of Denmark’, 25, and Harald Herresthal and Morten Eide Pedersen, ‘New Music of Norway’, 407, in *New Music of the Nordic Countries*. 
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The situation was different in Sweden. Hilding Rosenberg (1892-1985) started experimenting with modernist techniques after his experiences abroad — his First String Quartet (1920, rev. 1923 and 1955) demonstrates the influence of the chromaticism in Schoenberg’s early music. Although Rosenberg was considered an ‘extreme radical’ in his home country, his early manifestation of modernism in Sweden from the 1920s meant there was a steadier struggle between the modern and the traditional. Nevertheless, Swedish modernism also saw a breakthrough after the Second World War, as the activities of the “Monday Group” — a group of Swedish composers, musicologists and musicians — led to an intense flourishing of modernism during the 1940s.

Terminology surrounding modernism can also be a problem in the more focused Finnish context. Different techniques, including serialism, aleatoricism and Cageian experimentation altered what it meant to be modern. However, Finnish composers are frequently described as ‘modernist’ without these technical criteria being explicitly expressed. Korhonen often uses the term in a general sense, implying the presence of a modernist style, although this is in the context of broad overviews of Finnish music.

**Three waves of Finnish modernism**

The intensity and momentum with which a series of modernist styles have been introduced to Finland has led to the idea of three “waves” of modernism, with the ebb and flow of each wave landing and receding leaving new reactions and directions. The generation before Rautavaara had pursued international trends in the face of a conservative society. Sibelius was still alive — his combined eminence and musical silence fostered a certain reticence among younger composers — and many individuals were writing in relatively strict forms. Aarre Merikanto (1893-1958), Vaino Raitio (1891-1945) and Uuno Klami
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(1900-1961) were drawn to expressionism and impressionism, finding the works of Scriabin to be influential. These composers experimented with chromaticism and atonality, as well as newer approaches to orchestral colour that had opened in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. The conservatism at this time explains the hostility towards Merikanto’s works, whose international and experimental outlook was at odds with the more nationalist tone in Finland.

Before the second wave began in the late-1950s, Neo-Classicism was the main source of modernism in Finland, with Stravinsky, Bartók, Prokofiev, Hindemith and Shostakovich being influential. The starting point of the second wave was the introduction of dodecaphony to Finland. According to Anne Sivuoja-Gunaratnam, this time of new experimentation coincided with the opening up of cultural connections between Finland and trends in central Europe following the Second World War. 12-tone technique was basically unknown in Finland and Bergman was the first Finnish composer to introduce it there, having studied with Wladimir Vogel in Ascona, Switzerland. Since the mid-century, travelling abroad to study has become a rite of passage for Finnish composers. Bergman also encouraged Rautavaara to go to Ascona and study with Vogel, who did so in 1957, the year of Sibelius’s death. Other Finnish composers to embrace dodecaphony included Joonas Kokkonen, Usko Merilainen, Tauno Marttinen, Aulis Sallinen and Paavo Heininen. Both Merilainen and Marttinen also went to study with Vogel on Bergman’s recommendation. Consequently, without Bergman’s international modernism, the course of Finnish music would have been completely different.

Whilst dodecaphony became an established technique in Finland, not all composers pursued it for long. Heininen recalls how each individual turned towards their ‘own homestead’ at this point. For many, serialism had ceased to be useful to their own purposes. There was also an accelerated influx of other modernist techniques. Sivuoja-Gunaratnam points out that, while the progression from 12-tone technique to John Cage’s “anarchistic aesthetics” took some thirty years, the introduction of serialism,
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indeterminacy, electronic music and instrumental theatre in Finland happened in less than ten years. In this accelerated timeframe, total serialism, as used by Rautavaara, quickly fell out of fashion, as the trend turned towards the influence of the anarchism of John Cage. According to Korhonen, this period saw the introduction of a number of new phenomena that reacted against the total serialism of the 1950s, including aleatoric techniques, the “happening” and improvisation. Young composers leading the ‘Nursery Chamber Concerts’ pursued these new techniques, along with Bergman, Merilainen and Heininen, while others were more sceptical.

The third wave of modernism began in the 1980s. The founding of the ‘Korvat Auki’ (‘Ears Open!’) society in the 1980s brought a dedicated group of Finnish musicians pursuing the latest international trends. These trends included electronic composition, with composers like Kaija Saariaho and Magnus Lindberg going to study at IRCAM in Paris. Paavo Heininen encouraged these experimentations and Jukka Tiensuu was influential on this generation in using a computer within the compositional process.

Mikko Heiniö has listed characteristics of Finnish musical modernism, grouping together the numerous styles that arose in the 50s and 60s. These included: new instrumental combinations, the use of time-space notation, complex textural configurations, chromaticism and the avoidance of tonal associations, and timbre and harmony being of equal importance, and even more important than rhythm. The range of new techniques implemented also problematises Heiniö’s categorisation of Finnish composers around this time into “modernists proper”, “traditionalists” and “tradition-bound modernists”, placing Rautavaara in the final category. While this is a fair reflection of his comparatively balanced approach at this time, there are a number of variables and degrees for what “being a modernist” would mean, making the catch-all term unclear. Heiniö’s designations seem to be based on musical style but, given the range of styles in such a short period, it is also important to consider how these techniques relate
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to the underlying individual progress in Finnish composers of this generation. A pre-requisite of modernism for Matei Calinescu was an emphasis on the technical means of production, a quality that characterises serialism and integral serialism. Consequently, it does not seem surprising that a period of resurgent interest in opera, neo-tonality and stylistic independence followed from the mid-1960s, when, according to Korhonen, ‘the wave crashed and began to fall back’.  

Viewing modernist styles in a broader, pluralistic context that has admitted tonality, symphonies and opera becomes increasingly more important. Paavo Heininen states that, while “modernism” used to be a flag to wave for him, these days he has more or less forgotten the term. Clearly, the diversity and creative energy that has emerged from the younger generations of Finnish composers cannot be usefully categorised in the same terms of modern and traditional. However, given the pattern of ebb and flow – the dialectical process that has generated so much energy in contemporary Finnish music in the last 100 years – there can be no certainty as to how attitudes of modernism will shape music still to come.

**The Symphony in Finland**

In 1948, Jean Sibelius was asked what he thought about contemporary music. He answered:

> I’m very interested in modern music. And I think I’m roughly aware of the direction, or of the directions, that there will be in the future...that will have a future [...] I’m most interested in the form of the symphony.

The striking aspect of this characteristically concise answer is Sibelius’s certainty in the renewability of the symphonic form, prompting him to look beyond his own contribution to the genre. By now, the “Shadow of Sibelius” has become a legend of Finnish music but, as his own words would suggest, this phenomenon was largely the result of how other composers felt, rather than something Sibelius himself condoned. The diversification of the Finnish symphony beyond Sibelius’s influence happened gradually, but the status that this genre has in this country guaranteed its future.
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With hindsight, the symphonic genre in Finland since Sibelius has not only persisted but produced a diverse range of new stylistic approaches. The genre has survived each modernist wave, demonstrating great durability and flexibility. A considerable number of composers have written them since Sibelius, while a more focused group have made this genre one of the pillars of their output. Rautavaara would be a case in point. Many composers found a balance between acknowledging Sibelius’s significance and finding new elements from outside. Although there are some discernible trends in Finnish symphonies, for example those that are Neo-Classical, dodecaphonic, those that implement Ligetian, “field” techniques and those that are neo-tonal, many have pursued this “way of thinking” on an individual basis. Composers whose symphonies span longer periods of their careers, such as Kokkonen, Rautavaara, Heininen, Sallinen and Nordgren have both followed stylistic trends and taken the genre in their own directions. Rautavaara continued to explore the nature and limitations of the symphony in his own way, outside of established trends, whilst simultaneously never preventing their influence on him.

The problem of the continuation of the symphony was at its most acute for the generation immediately following Sibelius. Leevi Madetoja continued a Sibelian influence, especially in his Second Symphony, as well as absorbing techniques from contemporary French music, notably in the use of orchestration. Around the time of the first wave of modernism outlined above, while Sibelius was still alive, there was experimentation with moving away from the late-Romantic style that was prominent at the time. This stylistic shift can be experienced in a comparison of Merikanto’s First and Second Symphonies.\(^{87}\)

The more international Neo-Classicism was a significant factor from outside Finland. Einar Englund, who was influenced by composers such as Stravinsky, Bartók and Shostakovich, was an important Finnish figurehead in new symphonic composition whilst Sibelius was still alive. According to Korhonen, Englund’s First Symphony (1946) made his real breakthrough,\(^{88}\) asserting a new kind of symphonic style to that of his older countryman. In the context of Finnish conservative composition immediately following the Second World War, where many composers were not looking beyond Finnish late-Romanticism, Rautavaara’s First Symphony bears the influence of Shostakovich as well as Sibelian elements. In addition to the similar development of a limited set of motivic material, the strongest comparison is in the way that he took a long time to settle on the
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final form, recalling Sibelian issues of continuity and the relationship between form and content.

Rautavaara’s generation had a more balanced perspective on the Sibelian legacy. Thanks to the introduction of new techniques, Joonas Kokkonen, Usko Merilainen, Rautavaara and Aulis Sallinen acquired a certain amount of freedom and were able to experiment with serialism as well as other approaches. As well as Rautavaara – who composed his final four symphonies in the 80s and 90s, younger composers emerged with symphonies in the 1980s, coinciding with the gradual transition into a more liberal and pluralistic atmosphere, around the time of the third modernist wave. The three symphonies of Jouni Kaipainen – one of the founders of Korvat Auki! – cover considerable stylistic variety, drawing on Sibelius as one of a number of diverse influences, of which Lutosławski is another. Although there are exceptions, many of these works incorporate economic motivic development, expansive forms and, occasionally, the open admission of Sibelian influences and reference arising from an increased distance. Harri Vuori states that his First Symphony is more Sibelian than Mahlerian, while Kaipainen’s two-movement second symphony opens with a Sibelius quotation. Composers continued to be drawn to the symphonic genre. As a prolific symphonist, Kalevi Aho has written 17. Leif Segerstam (b. 1944), who to date has written 327 symphonies, but will almost certainly have produced more by the time this thesis is in the public domain, developed an aleatory technique allowing him to produce these works extraordinarily quickly. Although this seems far removed from other symphonic contributors, there is no denying the fascination and belief in this way of thinking. For him, the freedom of giving performers certain decisions is combined with a rigour and logic that derives from Sibelius, the latter being a vital influence on him. He favours continuous symphonic forms in single movements, with an emphasis on slowly-evolving continuity.

The question of what constitutes a symphony has kept returning in Finland and the vitality and diversity would appear live up to Sibelius’s vision of the genre. The fact that
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composers as diverse as Sallinen, Heininen and Rautavaara continued to be drawn to symphonies demonstrates that there is something fundamentally renewable about it. Furthermore, this renewability also explains the fact that other composers such as Lindberg and Saariaho wrote works that are not symphonies but symphonic in nature. As founding members of the avant-garde Korvat Auki! group, Lindberg and Saariaho both made a pact never to write a symphony, as a response to the fact that writing a work in this genre was, at one time, a pre-requisite for membership of the Society of Finnish Composers. The idea of the symphony, like modernism, being part of a dialectical process, emerges, and how these two elements relate to each other in the Finnish context is hugely significant. Finnish composers have felt the need to take a stance in relation to the symphony, which, along with Sibelius, is too fundamental a part of their musical history to be ignored. This environment has helped keep it alive. The prominence of the symphony has also led to its cross-fertilisation with other large-scale genres, such as opera, as in Rautavaara and Aho, and ballet, as in the case of Sallinen’s Eighth Symphony being based on material originally intended for a ballet.  

Rautavaara’s stylistic features and compositional mentality

Whereas previous biographies of Rautavaara present a chronological account of his life and music, this chapter takes a more thematic approach, examining those significant stylistic encounters and techniques that collectively informed his style. Because this thesis argues that there are consistent aims in his music and a reactive relationship with modernism, this approach is useful for determining how these stylistic elements relate to or modify each other. This perspective seems appropriate, as Rautavaara said that modernism (or structuralism), mysticism and national Finnish elements exist side-by-side throughout his music and do not fall into three stylistic periods.¹ By examining these various encounters, it will be easier to see how modern and traditional elements can inform and re-shape each other.

Rautavaara and the symphony

The exploration of what constitutes a symphony, and what it could achieve, can be seen in the context of Rautavaara’s own cycle of eight. In his autobiography, he muses that he did not see the symphony as dead in a post-Sibelian context, but as an individual speech, a monologue, and that the story of the genre had to get a new chapter.² These works are indicative of his relationship with many of the stylistic issues and changes in Finnish music. The question of renewing the symphonic genre also suggests a sense of inheritance from Sibelius, especially considering that Rautavaara had been personally chosen by Sibelius as a recipient for a Koussevitsky scholarship in 1955, which Sibelius had received as a 90th birthday present.³ In this context, issues of renewability and inheritance inevitably revolved around Rautavaara’s symphonies. He had not written one by this time,
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but the first piece he chose to write after he had travelled abroad was his First Symphony. He reflected on the reception of Symphony No. 1 (1956, rev. 1988 and 2003) and the progression to Symphony No. 2 (1957, rev. 1984):

I was given to understand, me, the white hope of Finnish music, personally chosen by Sibelius from the whole of the young generation to study in the States, that I was conservative! That would not do – I had to write a new symphony to show them!"⁴

The outward differences between the first two symphonies are nevertheless balanced by their shared symphonic ambitions, indicating the way that the symphony as a way of thinking took a strong hold from the beginning.

Many of Rautavaara’s symphonies are outwardly traditional, in that six out of the total eight have four movements. The two exceptions are Symphony No. 1 (1956), which underwent two revisions in 1988 and 2003, and Symphony No. 5 (1985), which is in one continuous movement. Rautavaara also frequently uses a Scherzo and there is often a slow second or third movement. Despite this relative outward uniformity, each symphony has a different character and purpose, drawing on a wide range of techniques. This idea is most evident in Arabescata, the concise, four-movement multi-serial work that became his Fourth Symphony in 1986, after he realised its symphonic potential.⁵ Although this is a four-movement work, it is stylistically far removed from Symphony No. 3 (1961), which combines serialism with the style of Anton Bruckner, composed just one year earlier, or a later work such as Symphony No. 7 – Angel of Light (1994). Nevertheless, these pieces fundamentally approach the same problem – the pacing of musical events over an extended timeframe – but in different ways. This diversity mirrors in a late-twentieth-century context that of Sibelius’s final three symphonies.

The symphonic genre forms a central pillar of Rautavaara’s style. Motivic development, musical journeying and unity continued to draw him, which might explain why his return to the genre coincides with his “synthesis” approach, starting in the 1980s. As pre-empted by the Third Symphony, each of the final four symphonies undertake a journey towards resolution, where unity and assimilation is often discovered at the end, as the piece works through a narrative experience. Rautavaara’s Fifth Symphony builds on the synthesis between the serial technique and the Neo-Romantic breadth that he felt compelled to express through the Third Symphony. A combination of a continuous,

⁴ Quoted in Aho, Rautavaara as Symphonist, 79.
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single-movement form with eight sections that recall each other in various ways demonstrates fresh independence with this genre. Symphony No. 6 – *Vincentiana* (1992) establishes the close relationship in Rautavaara’s music between symphonic writing and opera, drawing heavily on material from the opera *Vincent*. This relationship between symphonies and dramatic narrative was to be repeated, to a lesser extent, in Symphony No. 8 – *The Journey*, which has a connection with the opera *Thomas*. In his programme note to *The Journey*, Rautavaara reflects on the attitudes to the symphony in the context of modernism, stating that, little by little, ‘a new view emerged of it as not a particular form but as a particular way of thinking in music’. Rautavaara was finding ways of reconciling modernism with this enduring way of thinking. He goes on to say:

> It was a form characterised by slow transformation, a narrative element (operating not with words but with music alone) the generation of new different aspects and perspectives from the same basic premises, the transformations of light and colour.\(^7\)

In Rautavaara’s symphonies, musical narrative and modernism are often connected. As music is a temporal art, he continued to find this notion highly important. Because of this commitment to narrative experiences, he challenges the negation of this phenomenon with the onset of modernism. According to Leon Botstein:

> The link between music and narration particularly came under scrutiny. Modernity demanded the shattering of expectations, conventions, boundaries and limits as well as empirical experimentations (following the example of science) and the confident exploration of the new.\(^8\)

As Chapters 3-6 will explore, various influences of narrative helped Rautavaara reconsider the concept of the “new”, which extended to the combination of symphonic and operatic modes of thinking.

The continuation of Rautavaara’s symphonies might not have been possible without the commercial success of works like *Angel of Light*. Without this, Wolfgang Sawallisch and the Philadelphia Orchestra would almost certainly not have commissioned him to write the orchestral work that became *The Journey* (1999) for the centenary of the Philadelphia Orchestra. Whilst it might be tempting to see this simply as a response to a high-profile commission, on the back of popularity, the resources available – in this case
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an orchestra known for their technical abilities and attention to new music\(^9\) – provided an opportunity for Rautavaara to continue to explore this medium at the very end of the twentieth century in a particular way. Firstly, the work comprises a fresh approach to “journeying” in symphonic form. Sawallisch points to the “great, immense landscapes without end,”\(^{10}\) which suggests the durability of this way of thinking. Secondly, the work is the culmination of Rautavaara’s orchestral writing, as many ideas from earlier pieces are recast into this broad expanse. Feeding into this opportunity is the fact that Sawallisch saw him as the successor to Sibelius.\(^{11}\) This perspective is indicative of Rautavaara’s international reputation, where he is perceived as bearing the mantle of Finnish symphonic composition. In short, his international reputation has contributed to his continuation of symphonies.

### Serialism

Before the introduction of dodecaphony to Finland, Rautavaara had been exploring the very limits of tonality. After the atonality of the *Seven Preludes* (1956), the rigour of dodecaphony was a logical next step. Owing to Bergman’s influence, Rautavaara, who was looking for new organisational methods after a successful but not entirely satisfactory period in America,\(^{12}\) was one of the first Finnish composers to learn about serialism. His serial *String Quartet No. 2* (1958), recalls Alban Berg, whose reconciliation of serialism with tonal elements was to be an important influence, which was established during Rautavaara’s studies with Vogel.\(^{13}\) After completing the Quartet, he was enthusiastic:

> I felt that I had now mastered my [serial] technique to the extent that it had become a vehicle for my intuition, a tool for realizing my visions. It was no longer an uncomfortable set of rules which controlled me. No, through it I could make all the music I wanted to hear. The technique, the musical material impregnated by the technique, continually gave me ‘propositions’, and suggested to me a variety of possible solutions. The Music became
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For the first time I had at my service a flexible composition technique of my own.14

The acquisition of a new technique that was all-encompassing, influencing both the local and global design, had an understandable attraction, especially given how he found a technique of controlling the larger structure to have been missing from his studies with Merikanto.15 Total serialism was the next logical step, introducing the structure to other parameters beyond pitch. This technique placed Rautavaara at the forefront of Finnish modernism, and Sivuoja-Gunaratnam points out that Prevariata was the first Finnish ‘multi-serial’ piece.16 Ultimately, however, the extremely methodological approach of total serialism, which involved extensive predetermination of musical parameters on paper,17 meant that he eventually hit a point of stylistic crisis. The serial Symphony No. 3, with its strong evocation of Bruckner, anticipates the synthesis between old and new that Rautavaara would later perfect. The fact that this symphony comes after Prevariata and just before the integral serialism of Arabescata demonstrates that his experimentation at this time did not simply go in a straight line towards strict total-serialism. It was this kind of moderate serialism that Rautavaara found to be the most fruitful in the long term.

After this crisis, there was a stylistic shift, eschewing serialism in favour of a freer melodic and harmonic language that looked to a neo-tonal frame of reference. Around this time, there was also experimentation with aleatoricism. It is important to regard the music from the late-60s and throughout the seventies, a period commonly identified over-simplistically as the beginnings of Rautavaara’s Neo-Romantic phase,18 as a continued stylistic exploration, taken in a new direction. This period coincided with a larger receding of modernism in Finland19 which allowed greater freedom for Rautavaara to experiment with non-serial means. In works such as Piano Concerto No. 1 (1969), Anadyomene – Adoration of Aphrodite (1968), Garden of Spaces (1971), Cantus Arcticus (1972), and numerous piano works including The Fire Sermon (1970) and Narcissus (2001), several highly recognisable stylistic elements came to the fore.

14 Rautavaara, quoted in Sivuoja-Gunaratnam, Narrating with Twelve Tones, 55.
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18 See, for example, Kimmo Korhonen, Finnish Orchestral Music, Vol.2 (Jyväskylä, 1995), 39.
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During this time, Rautavaara’s belief in an expansive pitch network that drew on all the twelve tones, which serialism had previously provided, did not go away, but was channelled differently. From the early 1970s, he started to use Messiaen’s modes of limited transposition more consistently, especially Mode 2 (otherwise known as the Octatonic scale) which alternates whole tones and semitones, and Mode 6, which alternates pairs of whole tones and semitones. Their symmetry would have had a natural appeal to Rautavaara, who had explored this phenomenon so fully in his earlier serial works. After his break with serialism, these scales form a core structural component, capable of generating the required expansive pitch network through relatively free combinations. Through their synthetic nature, these modes essentially form a bridge between total chromaticism and the diatonic system – a perfect tool for establishing synthesis. This discovery was to play a fundamental feature in the more complex mixtures of rows and modes of limited transposition in the later music.

A 12-tone vocabulary

Rautavaara intended to renew his relationship with dodecaphony, while continuing triadic harmonic practice. What came to be regarded as his second serial period began in the late-1980s. In the opera *Thomas* (1985), he experimented with synthesising different pitch collections, so that a 12-tone row was generated organically through a “genealogical hierarchy”, where the row derives from its structural connection to diatonic systems and Messiaen’s second mode of limited transposition. Again, Mode 2 is a pivotal tool for bonding diverse pitch structures into one overall system. Works written during the 90s often use multiple rows which are used freely, often not observing strict serial practice concerning the order and repetition of notes, and implementing the row both vertically and horizontally. It is therefore likely that his freer approach to pitch design after his crisis brought on by serialism led to a renewed confidence in incorporating these series. Rautavaara’s rows in works of this time, as in Symphony No. 3, are used in a tonal way, where triads frequently form sub-sets and are the organisational structure of the series.

Rautavaara sought to use the 12 tones as a larger system or vocabulary that would combine structure with freedom. Speaking about his own organisation, he said:

> What I wanted was to try to find a synthesis. I think that the twelve tempered tones are the music-vocabulary of this century, but the question is the organization of that vocabulary.
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That is the great question, and my solution was to seek a synthesis of this modernism and tonal harmony, and to use personal variations of the 12-tone technique. That kind of organization did not have anything to do with that of Schoenberg or Webern, but was my way of organizing those twelve tones in a way which led me to use the harmony in the way I wanted.  

It is significant that Rautavaara does not include Berg in his list of composers from whom he intended to distance himself, given the similarities between these two figures in their reconciliation of serialism and diatonicism. Rautavaara compared this organisation to syntax, meaning the order and arrangement of the twelve notes, the vocabulary, to fulfil compositional aims. The intention to create a broad pitch network that uses all 12 tones without sacrificing melodic intuition and tonal or diatonic reference began with such works as the Second String Quartet and the Third Symphony. That this approach was in place in this earlier work further demonstrates that stylistic development was not a straight-forward succession of periods, but a process of finding different approaches to the same problems.

This outlook became more developed in later music, where incorporating 12-tone rows provided a structure that helped organise, distribute and vary the material, whilst also never being limited or restricted by it. The total chromatic set forms one all-encompassing framework which subsumes and synthesises different pitch systems, meaning they all derive from the same genus. Grouping notes from this largest set into different symmetrical combinations informs the various harmonic, melodic and motivic developments. Therefore, while Rautavaara brings diverse pitch systems together, he combines different aspects of the same system, achieving the greatest possible variation. As the following section argues, this 12-tone vocabulary was intrinsically connected to a lifelong fascination with symmetry.

**Symmetry**

Symmetry will form a major theme in this thesis. Firstly, this goal is fundamental to Rautavaara’s personal development of dodecaphony. For a 1997 documentary, he discusses the importance of the concept of “Mandala” – an idea he had become familiar with through the writing of Carl Gustav Jung. The timing of this documentary is
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significant, given Rautavaara’s renewed interest in 12-tone series during the 80s and 90s. Here, he talks about how dodecaphony and serialism were still important to him.

Carl Gustav Jung studied the Mandala, a circular pattern drawn or painted that symbolises the circle of life. […] In music it means symmetry, and it means that I became utterly fascinated by dodecaphonies, the 12-tone technique, which is a kind of circle where all things are connected with each other. I’ve been trying to combine the serial structure with harmony, which has been always extremely important for myself. In fact, serialism…twelve tone series and techniques to use them is a kind of Mandala, which Carl Gustav Jung has been studying so much […] he says this round picture where everything goes in a circle, which exists in all cultures and traditions, it’s an antidote against chaos, says Jung. And this is what it has been for music, an antidote against chaos, which was coming in at the beginning of the century. It still is.23

There is a lot to draw from this statement. This thesis proposes that the pitch circle or Mandala does not just refer to uses of 12-tone rows, but that this circular space forms one network, laying out the 12-tone vocabulary (see previous section). Such a network subsumes other pitch systems, retaining both order and freedom and can be in operation in works that do not feature 12-tone rows. This organisation is also a literal realisation of the way that, as Rautavaara says, ‘all things are connected with each other’. Because this system synthesises modes, diatonic collections, fourths, fifths and 12-tone series, it allows traversing and combinations between them. Therefore, when he combines different pitch collections, this is more than layering self-contained collections: modal configurations are part of a larger, symmetrical order – an ‘antidote against chaos’. When Korhonen states that Rautavaara often combines different stylistic elements within one composition,24 the emphasis should be less on pluralism, as he suggests, but more on the way these elements become part of one, unified system. Absent, therefore, is the specific postmodernist idea of pluralism, collage and fragmentation. Unity was a crucial principle to Rautavaara.

This circular perspective on pitch organisation is suggested by the way he continues to strive for symmetry throughout his career and in the way he often uses recurring interval patterns (thirds, fourths, whole tones, semitones) in addition to rows that feature a wider range of intervals. In discussing dodecaphony as a form of Mandala, he
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also observes how he has pursued the importance of craftsmanship.\textsuperscript{25} Perfecting the craft of a certain approach or modification to dodecaphony is evident in this synthesis from the 80s onwards.

As Chapters 7 and 8 will discuss, Rautavaara uses a neo-tonal language in a way that emphasises symmetry. Consequently, he can be seen as part of a larger context of twentieth-century harmonic and melodic practice that builds on, but differs from, functional tonality. Ernő Lendvai’s “Axis system”,\textsuperscript{26} which he uses to analyse the music of Bartók, helps in perceiving harmonic motions based on tritone relationships, as well as larger subdominant-tonic-dominant zones that are generated from adjacent notes on the circle of fifths. Symmetrical organisations around the tritone feature consistently in Rautavaara’s music. Previous work by George Perle, Elliot Antokoletz and Paolo Susanni on “Interval Cycles” – cyclical and symmetrical configurations made up of a recurring interval or combination of intervals – is useful.\textsuperscript{27} Rautavaara manipulates and expands on these kinds of organisations in particular ways.

In his recent PhD thesis on Rautavaara’s harmonic practice, Samuli Tiikkaja uses a theoretical model that he calls the “Harmonic Circle”,\textsuperscript{28} which is a 24-note cycle of triads (or alternating major and minor thirds) that comprises two interlocking circles of fifths. This work builds on previous systems by Johann David Heinichen, David Kellner, Gottfried Weber, Hugo Riemann and Ernő Lendavi. Tiikkaja uses this arrangement in light of Rautavaara’s extensive use of tertian harmony and the fact that his tonal language does not conform to rules of functional tonality. This system usefully illustrates mediant relations and emphasises the importance of symmetry as an invariant feature of Rautavaara’s harmonic practice.\textsuperscript{29} One potential limitation of this system, though, is that his harmonic language is not limited to triadic harmony – he also uses quartal, quintal, modal and chromatic configurations. It is also important to consider the complex relationships between pitch configurations. The broader view of a flexible pitch system presented in the present thesis is useful in understanding the synthesis in such works as the Eighth Symphony, which does not use a governing 12-tone row. Tiikkaja does not discuss
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this significant piece, choosing only to focus on those later symphonies where he identifies rows.

Exx. 2.1-7 include different configurations of this 12-tone space that feature in Rautavaara’s later symphonies. Whilst all 12 pitches can be distributed as a cycle of fifths or semitones – and both distributions would bring symmetry – fifths fit more with the diatonic and triadic configurations that emerge relatively freely in his later music. Also, both the Sixth and Eighth Symphonies feature fourths and fifths prominently, using these as a structure to interact with diatonic and dodecaphonic operations. Firstly, Rautavaara uses diatonic collections. These might be arranged, for example, in thirds, fourths and fifths, as shown in Ex. 2.1.

![Diatonic set on the Circle of Fifths](image)

**Ex. 2.1: Diatonic set on the Circle of Fifths**

When Messiaen’s modes of limited transposition are viewed in this arrangement, it further reflects how these scales always lay out in a balanced distribution within the larger set of the 12 tones (Exx. 2.2-3.). This balanced distribution is the same regardless of whether it is viewed in the circle of fifths or semitones, showing how they form a natural pivot for accessing different pitch collections. In this visual example it is also immediately apparent how they can connect twelve tone rows with diatonic, pandiatonic or pentatonic systems, helping remove the need for pitch centricity, but fully allowing this to take place at the same time.
Ex. 2.2: Mode 2 on the Circle of Fifths

Ex. 2.3: Mode 6 on the Circle of Fifths
Dodecaphony, serialism and integral serialism, and the symmetrical processes they utilised, were of great importance to Rautavaara. This purpose also motivated his freer 12-tone technique during the late-80s and 90s, where he often structured 12-note rows from two symmetrical or equivalent hexachords that use the same pitch set. The two hexachords (coloured black and red in Exx. 2.4-6) also split the cycle equally. These examples contain prominent rows used by Rautavaara – “Row VI” from Symphony No. 7 – Angel of Light, as identified by Tiikkaja and Stepien,\textsuperscript{30} and “Rows B and C” from Vincent, as analysed by Sivuoja-Gunaratnam.\textsuperscript{31} It is also possible to see how closely these hexachords align with diatonic systems. Although approached more freely, this symmetry brings a sense of order to begin with, which Heininen regarded to be important for Rautavaara.\textsuperscript{32}

Ex. 2.4: “Row VI” from Symphony No. 7 – Angel of Light

\textsuperscript{30} Tiikkaja, ‘Einojuhani Rautavaaran’, 21.
\textsuperscript{31} Sivuoja-Gunaratnam, ‘Vincent – Not Just a Portrait’: 8.
\textsuperscript{32} Interview with Paavo Heininen, April 2018.
Ex. 2.5: Row “B” from *Vincent* and Symphony No. 6 – *Vincentiana*

Ex. 2.6: Row “V” from *Angel of Light*
In Row C from the opera *Vincent*, the two hexachords form an inverse reflection of each other (see Ex. 2.7).

![Ex. 2.7: Row “C” from Vincent and Vincentiana](image)

Outside of 12-tone technique, symmetry is a truly unifying aesthetic that exists in various forms across Rautavaara’s output. It is also a concept that connects serialism with other methods of harmonic and melodic organisation. He started using symmetry from the beginning, as can be seen in his *Three Symmetrical Preludes* (1949/1950) for Piano, which works on the premise of intervallic keyboard symmetry. Symmetry pervades *Arabescata* on several levels. Sivuoja-Gunaratnam observes how this aspect manifests ‘from microscopic details to the global form.’\(^{33}\) Furthermore, Brandon Paul observes how this specific, bilateral keyboard symmetry occurs in a number of his works.\(^{34}\) Harmony is also approached symmetrically, with chords built from superimposed thirds and fourths forming a significant element in the later music. Rautavaara said that he arrived at the concept of composition based on keyboard symmetry independently, before going to Julliard and encountering the similar methods of Olivier Messiaen.\(^{35}\) This is likely to be true, given his relative isolation from central-European compositional trends in the 1950s. Consequently, symmetry can be understood as a central element of Rautavaara’s musical personality and independence.

\(^{33}\) Sivuoja-Gunaratnam, *Narrating with Twelve Tones*, 77.
\(^{34}\) Paul, ‘Bilateral Keyboard Symmetry’.
\(^{35}\) Einojuhani Rautavaara, *Omakuva*, 51.
When Rautavaara went to study in New York with Vincent Persichetti, his teacher was writing a book, *Twentieth-Century Harmony*, published in 1961. The young Finn was one of the students who heard these ideas first-hand as Persichetti was testing them out. Eila Tarasti even locates the notes made by Rautavaara during his lectures with Persichetti, on the progression of “dark” to “light” through different modes. One influential technique was “mirror writing”. The American taught his pupils about polychords, tertian and quartal harmonies, and triads related by tritones. These vertical, intervalllic constructions are reconstructed in Ex. 2.8. Persichetti describes how this twentieth-century technique produces various compound harmonies: ‘In mirror harmony, fundamental chords by thirds, fourths, and seconds generate larger formations of the same category.’ Deriving harmony in such a way, which is essentially rooted in tonal properties but aims to reinterpret these, was a goal both composers shared. Stacking symmetrical harmonies in this way also accentuates the expansive harmonic approach that is so characteristic of Rautavaara’s style.

Ex. 2.8: Persichetti’s illustration of ‘mirror harmony’ possibilities, derived from the harmonic series

**Neo-tonality**

Along with ‘Neo-Romantic’ and ‘mystical’, ‘neo-tonal’ is one of the terms used to describe Rautavaara’s more recent music. Korhonen states that the music from the 1990s onwards has been in ‘a more coherently Neo-Romantic style’. Neo-tonality should not
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be misunderstood as a reversion to traditionalism, however. Many of the composers most influential on Rautavaara were those who were reinvigorating, rather than rejecting, tonal ways of thinking in the mid-twentieth century and he joins this list at the end of the century. The role of Messiaen’s modes has been mentioned, but Stravinsky, Berg, Bartók, Hindemith, as well as Shostakovich and Prokofiev, contributed to stylistic decisions, largely because they viewed modernism as a way of renewing, rather than rejecting, the past. Rautavaara’s continuation of their ways of thinking when it comes to tonality was shaped by following serialism. The fact that Neo-Classicism was a form of modernism in Finland before serialism was introduced explains the harmonic and melodic language in some of his early works that demonstrate the influence of Stravinsky. Partly because of these influences, he made an early breakthrough with *A Requiem in Our Time* (1953).  

According to Tiikkaja, this piece may have led to Sibelius’s recommendation that the young Rautavaara receive a Koussevitzky Foundation Scholarship to study at the Julliard School in New York with Vincent Persichetti. *A Requiem* had won the Thor Johnson competition. This early work contains many of the traits that were to feature prominently in the development of Rautavaara’s style, especially the use of added-note cluster chords resulting in a diluted and de-centralised tonality. This tonal aspect did not truly leave him. For example, aspects of Stravinsky’s music re-occur in later works, such as the second movement of the *Violin Concerto* (1977).

When Rautavaara stopped using serialism, works written during the late-1960s and 1970s sought to renew tonal techniques. Harmonically, works such as *Anadyomene – Adoration of Aphrodite* (1968), *Garden of Spaces* (1971), and *Cantus Arcticus* (1972) use triadic harmonies. Harmonic progression in these pieces, however, operates outside of the diatonic or functional tonal system and the tonality is fresh. The use of modes of limited transposition and synthetic scales results in a horizontal use of melody that shares qualities of diatonicism, whilst also being different, and harmonic changes are often related by thirds. Consequently, the harmonic and melodic pitch range is far more expansive than traditional tonality. These modes therefore play a crucial role in this neo-tonal experimentation. Furthermore, *Garden of Spaces* and *Cantus Arcticus* in particular are both experimental in their use of form and the use of electronic soundscape, respectively.
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40 Mikko Heiniö, ‘Rautavaara, Einojuhani’.
Bearing this stylistic shifting in mind, Rautavaara’s neo-tonality indicates a redressing of the balance between the vertical and horizontal dimensions in music. This particular balance recalls an article by Kokkonen, who regarded the combination of these two dimensions as a recurring challenge for any composer.

Each generation of composers, every single composer, has, either deliberately or intuitively, been forced to solve the problems of how to combine the vertical elements of music with the horizontal. New methods of composition are constantly being devised, new devices invented for solving the problem, but no ultimate solution will, of course, ever be discovered. The composer is therefore still left with the task of finding his own personal answer.\(^{42}\)

The vertical – that is, combinations of harmony and texture heard at one time – was arguably put behind the horizontal organisations of serialism and multi serialism. Therefore, as was present in early works such as Icons (1952), the transformation and continuity of harmonic colour was reasserted. Rautavaara’s most characteristic harmonies are based on superimposed triads and fourths. Having established a broader 12-tone network, a new equilibrium could be sought. Furthermore, a freer approach, with repetition of harmonies, is an important part of this process of combining serialism with neo-tonal harmony.

Rautavaara’s use of harmony and register contributes to the expansive orchestral sound that he sought. Neo-tonality helped express the important visual stimulus of dark and light. This notion can be seen in the continuation of D minor harmonies, especially in the low registers, continuing the cultural associations of “darkness” with this key – see, for example, Symphony No. 3 (1961), the Piano Concerto No. 1 (1969), Angel of Light, the Harp Concerto (1999-2000), Rasputin (2000-03) and Manhattan Trilogy (2004). Rautavaara uses the D minor triad outside of functional tonality and such tertian chords help evoke this range of light and dark in the way that they can occupy the high, middle and low parts of the orchestral register. Tertian harmonic progressions also achieve a sense of expansiveness through their spacing in thirds and slow movement.

On the horizontal level, melodies often use notes that are close together, incurring a quasi-diatonic feeling that emphasises the linear orientation. Rautavaara often enhances this linear motion by doubling the melody in semitones, a particular use of “harmonic

planing”, or parallel harmonies, which bolsters expression by adding more harmonic colour within the melody itself. According to Stępień, Rautavaara sees this highly-characteristic aspect as contributing to the overall sound, stating: ‘In my orchestral output violin notes can be very dissonant; in that way there are added notes which give it more splendour. This is something that conductors cannot always understand’. The resultant dissonance relies on its role within a context that would otherwise be expected to be consonant and diatonic, and therefore sounds somewhat extreme, testing the boundaries of diatonicism.

**Aleatoric writing**

After Rautavaara’s break with serialism, he experimented with aleatoric techniques. This became a significant modernist element for him and helped shape the direction of his future music. Aleatoricism covers a range of techniques, from aleatoric counterpoint to graphic notation and “time-space” notation, all of which he used. Small elements of freedom, that nevertheless take place within a tightly-controlled framework, become an important new element within post-serial pieces, directly informing the transformation of harmonic fields and texture. Such experimentation formed another strand in approaching the balance between the horizontal and vertical.

The work that makes the first big step in this new direction is *Garden of Spaces*, which uses aleatoric counterpoint, where blocks of material are combined and heard simultaneously at the conductor’s discretion. Rautavaara’s balanced perspective becomes apparent at this point, as he continued to use experimental techniques but to a less extreme extent. Considering his alignment with the “happening”, there is some resonance with *Garden of Spaces*, originally entitled ‘Regular Sets of Elements in a Semi-Regular Situation’. The aleatoric structure of this piece actually retains a strong sense of control, revealing a particular manifestation of his critical stance on modernism, whilst still gleaning inspiration from it.

*Cantus Arcticus*, one of Rautavaara’s most well-known works, but one that has a reputation for being a ‘crowd-pleaser’ rather than a totally serious piece, also
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43 For a more detailed discussion of “planing” in Rautavaara’s music, see Leatherbarrow, ‘Angels and Transformations’, 37-38.
45 Howell, *After Sibelius*, 121.
46 Ibid., 122-123.
experiments with performers’ freedom. In the third movement, “Swans Migrating”, the orchestra splits into four groups which each have a limited amount of freedom. The manipulation of these blocks collectively creates the swarming textures at this point in the piece. Rautavaara also utilises “time-space” notation here as well, to a limited degree. The consistent use of Messiaen’s modes of limited transposition also creates a symmetrical “web” of sound, which transforms over time, and against which surface motions take place. This technique went on to influence later symphonies.

Time-space notation reached a peak in the Fifth Symphony. Given the direct parallels with the music of Bergman in works such as Colori ed improvvisazioni (1979), it is likely that Rautavaara’s use of this unconventional notation was influenced by Bergman and Lutoslawski. Where Bergman got this from is less clear, but it is likely to have evolved from his knowledge of the Polish avant-garde – Ilkka Oramo and Tim Howell point out the resemblances between this aspect of Bergman’s technique and Lutoslawski’s limited aleatoricism.48 Rautavaara also acknowledges his aleatoricism to be aligned with that of Lutoslawski.49 In both the Fifth and Sixth Symphonies, synthesis is reflected in the way they balance and assimilate this technique seamlessly alongside more conventional notation, helping achieve the gradual changes in atmosphere that take place in both of these works in different ways. The Sixth Symphony is possibly the last work by Rautavaara that uses time-space notation and he since retained control altogether, discontinuing the use of chance elements in his scores. Limited aleatoricism and time-space notation have informed broad orchestral textures and harmonic “fields” in such later works as the Seventh and Eighth Symphonies, demonstrating a continuation of compositional intentions but removing the already minimal freedom afforded to the performers.

Mysticism and accessibility

It would appear music that is regarded as more accessible often seeks to evoke inaccessible subject matter. Part of why Rautavaara is so widely known outside of Finland is his reputation as a mystic. The success of Angel of Light launched him into huge public recognition. References both to angels and tonality mean that Rautavaara is,
understandably, grouped alongside “holy minimalists”, whose music has strong and overt connections to religious subjects, including Arvo Pärt, John Tavener, and Henryk Górecki. The grouping of these composers in general should, of course, be challenged, but it is worth briefly identifying why they might be placed together. In so doing, it is also important to identify Rautavaara’s relationship with these elements and remain sceptical of the negative criticism that musical simplicity, tonality, mysticism and accessibility have attracted.

These composers are of comparable age. After starting out with modern techniques, they have all established independent styles in comparison to “mainstream” modernism. Most obviously, they have incorporated tonal or modal musical languages – a stylistic choice that has undoubtedly found appeal with wider audiences. The more familiar triadic harmony and extra-musical subject matter, notably on religious or spiritual themes, have made these composers exponents of “alternative” contemporary music, in contrast to the atonality found in the comparatively less “accessible” modern. Other than Sibelius, Rautavaara is the only Finnish composer to have received real attention from Classic FM, who refer to the ‘deeply spiritual’ Angel of Light. Unsurprisingly, their recommended listening is the third movement, ‘Come un sogno’ (‘Like a dream’) – the calm and slow movement that most conforms to the “holy minimalism” label. A search for “Rautavaara” on Spotify will often also prioritise this movement near the top of the suggested list. Works fulfilling these collective criteria are grouped under the heading of “new age” music, with a suitable marketing drive towards opportunities for contemplation and stress management in a busy modern world.

This “new age” musical world was certainly in the minds of the producers of Angel of Light. David Pickett, the conductor of the premiere and the person who commissioned the work for the Bloomington Symphony Orchestra recalls how Rautavaara’s original title for the piece was to be “The Bloomington Symphony”, while he had the title “Angel of Light” in mind but did not want to use it. On hearing this fact, the head of the record exclaimed: ‘With that title I can sell the recording!’ The symphony went on to sell over a million copies and gained several awards. The success is comparable with that of

---


52 Pickett, ““Angel of Light Symphony””.
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Górecki’s Third Symphony, which is sub-titled “Symphony of Sorrowful Songs”, in its wide appeal and popularity.

While this thesis does not wish simply to extract Rautavaara from this “holy minimalist” category, nor leave it otherwise unchallenged, his music has less in common with this group than they have with each other. He was not particularly religious – whilst the choral work *Vigilia* makes explicit reference to the Orthodox tradition, works from his “Angel Series” do not and are more abstract. The angel image has no specific impact on the music, other than the fact that the music grows out of this idea. Rautavaara states that works in the “Angel Series” are not programmatic but that a pair of words, such as ‘Angels and Visitations’ can suffice for an emotional impetus or “mantra” that can inspire the composition.\(^{53}\) Secondly, although parts of the Seventh Symphony might sound minimal or static in nature, this does not characterise much of the piece, which is primarily driven by dramatic oppositions between contrasting harmonies, textures and dynamics. In other words, minimalist-sounding passages are a by-product, rather than the purpose of the music. Furthermore, the inner complexity of passages that are outwardly simple, such as the dodecaphonic opening of *Angel of Light*, means they cover significant harmonic ground. This broad palette is far removed from the minimalistic, seven-note scales and relative modal stasis that consistently occur in music by Pärt and Tavener.\(^{54}\) Rautavaara observes the differences between his music and that of Pärt, pointing to the fact that opposition features heavily in his work while he sees Pärt’s music as more monotonic.\(^{55}\) This view aligns with the spirit of synthesis in Rautavaara’s music, seeking to forge stylistic unity out of seemingly diverse elements, whilst unity in Pärt music is often self-evident in its consistency of atmosphere.

Drawing on the writing of Rilke, Rautavaara refers to ‘terrifying angels’.\(^{56}\) Such a dualistic idea of the angelic became a dramatic principle to create contrasts in works from the “Angel Series”. The clashing of opposing elements, conflict, ambiguity and uncertainty features on many levels, but these seemingly incompatible elements can not only co-exist but be brought into alignment and synthesis. Such synthesis brings a creative

\(\text{\textbf{56}}\) Rautavaara, ‘On a taste for the infinite’: 113.
energy. This music replicates the real-life balance between rationality and those things that are beyond control, permitting a wide range of technical devices all channelled into one vision. A larger notion of balance is also one that Howell regards to be a defining characteristic of Rautavaara’s oeuvre as a whole. While mystical elements – the idea of involving something beyond human understanding – became more prominent in his later music, he sought a balance between the mystical and the development of technical devices.

**A taste for the infinite**

There are other mystical elements in Rautavaara’s music. As part of his stylistic assimilation, he summarises his mysticism as having a ‘taste for the infinite’. This statement describes the way that mysticism is not categorised by any specific religious idea or content, but by a more general fascination with elements that are beyond human control or understanding. An area where this idea comes to the fore is pitch organisation. Rautavaara describes how organising such musical content co-exists with what he saw as its self-generating potential:

Nature does not improvise, nor is it chaotic; it follows strictly the directions of a genetic code, in mutual relation with environmental factors. Within musical material, within its constellations, there lies hidden such a genetic code, the amino acids of the music – all the necessary information is implanted there. The composer is not able to add anything of any significance to this. He must simply find it, and so must be interested in the tendencies of his material.

Rautavaara’s approach to pitch is often to facilitate some kind of self-generating order, where connected pitch structures allow larger developmental processes. This approach explores the limits of the composer’s control, and it is often difficult to trace such connections, especially when he synthesises multiple pitch systems together. This mentality is also intrinsically connected to his self-quotation, which seeks to re-express and re-orientate musical gestures, as Chapter 6 will explore in more depth. Ancient mystical concepts such as Mandala, bringing order and balance, therefore form an overarching mysticism, which results in highly complex and individual organisations of his material.
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57 Howell, *After Sibelius*, 141.
58 Rautavaara, ‘On a taste for the infinite’: 109 and 115.
The rise of the individual

This thesis began with the following quote from Rautavaara:

If an artist is not a Modernist when he is young, he has no heart. And if he is a Modernist when he is old, he has no brain.⁶⁰

This comment is characteristically self-aware and concisely conveys his intention to move away from modernist tribes that reject what has come before. And yet, the integration of modernist techniques cannot be overlooked, as they reveal the thinking behind the progress of this modernist beyond his youth, as he moved from a stance of rejecting the past to one of developing it.

Rautavaara’s personal development is evident throughout both his more extreme modernism and later on, even though he was not actively involved in the third modernist wave that took place in the 1980s. Individualism therefore becomes ever more significant in considering his music, and this issue is also emblematic of his generation. The Finnish composers who embraced serialism so fully were then presented with the challenge of continuing their stylistic paths in an increasingly heterogeneous musical context. He was still emerging from his own wave of modernism – an idea that will form a major theme of this thesis. His relative distance from the new trends in the 80s indicates his role in the dialectical unfolding of Finnish modernism.

⁶⁰Quoted in Andy Gill, ‘Album: Einojuhani Rautavaara’.
3

Journeying in symphonic form

…This journey goes on – whose is it? – Of one who wanders from the end of the journey…beyond time?....

Any large-scale composition establishes a unique balance between a formal process that is linear, continuous or temporal and a framework that is non-linear and architectural. While both of these perspectives rely on each other, it is possible for one of them to be perceived as more significant than the other. An overall emphasis on linearity and continuity can override architectural breaks, such as distinctive movements. Equally, a work that is sounding continuously can, in the right circumstances, be more meaningfully divided into separate stages that make up a larger whole. This chapter focuses on a particular kind of linear organisation in Rautavaara’s Fifth and Eighth Symphonies – the notion of journeying. Although these works are related in some ways (they actually share some material), they comprise two different kinds of journeys, where linearity and slow transformation come together to convey a particular temporal experience.

The perception of large-scale form as linear, as something that unfolds over time, is well established. According to Jonathan Kramer, linearity was expressed through tonality, the form being determined by ordered hierarchies creating what he refers to as the illusion of motion towards the home key. Kramer highlights different perceptions of musical time arising in the twentieth century, meaning that linear time, which emphasises continuity, becomes a choice for composers. If linearity becomes a matter of personal preference for the composer, then it can also be expressed through musical elements beyond functional tonality, such as harmony, melody, texture, dynamics and orchestration.

In an article discussing the rise of ‘moment form’ in the twentieth century, Kramer states how the removal of an ‘a priori of continuity’ came about with the dissolution of triadic tonality. He states: ‘The early posttonal composers were forced to extreme lengths to create contextually a sense of goal-directed motion, since continuity was no longer a given of the system.’ A core principle of linearity in Rautavaara’s music is a process of continuous cause and effect, where what is being heard is a direct result of what has taken

---

1 Rautavaara, Preface to Symphony No. 8.
place beforehand. However, understanding and appreciating this continuity also requires an understanding of those architectural blocks of material that shape it.

In a post-tonal, and post-serial, context, it is significant that linearity features prominently in the formal thinking behind Rautavaara’s later symphonic style. This preoccupation with continuity and organicism is present in his Fifth and Eighth symphonies and the temporal experience of music unfolding is pivotal to an understanding of their formal purposes. This being the case, although triadic harmonies are used in Rautavaara’s later large-scale works, the tonality is attenuated, meaning that linear forms are not driven by tonal organisation or functional harmonic progressions. However, music can still be linear but not functionally tonal, and teleological writing need not be restricted to the establishment of, or return to, the tonic key. Although linearity as a motivation within large-scale form is not new, Rautavaara found fresh ways to manipulate this impulse.

There is engagement here with old ideas of symphonic composition – organic development, transformation, continuity and unity through motivic recurrence. To emphasise linearity, though, the restatement of musical ideas goes beyond circular repetition: the developed restatement of material demonstrates a larger dynamic process. Often, then, linearity is combined with some degree of circularity. The discussion that follows will therefore consider Rautavaara’s formal approaches in relation to principles of ‘rotational form’, as developed by James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy. Considering the Finnish context, Tim Howell argues that the restatement of musical ideas in Magnus Lindberg’s Era (2012) forms a ‘developmental displacement’. A similar prioritisation of progress through restatement, rather than structured, architectural repetition in Rautavaara’s music forms a particular contemporary approach to linearity and symphonic coherence as part of a distinctive musical vocabulary.

**Re-asserting linearity**

Linearity and large-scale forms had always been important to Rautavaara, but early on he had sometimes struggled to assert this impulse to his satisfaction. The multiple revisions of Symphony No. 1 and the predilection around this time for short forms (such as the Seven Preludes and Symphony No. 2) bear this idea out. With Symphony No. 3, he returned to the linear way of thinking, stating that he wanted his music to ‘breathe in long, etc.
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broad, sweeping paragraphs. This juxtaposition between the extended and the miniature informs Aho’s view of the first five symphonies as a ‘dialectical continuity’. Arnold Whittall describes musical form as a ‘constructive or organizing element in music’. Within this definition, there is tension between form as a series of states or sections versus form as a process. For Rautavaara, symphonic form cannot be separated from content. As Whittall says, the ‘argument that formal organization is essentially and inevitably organic reflects the principles of aesthetics formulated during the eighteenth century’. This periodic association indicates Rautavaara’s conscious decision to build on an impulse to allow the content to shape the form. He moves beyond formal categorisation, focusing instead on the essence, the way of thinking behind them.

Unity, organicism, and a sense of a cohesive integration are primary concerns from the Fifth Symphony onwards. He never truly accepted the notion championed by Adorno that music should ‘push beyond totality towards a state of fragmentation’. With this preference in mind, he then draws on his experiences to achieve this unification in a late-twentieth-century context and finds various ways to bring this impulse to life. This inclination towards organicism, and the total interconnectivity between form and content, was a conscious element. In an interview with Martin Anderson, Rautavaara recalls the advice he gave when teaching Composition at the Sibelius Academy:

Don’t ever try to force your music, because music is very wise and it has its own will. It knows where to go. You have to listen to it, to listen your material which you have chosen. Start with that and then the material will dictate where it wants to go. It’s much wiser than you are. Don't push yourself, but try to find out what the music wants to become.

Rautavaara’s belief that his musical ideas were somehow living and sought to influence the composer as to the direction they wanted to develop into resonates with Arnold Schoenberg’s writing on musical form:
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6 Ibid., 99.
8 Arnold Whittall, ‘Form’.
Used in an aesthetic sense, form means that a piece is organized, i.e. that it consists of elements functioning like those of a living organism. [...] The chief requirements for the creation of a comprehensible form are logic and coherence. The presentation, development and interconnexion of ideas must be based on relationship.\[11\]

Whittall acknowledges the difficulty of Schoenberg’s exclusive reference to Classical music, while seemingly advocating a path for contemporary composers.\[12\] Nevertheless, in applying a similar philosophy of logic and coherence, Rautavaara was able to benefit from a contemporary perspective. During the 1980s, Rautavaara’s compositional style crystallised into a state removed from his earlier symphonic experimentations. The symphonic hiatus of 23 years between symphonies Four and Five may well have contributed to the development of a more personal symphonic idiom – a new organising principle in a serious contemporary context, rather than a test-bed for previous compositional approaches. A return to coherence and linear logic, often resulting in a driving lyricism and a vibrant, fresh harmonic language, emphasises the musical process itself.

This period of transition for Rautavaara therefore saw the development of his ability to reconcile those disruptive, contrasting elements that exist within a symphonic work as a whole, but express them in a way that is based on linear coherence, so that events form part of one continuity. He was able to make a conscious decision to return to linearity, in light of his experiences with the avant-garde, where he had deviated from such linear forms. In his later symphonies, therefore, he took notions of motivic development and journeying beyond tonality.

Rautavaara’s Symphony No. 5 (1986) constitutes a high-water mark within his output in terms of uncompromising symphonic narrative. This piece challenges the idea of the symphonic genre itself, which is unsurprising, given that the original intention for the music that became the Fifth Symphony was an orchestral piece called Monologue with Angels. However, its musical continuity and epic proportions led Rautavaara to feel the work was symphonic.\[13\]

---

12 Whittall, ‘Form’.
13 Howell, *After Sibelius*, 120.
The Spiral

Kalevi Aho’s analysis of the overall form of the Fifth Symphony as a ‘widening spiral’\(^{14}\) is now well-established and accepted. In interview, Aho stated that he came up with the spiral metaphor as part of the analysis,\(^{15}\) presumably prompted by the slow transformation and systematically recurring atmospheres in the piece. He also stated that Rautavaara liked this analysis, which the latter also confirms in his autobiography.\(^{16}\) Tim Howell has also emphasised the organic significance, and three-dimensional progress, of large-scale connections between the eight sections that make up this single-movement symphony.\(^{17}\) The notion of returning to a place but being one revolution further up and along a continuous thread of musical thought combines developing variation with constantly-driving, ascending linear progress. Such a ‘free construction’, as Kimmo Korhonen puts it,\(^{18}\) allows an intuitive departure from any traditional symphonic structure. The emphasis on the spiral image as a motivation for the compositional process is a most effective metaphor for focusing on symphonic development and allowing the form to focus on continuity.

In discussing the Fifth Symphony, Rautavaara states his ambitions concerning the large-scale distribution of material.

Because in its continuity and epic form I believe a species of ‘symphonic thinking’ can be heard. Aphorisms and miniatures, bagatelles and preludes, even single movements seemed to me to be a symptom of short-windedness and myopia. I wanted broad horizons, long journeys, far-reaching thoughts.\(^{19}\)

Aho’s presentation of the formal layout of the Fifth Symphony in Ex. 3.1 forces a questioning of the balance between narrative continuity on the one hand and spatial blocks of material on the other. Rautavaara’s handling of these two processes suggests that they are inextricable, each one reinforcing the other. Although such conflation is often intrinsic to symphonic composition, the widening spiral that Aho includes in his summary of the piece suggests a particular emphasis on linear progress and continuity but also has an


\(^{15}\) Interview with Kalevi Aho, April 2018.

\(^{16}\) Rautavaara, *Omakuva*, 328.

\(^{17}\) Howell, *After Sibelius*, 126-127.


\(^{19}\) Quoted in Aho, *Rautavaara as Symphonist*, 98.
immediate visual, three-dimensional appeal. Fitting within this spiral are eight sections (see Ex. 3.1).

Ex. 3.1: Spiral form in Symphony No. 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Bars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>‘Processional’</td>
<td>12-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>‘Chorale’</td>
<td>70-138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>‘Scherzo I’</td>
<td>139-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>‘Chorale’</td>
<td>198-312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>‘Scherzo II’</td>
<td>313-402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>‘Transition’</td>
<td>403-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>‘Coda’</td>
<td>447-93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 This spiral diagram is Howell’s reproduction of Aho’s original example and is found in *After Sibelius*, 127.
How the temporal and the architectural work together, and how a linear spiral motion becomes the driving force for the formal perception, is a complex balance. This shape combines progress and change alongside restatement. There is symphonic development, while something of the constructivist rigor of Rautavaara’s earlier modernism is evident in its segmentation, which seems to have an inevitable logic to it. Contrasts in character mark each section as further along a linear path than its immediate successor, whilst recollections of musical content and atmosphere between non-adjacent sections incurs overall cohesion through large-scale connections. However, as Howell observes, the musical content changes because of the events of the intervening sections, achieving both return and progress – the essence of a spiral. To come full circle in this discussion, the spiral analysis neatly shows a new balance between linear and circular form. In discussing Kaija Saariaho’s Nymphéa (1987), Michael Rofe highlights a ‘fundamental paradox’ between cyclic and linear time as ‘two different modes of temporal expression.’ He recognises this contradiction by identifying cycles of material but presenting these linearly. A negotiation between these two perspectives occurs in a wealth of music, old and new, but Rautavaara’s solution in Symphony No. 5 is to find a way for them to co-exist in a logical continuity, moving away from and returning to familiar atmospheres. There is circular motion, but every revolution is one stage further advanced.

This spiral form closely resembles the idea of rotational form and sonata deformations developed by James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy. Hepokoski and Darcy define rotations as ‘those that extend through musical space by recycling one or more times – with appropriate alterations and adjustments – a referential thematic pattern established as an ordered succession at the piece’s outset.’ This idea originates in Hepokoski’s study of Sibelius’s Symphony No. 5, where he states that ‘a rotational structure is more a process than an architectural formula’ and points out how they align with content-based forms. He combines this rotational principle with the notion of “teleological genesis”, where a musical goal is generated over ‘a rotational structure that progressively becomes more complex or “revelatory” with each cycling.’

---

21 Howell, After Sibelius, 130.
24 Hepokoski, Sibelius: Symphony No. 5, 25.
therefore aligns closely with a moderate modernist mentality and has been identified as an archetype of early modernism.\textsuperscript{26}

The flexibility and potential novelty afforded by content-driven, rotational forms has undoubtedly influenced the construction of Rautavaara’s Fifth Symphony and allows him to channel his own modernist mentality. Furthermore, the combination of large-scale development and rotation comprises a genuinely symphonic trait in the work. However, Rautavaara’s distance from the sonata model, working in the late-twentieth century, means his rotations are not so much a “deformation” of formal models as a bespoke musical form that continues symphonic thinking. Melody, harmony, texture, timbre and dynamics all participate in the spiralling process and, consequently, tonality and themes are not the principal instigators of cyclical processes. Such integration reflects how Symphony No. 5 is a self-confessed example of Rautavaara’s stylistic maturity: ‘…until the Fifth Symphony […] I considered myself a student, more or less, trying to learn what there has been, what there is in western music.’\textsuperscript{27} Another difference to those rotational forms of early modernists is the fact that it takes the entire symphony to return to the opening atmosphere, rather than moving through a series of strophes based on the same material. The closest architectural precedent might therefore be the arch form, to which the structure in Ex. 3.1 has a general resemblance in its proportional symmetry and internal contrast. But such an architectural emphasis is overridden by the spiralling process that avoids a \textit{telos} centred on tonal clarity.

The diversification of a unity through blocks of material is crucial to the shaping, communication and perception of an overall process. The spiral is the more salient perception, but how this is achieved practically is, at a core level, architectural. However, all eight sections are linearly-connected: they can all be traced back through a single-track motion and the movement between these segments is never sudden but gradual and organic. Transitions, therefore, are pivotal to an appreciation of a continuous spiral-like motion. Although each section starts in a specific bar, transitional passages provide a


\textsuperscript{27} Anderson and Rautavaara, ‘Einojuhani Rautavaara, Symphonist’.
merging space between them. This merging distorts the boundaries of each episode, making them less block-like to listen to and more like zones of material which overlap – see A and B, for example, and sections that are vertically-related, such as A and H. Structural markers are fundamental to the construction and appreciation of any symphony but, in this case, a preoccupation with narrative thread and cohesion has broken down their autonomy. Seamless transitions include the sustained note B that links Section A and Section B, as well as, for example, the gathering of momentum through increased rhythmic surface activity and dynamics between Sections C and D. Furthermore, the transition between Sections D and E references directly a sustained note link – this time on the note F, rather than B – from the end of Section A. This is exactly the kind of link that communicates the form, whereby points in the smaller spiral refer back to equivalent moments in the larger one.

Transitional space, where combinations of material take place, also explains an initial problem when faced with Aho’s spiral summary – how to account for musical references between adjacent ‘sections’ before a revolution to the corresponding point on the upper level has taken place. Although Aho observes the reference to the opening chords from the Introduction in ‘Processional’ (Section B), he does not describe how it reinforces the spiral perception. It seems at first that a restatement of material in an adjacent section would undermine the sense of progress from Section A to Section B as a new block of material. One explanation would be that this symphony is one, connected organism. As such, the line connecting the ‘Introduction’ and the ‘Processional’, by necessity, allows combinations of material to take place. Furthermore, the musical characteristics have noticeably changed, marking Section B as new, while recurrence provides continuity. Local-level connections override the sense of block-like distinction between the eight sections and restatements of material in adjacent, contrasting sections effectuate a narrative thread. Tim Howell notes that at least one element is continued from one section into the next.

A similar transitional stage, where material is shared between adjacent sections would be the motion from Section G (actually called ‘Transition’) to Section H (‘Coda’). Section G, by necessity, relates to Section H, making the latter part of a more gradual, phased return. The identification of Section H at bar 447 as an exact upper-level equivalent is useful in mapping out the shape of the spiral, but more significant is the

28 Aho, Rautavaara as Symphonist, 99.
29 Howell, After Sibelius, 134.
sense of constant motion and orientation up-and-around, arriving at a re-interpretation of the ‘Introduction’. Rautavaara achieves this sense of fluidity again through combination, by incorporating references to the opening chords in Section G (‘Transition’) which are broken up by violent interjections before arriving at a purer re-establishment of the repeated C major triads from Section A (‘Introduction’). To experience the linear narrative so strongly implied by Aho’s spiral diagram, there has to be some kind of transitional phasing between G and H, which connects the formal furthest points of C-D-E-F back around to the vertical area of A and H.

These transitions also enact progressive restatements which are central to the sense of enhanced understanding of recurring material unfolding over time. References back to memorable musical atmospheres also open up new contexts, continuing onto something different, whilst simultaneously forming part of one organic entity. Aho describes how during the course of the spiral, ‘new horizons perpetually open up’. This journeying metaphor aligns with Rautavaara’s own view of symphonic composition, and specifically the Fifth Symphony, as a journey: ‘I was wandering through perpetually new vistas and landscapes. It is precisely this that I would call “symphonic” if questioned’. As this way of thinking is applicable to the Eighth Symphony, The Journey, there is a clear connection between these two works.

The Journey

Symphony No. 8 – The Journey explores a different musical journey, but features a similar balance between continual transformation and recurring atmospheres. The image of a spiral – combining continuous movement and restatement – has some resonance with this later work. As with Symphony No. 5, the principle of “rotation” – the gestational process of coming around again in succession – is evident here, as larger connections are visible within multiple levels of linear movement. But the Eighth Symphony also demonstrates the same freedom of construction which allows for the integration of a particular musical language. Given the lack of literature on the Eighth Symphony – a work with a distinctive and complex neo-tonal idiom – exactly how a journey is expressed has yet to be assessed. Symphonic narrative is present, but stretches over four movements.

At the end of every journey (one hopes) is a destination. In this sense, Symphony No. 8 is not just linear but teleological. The sense of arrival is not connected to functional

30 Aho, Rautavaara as Symphonist, 100.
31 Ibid.
tonality, however, despite the presence of triads and temporary pitch centres – pedal points outlay linear structure, while also achieving continuity and unity. Triadic harmony is part of a larger process, rather than being a focal point, and the destination therefore becomes more contextual. The combination of musical factors working towards this end-goal seems to embrace the common human experiences of any journey. An explicit reference to journeying might explain the extrovert, almost Mahlerian, perspective in Rautavaara’s programme note, where he says that the symphonic medium is a ‘journey through the world, through ever-changing landscapes.’ The loud, almost heroic, finale to this symphony stands out in Rautavaara’s symphonic cycle as an optimistic conclusion to his symphonic output. However, the fact that the third movement quotes the opera Thomas, notably an extract where the main character sings about an on-going journey, also alludes to the development of a co-existing psychological journey, alongside a physical one.

A further indication of the significance of linearity is the use of formal and temporal compression. At first glance, the Eighth Symphony has a traditional layout: four movements, with a Scherzo second movement and slow third movement. However, in terms of its duration, this is a comparatively short piece, a typical performance lasting between 27 and 29 minutes and is therefore approximately the same length as the single-movement Symphony No. 5 – a thematically economical work that lasts for over 30 minutes. That the Eighth Symphony has four movements, with a pause between three of them, means this work feels longer when it is not that different. This impression results from the different organisation of a symphonic journey. Each movement forms a stage within a larger development, and each varies the pace. While the slow third movement is more reflective and circular in comparison to the dynamism in others, and offers brief respite, it is nevertheless part of a linear sequence, referring to earlier and future events.

Formal compression works alongside the concise and coherent development of an ascending-fourths motif throughout, bringing a sense of orientation that transcends individual movements, and making it more necessary to view this piece as one process. This motif (Ex. 3.2) provides the basis for linear transformation and is a recognisable element moving through changing musical landscapes. As Rautavaara states, this motif, forms the identifying feature of the entire work. The unifying properties of this motif go beyond the fact that it is repeated. With its transformations, transpositions and extensions,

---

32 Howell, After Sibelius, 125.
33 Rautavaara, Preface to Symphony No. 8.
it is also a link, a pivot into new harmonic regions and sections of the piece. Chapter 7 explores this notion of an expansive harmonic language in much more depth.

Ex. 3.2: *The Journey*, ascending-fourths motif

An overview of the formal journey of the entire symphony is shown in Ex. 3.3. Departing from and returning to this musical idea drives large-scale rotations.
Ex. 3.3: Formal summary of *The Journey*
Departure

There is a purpose to the block-like divisions of the four movements. The first (Adagio assai) makes significant progress into the journey, emerging into a broad, relatively static space. This movement is further sub-divided into sections that articulate change and achieve coherence. Whilst this movement does not conform to any sonata form plan, Rautavaara retains certain core principles of development and unity that aid in shaping and expanding linear continuity. Therefore, a tripartite model that bears some relation to an Exposition – Development – Recapitulation would be: Statement – Development – Emergence. As shown in Ex. 3.4, these broad phases have sub-sections that illustrate the continual development running throughout, while this continual musical transformation also returns to familiar places. The use of repetition or restatement as a purely architectural device is completely avoided. At all times the emphasis is on the overall effect of cumulative growth that these structural markers articulate.

Sonata form is a specific category of developmental formal thinking. Its flexibility has been explored by James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy and their concept of sonata “deformations”, where deviations from ‘normative procedure’ often result in the most expressive or novel aspects of the work. The difference with Rautavaara is the way he consciously uses linear formal processes, but from a position of greater distance from the past. This makes it possible to draw on the deeper, renewable notions of tension and resolution behind sonata form, whilst simultaneously drawing on his wider experiences.

---

34 Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 614.
Ex. 3.4: Formal outline of *The Journey*, 1st mvt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tempo</th>
<th>Adagio assai  ( \text{\textbullet} = \text{c.46} )</th>
<th>Poco più mosso  ( \text{\textbullet} = \text{c.50} )</th>
<th>Tempo primo  ( \text{\textbullet} = \text{c.46} )</th>
<th>Poco più mosso  ( \text{\textbullet} = \text{c.52} )</th>
<th>Andante assai  ( \text{\textbullet} = \text{c.60} )</th>
<th>Tranquillo  ( \text{\textbullet} = \text{c.56} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Emergence</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Trans.</td>
<td>Section C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Section A Intro</td>
<td>Section B</td>
<td>Section A1</td>
<td>Section B2</td>
<td>Trans.</td>
<td>Section C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prolonged pedals</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G#</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Thematic development significantly affects the formal trajectory throughout *The Journey*. The introduction (bars 1-12) crystallises the pivotal ascending-fourths motif (Ex. 3.5) following a series of gradually ascending melodic lines. The early part of the first movement introduces melodic material that grows out of this motif and gradually transforms over the course of the movement. As well as stemming from this motivic germ, melodies share rhythmic similarities, thereby generating coherence and continuity.

Although the section between bars 48 and 91 is clearly developmental, containing aspects of thematic and motivic deconstruction, the larger emphasis is on continued exploration, not fragmentation. The return of the introductory material (see Ex. 3.6) from bars 1-12 in bar 48 is more than simple repetition: it is extended by a second wave (bb. 53-63) and forms a widened reinterpretation of recent events. The music has progressed further along a continuous process. As with the Fifth Symphony, restatement becomes dynamic rather than static when similar, but extended, events are displaced over time. This development

Ex. 3.5: *The Journey*, 1st mvt., crystallisation of ascending-fourths motif, bb. 1-15
of the introduction moves purposefully towards a transposed restatement of the ascending-fourths motif which then resolves into a new harmonic realm – centred on an E pedal in bar 63.
Ex. 3.6: The Journey, 1st mvt., return of introductory material, bb. 48-69
This extended restatement achieves an increased sense of forward motion. The combination of the restated but linearly-developed material (motivic and thematic) becomes the focus of the journeying progress, passing into a different context or landscape. In addition, the undeniable effect here is not just of linear progression, but also of ascension. The impression that the E-centred harmonic area, achieved through the directional horn melody from bar 57 is of being on a higher harmonic level. This process recalls the spiralling form of the Fifth Symphony, but the melodic continuity makes this symphony especially organic. The three-dimensional sense of restating something, but being a level higher in a continuous process is a significant feature of Rautavaara’s approach to large-scale temporal form, and demonstrates partly how the auditory illusion of motion in the journey of this symphony can take place.

The idea of outgrowth or extension taking place as part of this section is shown in the developed return in bar 63 of the first interrupted theme from bar 13. This theme is extended as part of its development, before passing onto a melodic continuation in the strings over bars 67-73. Therefore, the awareness of this theme becomes a temporal experience – it is never heard as a satisfactorily complete and self-contained thematic idea in this movement. Rather than being stated in an extended fashion at the beginning of the work, it is a thematic presence that is continually in a state of transformation.

The purpose of the transition between bars 92 and 95 is to build momentum and break through into the Andante ‘Emergence’ section at bar 96 (see Ex. 3.7). This is a continuous thread, producing tension followed by release. The change of tempo at bar 92 to Poco piu mosso contributes to this gathering of momentum, but the real temporal manipulation is achieved through an increased rhythmic surface activity in Ex. 3.7, creating the impression of acceleration towards an emergence. This acceleration takes place over the extremely concentrated musical time of four bars and pushes towards the Andante section at bar 96. With the preconceived notion of journeying in the listener’s consciousness, Rautavaara conveys a teleological sense of opening into an expansive space. The structural significance of bar 96 is clear, and so therefore is the need to distinguish this section, but, at the same time, its emergence from a temporal process is fundamental.

Arnold Whittall, in discussing musical form as an organising principle, points out how form (an organic sequence of events) and content (‘plots and actions’) are difficult to
separate when discussing the character of an art-work. Furthermore, Whittall explains how this difficulty has been a ‘determining factor in studies of musical form which aspire to rise above the purely pedagogical.’ This view is encouraging when, in Rautavaara’s case, the underlying nature of form is the unique shaping of musical content. His formal approach is characterised by organic growth, meaning that significant structural markers in the Eighth Symphony, such as the ‘Emergence’ section from bar 96, are the result of a cause-and-effect process that drives ever forwards. The cause in this case is the gradual unfolding of melodic material. From this perspective, the movement reaches a natural culmination, rather than a recapitulation. It is worth remembering, however, that received expectations of formal categories are often explained by the way they articulate a process – for example linear re-establishment of the tonic key in Sonata Form. Indeed, as Whittall observes, formal categories, such as chaconne or minuet and trio provide a ‘common organisational underpinning for an infinite variety of musical materials and compositional procedures’. Nevertheless, in the context of the late-twentieth-century symphony, it is necessary to focus on a process which can be shaped in a number of bespoke ways, rather than architecture-based genres.

35 Arnold Whittall, ‘Form’.
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Ex. 3.7: The Journey, 1st mvt., transition into Andante assai section, bb. 92-99

The ‘Emergence’ section includes elements of restatement and resolution, brought on by the return of the fourths motif. But it also reaches a level of stability through its more expansive use of harmony and melody. Alongside the tempo change to Andante is a broad, fully orchestrated and expansive melody, with phrases longer than any up to this point in the work. This melody sounds new, but within its DNA are recognisable elements from earlier, fragmented statements of material. Melodic synthesis therefore leads to a new, transformed form. However, although thematic shapes are somewhat recognisable in
the make-up of this melody from bar 96, they are constantly changing. Through melodic transformation and metamorphosis they collectively form an overall organism. Again, there is evidence of re-contextualising old but renewable symphonic concepts. This broad view of form as a process recalls Scott Burnham’s argument for linearity in Beethoven’s music, and how an ever-present fundamental line is achieved through such musical values as thematic development allowing coherence in expansive stretches. In discussing the significance of melody-driven linearity, Burnham states:

The resultant line is of course not melodic in the everyday sense of a prominent and foregrounded voice set against a background accompaniment. Instead, the entire texture is heard to participate in the fundamental illusion of melody, that of motion through time, and thus to partake of melody’s sense of unfolding presence.  

In a very similar way, every aspect of this passage of the first movement works to create an effect of projected motion involving the entire texture, and Rautavaara continues this principle within a fresh, quasi-tonal idiom. This is largely possible through the adaptability of the thematic ideas presented from bars 1-39 and, revealingly, their characteristic similarities and interconnectivity that allow them to be freely combined as a structural breakthrough of melodic growth.

The expansiveness and relative stability at the close of the first movement is also emphasised through pedal points. The D pedal from bar 96 in Ex. 3.6 is prolonged for 10 bars, providing structural stability underneath a slowly-changing harmonic movement. The descending minor third (F-E-D) outlined in the bass during this section recalls the same outlined interval in the introduction (B♭-A-G). As both the beginning and the end of the movement are relatively static, the section from bar 96 reflects on the progress undertaken so far. These sections form a soundscape similar to the Klang effect that James Hepokoski observes in such works as Sibelius’s Symphony No. 5. These moments illustrate stages along the journey. While this piece works outside of tonal operations, the interval of an ascending perfect fifth (G-D) between the pedal tones in bars 1 and 96 brings an underpinning logic to the transformation that takes place in this final section. This moment reveals Rautavaara’s visual instincts, as the music emerges into a new landscape.

Following this emergence, the first movement does not settle completely on a D pedal and is in fact still transforming, albeit more gradually. After changing to a pedal on

---

F♯ in bar 111, the coda (*Tranquillo*), beginning at bar 119, pushes further forward into yet new harmonic territory, this time centred on a non-triad but extremely lengthy D♯ pedal. This stability, combined with multiple, varied restatements of the fourths motif, establishes the end of the first stage of the journey, as the extended D♯ pedal provides a satisfactory, but temporary, resolution. This closing section does not prolong a tonal resolution; rather, resolution is achieved through non-tonal means, because of the sustained D♯ pedal – a new context – and comparatively static harmony.

Large-scale connections between sections establish linear coherence throughout the movement. Ex. 3.8 shows harmonies that appear at strategic moments, forming small stages of arrival and the brackets in this example show similarities or common notes between these vertical pitch collections. This harmonic summary shows how there is opposition between harmonies that predominantly use white notes and those that predominantly use black notes, and how these illustrate large-scale harmonic connections, shown with brackets in Ex. 3.8. The long D♯ pedal which closes this movement, and the harmony above it, is foreshadowed therefore in bars 35 and 74. The idea of a linear logic unfolding over time is further suggested through the horizontal relationship between notes at the top of the orchestrated triad in each case. These emphasise intervals such as fifths, semitones and thirds.

![Ex. 3.8: Large-scale harmonic connections in The Journey, 1st mvt.](image)

**Progress and reflection**

The second and third movements comprise two very different stages along this journey, providing shifts in pace and dynamism. The second movement (*Feroce*) is a fast *Scherzo* with a Rondo-type structure – although, once again, architectural sections support dynamic, goal-directed motion. Following the slow conclusion to the first movement, this
Scherzo re-starts the motion with renewed decisiveness and purpose, pushing towards a new section beginning at bar 19. The swift and frequent shifts through triads (two to every bar) imply urgency: the music proceeds in a direction, but the lack of functional tonal relationships between the triads mean the destination is uncertain.

The return of Section A is varied each time, emphasising linear progress and orientation towards a new context. Although the movement returns to material from the opening, its effect is that of an accelerated spiral. The second melodic section (Section C in Ex. 3.2) uses shorter note values, creating the illusion of acceleration. The movement also orientates towards a new statement of the fourths motif over bars 84-85. The directional energy and fast pace means this statement of the motif is perceived as a transitional breakthrough; the *attacca* transition into the slow third movement (*Tranquillo*) gives the motif the dual function of a local goal and a gateway into a new context. The emphasis on continuity and dynamism again creates the effect of projected emergence, in this case into the more circular slow movement.

Although the third movement is reflective and less dynamic, it has motion or growth. Alongside the organic movement towards another re-interpretation of the fourths motif in bars 73-74, there is a steady, circular development of a new theme which is passed over to the strings and rises to a restrained peak, before returning to its original statement in the solo horn at bar 76. Temporal development is therefore contained to a small space. This slow movement brings tranquillity and an opportunity for reflection – as seen through its circularity – but this reflection is on the musical progress so far in the overall symphony. The self-quoted melody over bars 37 to 72 is taken from the opera *Thomas*. Thomas sings this melody to the words ‘This journey goes on – whose is it? – Of one who wanders from the end of the journey…beyond time?…’. This evocation of a different kind of journey adds to the reflective mood of this movement.

Towards the “ever-lasting sea”

The main role of the fourth movement (*Con grandezza*) is to push towards the destination that forms the end-point of the entire symphony with renewed energy and determination. There are two principal effects: the first is a gathering of forces – the synthesis and assimilation of various materials from the first three movements – while the second is channelling those forces and directing them towards the ultimate destination that is promised. The latter is achieved through cumulative combinations of this material projected through an extended linear process.
Rautavaara refers to the finale as a ‘broad stream’ that flows onto ‘a broad estuary – the everlasting sea.’\(^{40}\) Although this is not a programmatic piece, the idea of an elemental, fluid and inevitable motion through time becomes a useful metaphor that demonstrates his visual stimuli. The musical processes behind this metaphorical, linear force are quite clear. Firstly, there is an expansion of thematic material. As Ex. 3.3 shows, a broader ternary structure contains subdivided blocks of material (bars 40-95), each re-introducing respectively the thematic ideas heard in movements one to three. The effect of this is a gathering of elements in one movement, and previous passages that share thematic connections, rather than being truly episodic, are now revealed to be parts of a larger temporal narrative towards an end-point. This idea aligns with Arnold Whittall’s assertion that, in Sibelius’s Third Symphony, there is coherence so cumulative that moments of extreme contrast, such as the second subject material in the first movement, achieve contrasted but connected continuation.\(^{41}\) In Rautavaara’s case, however, this effect is put to extremely dynamic use and, unlike Sibelius, contrast is not tonal, but based on shifts between melodic materials that are already connected.

A second way in which a sense of broadening is conveyed is through combinations of temporal levels, an example being the retention of large phrases of the third-movement theme from bars 54 to 69 combined with the faster, rhythmic surface activity of the strings. Thirdly, the fourths motif is literally broadened in the final movement. Over bars 35 to 37, the motif is in an inverted form and climbs up a succession of ascending fifths, allowing for a descent of six perfect fourths. The effect is an audible expansion: the motif has been pushed further in terms of horizontal pitch separation than ever before. Finally, the closing chord – a musical representation of the “everlasting sea” – is based on D but is non-triadic. This chord is spaced in fourths predominantly, achieving a broadness of sound and a horizon-like sense of stability and symmetry.

This issue of non-triadic, contextual resolution achieving a sense of arrival is significant when considering the traditional role of triadic tonality and an idea of “home”. Richard Cohn describes how the sense of “home” in Wagner’s *Götterdämmerung* is shattered when an E major triad is combined with its ‘hexatonic pole’, C minor, but that in some deep sense this hexachord is a consonance because of its triadic orthography.\(^{42}\)

---

\(^{40}\) Rautavaara, Preface to *Symphony No. 8*.


Although triads can be formed from the closing chord to *The Journey*, and these notes come from a diatonic set, it grows out of the quartal, rather than triadic, harmonies that close the piece. This comparison reveals the different ways in which consonance and dissonance (which are relative terms that depend on their context) can be manipulated when triads are so engrained in our cultural consciousness of safety. While *Götterdämmerung* features a triad-generated dissonance, *The Journey* features a fourths-generated consonance that emerges as the end-result of a continuous process. Every element of this piece – every tension and resolution – can be traced back to this interval.

This spatial expansion effect is combined with the illusion of gathering pace and momentum as the symphony rushes towards its destination. The impression of three-dimensional motion is a driving force behind the flexibility of the form. In bar 130, an altered version of the third movement’s lower-neighbour-note figure is introduced – the criterion for recognising this figure is primarily rhythmic. The reduced space between each time this figure is heard over bars 130 to 138, and its rhythmic diminution in this movement, contributes to the impression of gathering speed, even though the tempo does not actually alter. These statements of the figure also follow an ascending pattern, which adds to the sense of momentum. This rhythmic manipulation intensifies the perception of gathering intensity, energy and forward momentum.

Temporal manipulation is further enhanced with the final statement of the rising-fourths motif in bar 140. The return of this pivotal musical idea in its original crotchet rhythm re-affirms the awareness of the original tempo. Again, Rautavaara seems to combine two levels of action: firstly, there is the temporal illusion of local-level acceleration but, when taking in the broader soundscape, it is revealed to be a part of something more steadfast. Eric Clarke argues that a sense of musical motion is often conveyed through rhythm and tempo, and the audible impression of motion in this culmination point of the Eighth Symphony is achieved rhythmically and texturally. He points out that the idea of motion in music can only ever be metaphorical, as musical sounds cannot move through space like any physical object, but that it also has basis in the real world of musical performance (bowing, blowing, plucking, striking). While the musical objects in *The Journey* are metaphorical, such environmental actions add to this dynamic sense of ebb and flow. As Clarke goes on to discuss in relation to Berg’s opera

---
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Wozzeck, metaphorical musical motion can be signified through changes in musical elements, in this case the texture and dynamic changes in two crescendos which achieve a ‘sense of highly-focused and unswerving approach.’\(^{45}\) The effect of acceleration at the end of the Eighth Symphony achieves metaphorical movement – it will only ever be an image, an impression in the listener’s consciousness – but the real motion in pitch and rhythm means it is heard as accelerating from one point to another, and that is the unidirectional motion that Rautavaara intended to achieve.

This idea of perceiving movement and acceleration aligns with A. B. Marx’s view on the nature of Sonata and Rondo forms. As Burnham summarises, for Marx, ‘the fundamental nature of musical form is not structure, or balanced repetition, but motion.’\(^{46}\) Such projection remained active in the context of the late twentieth-century symphony. This notion of movement, in turn, recalls Charles Rosen’s view that drama characterises the action of sonata form,\(^{47}\) whereby the exposition presents a polarisation of tonalities (i.e. a conflict),\(^{48}\) while the development conveys the highest point of tension. Meanwhile, the recapitulation brings a ‘dynamic closure analogous to the denouement of eighteenth-century drama, in which everything is resolved, all loose ends are tied up, and the work rounded off.’\(^{49}\) While it is true that, as Peter A. Hoyt says, the large-scale repetition in certain sonata forms calls for a somewhat liberal idea of drama as a linear narrative,\(^{50}\) the essential dramatic idea of progress towards a resolution is entirely transferable. In Rautavaara’s case, though, the finale’s resolution is less of a neat “tying-up” of loose ends as the final stage of an inevitable motion towards an expansive musical horizon. This resolution is perceived as natural and elemental. The points of conflict are seen principally through the perceived directional uncertainty (harmonic and melodic) that characterise much of this work. The symphonic predilection for unity and drama proved renewable and capable of existing in new formats.

**Teleological significance**

In Rautavaara’s linear, large-scale forms, content is not only inseparable from form, but largely determines it. There is also the intention in his later symphonic style to re-establish
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\(^{45}\) Ibid., 76.
\(^{46}\) Burnham, *Beethoven Hero*, 79.
\(^{48}\) Ibid., 25.
\(^{49}\) Ibid., 10.
a teleological coherence, as Symphony No. 8 works holistically towards the journey’s destination. There are elements of large-scale tonal connections – the role of D as a harmonic centre is significant – but the tonality in this symphony is reduced and ambiguous, becoming just one factor within a wider teleological process.

Extrovert goal-orientation further reveals how the music embraces aspects of contemporary human experience, in this case an awareness of time and the unfolding of events that lead somewhere. However, whilst it is true that journeys are inherently teleological, the structural purpose is defined just as much by the events along the course, as well as the eventual arrival. The process allows growth, progress and change to occur. There is less a sense of active urgency with this symphony as a kind of natural inevitability. Much like Symphony No. 5, the Eighth therefore differs from the hard-won establishment of a tonal key – a linear struggle within the symphonic canon that occurs in such Nordic works as Sibelius’s Symphony No. 5 (1919) and Nielsen’s Symphony No. 5 (1922).

In terms of broader connections, however, issues of continuity, goal-orientation, and the fact that Rautavaara’s own Fifth Symphony is in one continuous movement that re-visits events at various points, demonstrate a broader affinity with Sibelius. While Rautavaara’s Fifth and Eighth Symphonies contain contrasting elements incurring drama, ultimately everything counts and contributes as part of one continuum to support a larger, focused orientation towards a conclusion. The formal emphasis in Sibelius’s Fifth Symphony on a single, organic process,\(^5\) as well as the ‘layers of activity’ that Howell identifies in his Seventh Symphony\(^6\) suggest a precedent to the practice of subjecting the same material to a complex, multi-level array of transformations. The emphasis on slow transformation in the Rautavaara’s Fifth Symphony and the elemental force of his Eighth highlight how deep formal processes, continuity, and linearly-driven forms are important aspects of certain Nordic symphonies. He continues this way of thinking within a new musical idiom, especially in the way developmental formal processes work beyond tonal resolution.


\(^{6}\) Howell, ‘Sibelius the Progressive’, 43.
**Journeys and Spirals**

The temporal process in the Fifth Symphony is characterised by recurring atmospheres and slow transformation – something that unfolds temporally and only makes full sense in retrospect. This retrospective, temporal understanding of form is common to both the Fifth and the Eighth Symphonies. The terms “spiral” and “journey” overlap in their meaning – indeed, the opening note to Symphony No. 5 describes the spiral as a journey that ‘presses ever forwards.’ Just as there is a journey within a spiral in Symphony No. 5, the formal journey of the Eighth Symphony can be understood in terms of three-dimensional spiralling processes. Large-scale revolutions gradually return to a place that is familiar but also changed. This process happens over the four movements and centres on statements of the fourths motif – a source of unity and continuity.

The most powerful impression of spiralling back around to a new perception of material occurs with the final return of the ascending-fourths motif at the end of the fourth movement, where there is a retrospective understanding of the complete journey. In this culmination, the fourths motif fits within the secured arrival of the diatonic, ‘broad-estuary’, chord that closes the work. This harmonic closure is the final reinterpretation of this motif, becoming the object through which the arrival at the journey’s destination is perceived. This return, although unaltered, is perceived differently, due to the experience of the intervening material.

Like Symphony No. 5, the form forces a questioning of the meaning of restatement, as reinterpretations of familiar content become the larger narrative. When familiar material occurs within an altered context, the listener is made to feel that the journey they have undertaken into this new context makes it impossible to go back. In both works, transitions are pivotal to conveying continual transformation, as these often create the momentum required to enforce a perception of moving up and around to a new level.

---
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Moving forwards, looking back

Notions of journeying, temporality, continuity and spiralling connect Rautavaara’s Fifth and Eighth Symphonies in a deep sense. These works explore new and varied ways of realising these symphonic inclinations. These forms have much in common with the past, but new content and vocabularies re-shape them. Both pieces are concerned with the psychological significance of moving onwards-and-upwards and striving towards a renewed understanding of the same musical issues. However, even though such resolution occurs, both symphonies end with the impression that they are not completely closed. Like a spiral, there is a sense of the infinite – a constantly-renewing horizon, or the ‘ever-lasting sea’.

These notions of journeying reach out to non-musical contexts and metaphor. The impression of unified movement allows listeners to engage with the music on its own terms and experience various metaphorical perceptions. Journeying here might include the musical process, a journey of musical style, some kind of dramatic narrative or a journey through an imagined environment, based on the musical regions that are passed through. In short, the intention to convey a dramatic temporal experience and a sense of inertia is an integral part of the symphonic forms in these cases. There is also an issue around control. Viewing form as an organic process, Rautavaara aligns musical form with elemental forces, an ever-present source of motion and inertia. As his particular aims with the symphonic form became clearer, looking back in order to continue to move forwards became ever more valuable.
Visual and spatial influences on form

Rautavaara was, without doubt, a visual composer. Visual and spatial aspects have influenced his music, and symphonic form, in a particular way. After considering new approaches to linear time in Chapter 3, this chapter considers this alternative, spatial perspective, focusing on Symphony No. 6 – *Vincentiana* (1992) and Symphony No. 7 – *Angel of Light* (1994) to understand how such conceptualisations are equally important in influencing an understanding of large-scale form.

Cross-relations between music and visual influences

Painting was Rautavaara’s first art form and he has written about how, as a child, he would paint music on paper using watercolours,¹ not starting to compose in the usual sense until he was 17. This early confluence of composing and distributing colours from a palette must have had an influence on his music and, as this chapter will go on to discuss, Rautavaara acknowledged using 12-tone rows as “pigments” in the opera *Vincent* (1986-87),² as Chapter 7 explores more fully. Painting was always important to him. In the 1997 documentary ‘The Gift of Dreams’, he admitted to completing at least one painting a year alongside composing.³ The intriguing, childhood notion of ‘painting’ music suggests an inextricable relationship between these two art forms and a transferrable mentality in assembling and distributing materials, shapes, and colours to create form. Wojciech Stepień also points out how, when Rautavaara returned to painting in the 1970s, his first picture of this period shares its title with his double bass concerto, *Angel of Dusk*.⁴

More broadly, other, non-musical visual stimuli crop up persistently across his output. Having some kind of visual inspiration is one of the few truly unifying aesthetics of his collective works. His preoccupation with the specific image expressed by Rainer Maria Rilke that ‘every angel is terrible’ plays a significant role as a visual mantra in

generating the music that came to be the “Angel Series”.\textsuperscript{5} As discussed in Chapter 2, Rautavaara also acknowledges the influence of the Mandala, with its ancient emphasis on symmetry and creating order out of chaos. Symmetrical intervallic construction plays a significant role in Rautavaara’s harmonic processes,\textsuperscript{6} and this idea of vertical symmetry, both chromatic and diatonic, will be discussed in depth in Chapters 7 and 8. Furthermore, the journeying forms in Symphonies 5 and 8 can pass through different atmospheres or landscapes, emphasising that these large-scale forms are not easy to disconnect from some kind of external image.

Rautavaara’s interest in other art forms led to inspiration from paintings, drama and poetry. His transference of material from operatic and choral works into new, orchestral formats suggests the influence of dramatic and visual aspects on more absolute works. Certain compositions also draw a kind of inspiration from a static image or idea that persists in Rautavaara’s psyche. The image of the Unicorn, an icon that he describes in his autobiography as his ‘coat of arms’,\textsuperscript{7} appears in several works, including \textit{Serenades of the Unicorn} (1977), \textit{Monologues with the Unicorn} (1980), both for guitar, and the cantata \textit{True and False Unicorn} (1971/2000). The composer was also drawn to the mysterious and dramatic image of the disappearing boat at the end of Edgar Allan Poe’s book \textit{The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym of Nantucket}, stating that this book provided him with a lasting image that influenced the orchestral work, \textit{On the Last Frontier} (1997).\textsuperscript{8} Rautavaara comments on the multiple interpretations of the title of this piece, reflecting the uncertainty of the story from which it originates. The extra-musical allusions in his music – avoiding any obvious and narrow programme – suggest a wider affiliation with the multiple perspectives that can derive from visual art. The idea that music can reach beyond purely absolute formats is an important element within Rautavaara’s compositional aims.

\textbf{Musical paintings and non-linear narrative}

In his opening notes to the score of \textit{Vincentianiana}, Rautavaara states that, just as the opera \textit{Vincent} (1986-87) is based on the life and works of Vincent van Gogh, so the Sixth

\textsuperscript{5} See \textit{The Gift of Dreams}, 08:14, and Rautavaara (trans. Susan Sinisalo), Preface to Symphony No. 7 – \textit{Angel of Light} (Helsinki: Warner/Chappell, 1996), iii.

\textsuperscript{6} For a detailed discussion of symmetry in Rautavaara’s keyboard works, see Paul, ‘Bilateral Keyboard Symmetry’.

\textsuperscript{7} Einojuhani Rautavaara, \textit{Omakuva}, 139.

\textsuperscript{8} \textit{The Gift of Dreams}, 46:00-47:16.
Symphony is based on that earlier opera. What is less clear is the extent to which the Sixth Symphony – being thus once removed from the original dramatic source – absorbs or rejects the story of Vincent within this new symphonic context. This thesis will go on to discuss the role of self-quotation in Rautavaara’s music in Chapter 6, but his re-use of material in this case presents an intriguing grey area between absolute symphonic events and visual influence. Vincentiana preserves sections of material in the opera that correlate with specific paintings by van Gogh. These passages are relatively self-contained. Ex. 4.1 identifies these extracts and other episodes from Vincent and their placement in this new, continuous symphonic context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vincent</th>
<th>Vincentiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extract</td>
<td>Painting depicted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Auvers’in” – Orchestral Prelude (Act III)</td>
<td>“The Church at Auvers” (June, 1890)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Niin on siis teidan lyotava” (“So it is your way”) – Vincent, Chorus (Act II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ex. 4.1: Common material between Vincent and Vincentiana**

The dramatic aims of the opera influence the formal experience of the later symphony through the fundamental common perception of non-linear narrative. The essential effect is that a listener is presented with events out of order, but is relied upon to realign them retrospectively into a timeline. The libretto of Vincent opens in the asylum in Saint-Rémy, where van Gogh is resident and the story proceeds as a series of flashbacks. Erkki Arni describes the story of Vincent as a ‘long flashback’, which moves through events in the character’s life in retrospect; indeed, Rautavaara – who also wrote the libretto – states

---

that almost everything in the opera could be either a dream or a flashback.\(^\text{11}\) There is an emphasis in the opera on never being completely sure where one stands in the timeline, as Vincent’s memories and dreams merge into one constant flux. Anne Sivuoja-Gunaratnum concisely points out how this psychological, subjective dramatic perspective is a recurring one in Rautavaara’s operas from this period, including *Thomas* (1982-85), *Vincent* (1986-87) and *The House of the Sun* (1989-90): ‘The heroes escape their brutal reality into an imaginary journey into the past, where real memories and unfilled illusions and hopes get fused into a kaleidoscopic pattern.’\(^\text{12}\)

How do the paintings fit into this non-linear continuity? As Ex. 4.1 shows, these images are recreated exactly in the Sixth Symphony. In discussing the opera, Arni describes the paintings as ‘waymarks’.\(^\text{13}\) A better word here might be “signposts”. Whilst the musical pictures do not guide us through a chronological story-line, they do help orientate to and from certain musical states or atmospheres, highlighting the sensation that the story merges between past and present. This notion is supported by their ordering in the opera. According to Stępień, each of these paintings is representative of a significant moment in Vincent’s life,\(^\text{14}\) but it is worth adding that they are presented out of order. “Wheatfield with Crows” was painted in 1890, after van Gogh had been admitted to Saint Remy, and yet in *Vincent*, it is placed before his admission to the asylum. Such non-linearity reflects how Rautavaara presents Vincent’s life without recourse to a timeline. The ordering of these visual events, it seems, is less significant than arriving at a stage where they have all been heard. This makes the final movement of the symphony, “Apotheosis”, the aggregate of a non-linear narrative – a kaleidoscope of previous experiences.

In a similar way to the opera, the paintings in the symphony function as signposts that help in navigating the complex back-and-forth narrative. Residing in this more absolute symphonic context is the influence of memory – the means by which events can proceed non-linearly, with the past, present and future hopes all merging as one experience. Visual elements play a crucial role in this process, as they quickly establish a subjective atmosphere. They also contribute to a particular approach to symphonic form, as these images are re-contextualised.
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\(^{11}\) Sivuoja-Gunaratnum, *Rautavaara as Opera Composer*: 42.
\(^{12}\) Ibid.
\(^{13}\) Arni, ‘Vincent’.
These paintings do not literally depict any details of these paintings in a programmatic sense, but create a musical sense of depth, colour and atmosphere, highlighted by the fact that the first three movements are named after the three paintings. There is also no evidence to suggest any specific, synaesthetic associations of sound and individual colours. Rather, their construction is based on the commonality between composing and painting as processes, as Rautavaara saw it — the overall effect comes from assembling and combining sound qualities. Again, it must be remembered that that these images are directly lifted from the opera, where they manage to set the scene of the drama, specifically the unrest of the hero, Vincent. In the symphony, this psychological impetus is inextricably linked to the visual awareness in the compositional approach, so that the music reflects the close dialogue in the opera between van Gogh’s psyche and his highly colourful paintings.

The paintings establish an atmosphere that other sections of the symphony are in dialogue with, creating an on-going state of flux, as well as a particular kind of structure. Residing in some small way, though, is what Mikko Heiniö describes as the ‘madness and excess’ of Vincent’s character. The pictorial atmosphere therefore could also be seen as a metaphorical “present”, deriving from the dramatic plot, which the music then proceeds away from and returns to several times. This forms a metaphorical dialogue between a troubled present and a nostalgic past. The paintings provoke new musical excursions, but also highlight the formal significance of a recurring, troubled atmosphere.

The application of narrativity to music should of course be used cautiously. Anne Sivuoja-Gunaratnam uses a model of narrativity with Rautavaara’s earlier serial works as an ‘innate response to being in a world and a way of processing mental content, experience and the like’. Sivuoja-Gunaratnam’s premise is that narration is a natural and innate form of human cognition. Music can be “narrative” without explicit reference to a non-musical story, although a residing influence of the opera is present. Rautavaara also lays out the significance of musical narrative:

As with my fifth symphony, the musical character of the sixth is indeed “narrative”, musically epic, but the intention is not to tell a story which would be translatable into words or ideas. This is story-telling of a purely musical kind. The opera’s music – its

15 Mikko Heiniö, ‘Rautavaara, Einojuhani’.
16 Sivuoja-Gunaratnam, Narrating with Twelve Tones, 137.
substance – proved rich enough as a source: it cried for a new treatment, an expression outside the confines of drama, a new fate. It found it here, in the sixth symphony.\(^{17}\)

While this preface expresses a desire to move away from operatic story-telling in *Vincentiana*, larger resonances of the story are nevertheless present. Non-linear narrative – a technique that lends itself so readily to drama – offers a different, but complementary, perspective on the unfolding of musical ideas through architectural sections that is often featured in symphonic music. Such an approach reflects the Finnish belief in what Mikko Heiniö describes as the durability of ‘symphonic thinking’.\(^{18}\) Heiniö also alludes to the idea that the inherent contrasts in the symphony form part of a deep-rooted mode of expression that transcends history.\(^{19}\) The formal approaches in *Vincentiana* also illustrate the flexibility of symphonic thinking.

**Paintings and the question of autonomy**

An important part of the narrative experience in *Vincentiana* is the treatment of these pictures in relation to the movement in which they are contained. Much of the energy in the form derives from a dichotomy: these pictures are both self-contained but relate to and impact all other events in the symphony. When looking back on the symphony as a whole, these pictures stand out, but during the narrative itself, everything happens transitionally, a process of cause and effect. Fred Everett Maus’s notion that one definition of musical unity is the unity of the listening experience itself\(^{20}\) supports the idea that this dichotomy helps the playing-out of non-linear narrative. Maus acknowledges the influence of John Dewey’s thinking in *Art as Experience*.\(^{21}\) Dewey outlines a subtle distinction between ‘experience’ as an all-encompassing, continuous process and ‘an experience’, which paradoxically forms part of a larger continuity and yet is itself complete, having run its course.\(^{22}\)

A number of techniques combine to convey the self-identity of the pictures. These include the use of graphic and time-space notations, aleatoric elements, chromaticism, and the particular sound-world of Messiaen’s Mode 6, which Rautavaara frequently uses to

\(^{17}\) Einojuhani Rautavaara, Preface to Symphony No. 6.


\(^{19}\) Ibid.


\(^{21}\) Ibid., 179.

build dense, relatively static textures. Put together, these elements create a sound field that contrasts with the sense of dynamism in other parts of the symphony. Clearly defined, constructional cells build, overlap and combine to create a distinctive atmosphere. Ivan Moody observes how the abrasive, ‘glowing sound washes’ which create most of the intensity in Vincent depend on the orchestra’s ‘essentially 12-note material’. But in the symphony, and in the opera, modes of limited transposition help to establish these paintings through their distinctive properties and highly colourful use. Both Sivuoja-Gunaratnum and Moody highlight this modal element as a feature of the overture in Vincent.

Such a contrast, projected through a complex non-linear process challenges Kimmo Korhonen’s statement that there is a lack of internal contrast within the Sixth Symphony. The energy produced from these painting “motives” as static points of departure, out of which the thread of narrative grows, draws the listener into a particular world. A process of journeying through different and unknown contexts then ensues, building intrigue. Contrary to Korhonen’s assessment that this symphony is akin to a suite, inner contrasts within movements and within individual pictures like “Starry Night”, “The Crows” and “Saint-Rémy” reveal a consistent conflict or inner drama between different musical states. The manipulation of form and musical timescales in the Sixth Symphony is an integral part of its character. Although the opening of the first movement, “Starry Night”, is relatively static and non-directional, it is still dealt with temporally, and therefore demands a different view of musical time.

To understand Rautavaara’s approach to form in these cases, it is useful to consider temporal processes in post-tonal music. Robert Adlington argues for the use of other metaphors for changing musical sound other than those of unidirectional motion. He finds metaphor theory useful in light of the notion that ‘time should be viewed as a set of social strategies for dealing with change, rather than an unchallengeable condition of existence’. He goes on to point out the ‘inadequacy of the motional framework for dealing with certain kinds of modern music’.

---

26 Ibid., 41.
28 Ibid.
alternative metaphorical readings such as heat and rising pressure. Such metaphors, which still depend upon the fundamental view of music as a temporal art, are particularly useful when considering the opening section of “Starry Night”. Again, some sense of the psychological subjectivity of the operatic hero is retained in the symphony. Cells of material, including a gradually intensified use of a block of Messiaen’s Mode 6 in divisi violins brings a growing intensity, followed by a dissipation of that energy. Out of this chaos, the symphonic story can proceed. Rautavaara therefore draws together multiple and seemingly opposed techniques and perceptions of musical time to achieve one, non-linear process. This approach further demonstrates how he deviates from symphonic tradition, but utilises new and different techniques to build on what the symphonic process is capable of conveying. This is another subtle effect of the close relationship between the residing psychological drama of *Vincent* and imagery to reimagine symphonic form.

Another distinctive element that isolates the atmospheres of these paintings is a DX7 synthesizer – an instrumentation choice retained from the opera. The DX7 features similarly in *The House of the Sun* (1989-1990) with visual connotations of supernatural elements. It is significant therefore that this instrument reappears at the end of the final movement, “Apotheosis” as part of a larger sense of acceptance from the disparate, visual and symphonic strands that characterise the narrative. Although *The House of the Sun* was composed after *Vincent*, it predates both *Vincentiana* and *Angel of Light*, although the fact that all of these works were composed within a few years of each other further indicates the close relationship between opera and symphonies in Rautavaara’s hands, with opera being something of a testing ground for instrumental decisions. In “Starry Night”, the DX7 builds a spatial, vertical harmonic block making use of a pitch collection (G♯-A-G-D-C♯-E♭) – see Ex. 4.2.

![Ex. 4.2: Vincentiana, “Starry Night”, DX7 synthesizer, bb. 4-7](image)

29 Ibid., 307.
Although Moody dismisses the role of the synthesizer, stating that its ‘cinematic’ sound effects during the orchestral prelude in the opera (“Starry Night”) ‘fit uncomfortably in the context’, the resultant contrast found in its electronic, sustained sonority becomes a tool for identifying the visual. The DX7 is therefore put to subtler, less programmatic, use in Vincentiana than, for example, the wind machine in Vaughan Williams’ Sinfonia Antartica (1952). This is another symphony that grew out of a pre-existing medium, in this case the film score to the 1948 film Scott of the Antarctic and its identity as a symphony has been called into question. Whereas the wind machine is a musical signification for the backdrop of an extreme Antarctic landscape, the synthesizer becomes a symbol or visual “other”, which happens to derive its inspiration from the colourful work of van Gogh.

The dichotomy between a spatial perspective of the relatively self-contained musical paintings and their place in the overall experience of the symphony affects more global issues. There is little obvious motivic development spanning the whole work – musically the individual movements are relatively self-contained, but there is a more contextual sense of narrative development that works over the top. Each movement orientates around or comments on a particular atmosphere. Out of the picture that opens the second movement, “The Crows”, a diatonic-sounding melody begins in the solo bassoon at bar 40. However, continued underneath this melody is a suppressed version of the oscillating, “disturbed” upper-string figuration from the picture. As a subjective, possibly expressionist statement, there is evidence that this painting was associated with a certain mood in van Gogh’s life. When he completed the set of three “Wheatfield” canvases, he wrote in a letter to Theo van Gogh and Jo van Gogh-Bonger, his brother and sister, of his intention to make a point of ‘trying to express sadness, extreme loneliness’. Its symphonic realisation forms a kind of expressionistic comment on this event. Rautavaara studied van Gogh’s correspondence, as well as his works, so would have been aware of the complicated relationship between his life and his paintings. The movement captures a visual impression and explores it musically, but overall it is a “moment” – a musical snapshot of a feeling or stage of life.

The final movement, “Apotheosis”, also exemplifies this dualism between autonomy and the wider formal context. This closing episode is noticeably different in atmosphere from the previous three, establishing a freer, diatonic and lyrical development that builds to a peak of orchestration. In terms of atmosphere and thematic material, this movement is also the most consistent. As shown in Ex. 4.1, the melody beginning in bar two is taken from the end of the opera, as Vincent proclaims his praise for the sun, achieving a sense of liberation, transcendence and closure. This finale therefore presents a more spatial, visual view of form, which is retained in the symphony, by capturing a more optimistic mood. Rautavaara had been struck by the fact that van Gogh’s paintings towards the end of his life were more colourful than those at the beginning:

And then I went and saw all those paintings from his last years from his last period, in Arles, where he died: though he was sick, he was hopeless, he was desperate (he had sold one painting while he was there), he seemed to have no future, nobody cared about his art—and he was schizophrenic and they let him out from the lunatic asylum—the miracle was that these paintings were full of light, full of colors, full of anything but death and desperation, full of trust in life.

Whilst “Apotheosis” is the culmination of an overall operatic and symphonic process, it has also, confusingly, proved marketable as an independent piece. This can be explained by the more obvious Neo-Romantic tone of the movement as a whole, in contrast with the other movements. The Naxos and Ondine record labels have each recorded the movement twice. The score even instructs performers to make use of a harp to play the DX7 synthesizer part when performing this extract in isolation. Its function as a celebration of light and life means it can be appreciated on its own terms, much like a work of art. Nevertheless, it is more impactful when it forms part of the experience of the whole symphony. This sense of resolution is largely caused by the extra-musical influence of the operatic story-line. Additionally, subtle musical recurrences, as well as dodecaphonic and modal connections, form a kind of synthesis.

The idea of retrospective understanding, then, extends to the compositional process. The placement of disparate and un-contextualised musical ideas and visual extracts from the opera is not designed to be jarring, but to integrate into a fully coherent, completely new context. For example, Rautavaara implements the Waltz from Act II of Vincent into the third movement. In comparing the opera and symphony, this section

stands out stylistically, and is therefore a more explicit example of the operatic story residing in the symphony. However, his ability to derive unity from elements that are not obviously connected in musical terms alone is part of what forms this particular symphonic narrative.

This question of symphonic coherence working above musical recurrence alone aligns with Jonathan Kramer’s argument for nuanced disunity being a valuable experience in a given musical work. Arguing against the notion that disunity equates to a lack of coherence, he claims that musical coherence can exist beyond unity. Taking this idea further, Kramer argues that a sophisticated knowledge of disunity can lead to a valued appreciation of it as a musical experience in and of itself, as an ‘expressive force, not just the lack of something we like.’ The narrative unity experienced in the Sixth Symphony depends upon the diverse elements that it throws up and the way they connect as an experience, but also through a thematic and dodecaphonic logic that will be discussed in Chapters 5 and 7, respectively.

The question of deconstruction also aligns with Kramer’s view of Nielsen’s Sinfonia Semplice, which highlights the latter’s apparent rejection of the notion that a symphony had to follow every idea or ‘problem’ introduced through to a properly-restored conclusion. Kramer also concludes that such a handling of disunity reflects a current postmodern age where ‘disunity, surprise, collage and discontinuity are common in all our contemporary arts’. Such a postmodern perspective can be problematic in Rautavaara’s case, however. While Vincentiana does not return to musical or motivic arguments, and there is at first glance a collage-like collection of material, a larger orientation towards narrative proves more significant.

Transitions and continuity

This chapter has introduced the significance of non-linear narrative, claiming that Vincentiana has a complex balance between visual/ spatial atmospheres and a temporal interaction with these moments. This approach to form is heavily influenced by the characteristics of subjective memory, especially in the presence of non-linear time structures that project a unified experience through a series of moods and a wealth of

36 Ibid., 362.
38 Ibid., 342.
material. Transitional passages help create this subjective narrative, especially the sensation of departing from and returning to relatively static events. This understanding tallies with Arnold Whittall’s view that deconstructive analysis is appropriate as a means of exploring the ‘formal richness and multiplicity of musical structures which move through time rather than existing as solid, visible objects in space.’

The influence of painting on composition continues in a different way following the “Starry Night” section at the beginning of the first movement. From bar 31, upper-first violins, violas and cellos play 12-tone rows – the first doubled by transposition. These proceed in counterpoint, moving the music away from the non-motional temporality of the opening picture. The comparatively linear distribution of this row enacts a transformation away from the painting into a new section, as though replicating in symphonic form the developmental process of reflection and memory as a premise for narrative. As previously stated, a narrative does not need to be present in a musical work for the sensation of narrative to be felt.

Transitions return to the visual atmosphere that opened the symphony. Towards the end of the first movement, the sound world of the opening returns gradually, as the melody becomes more intense and the harmony more chromatic (see Ex. 4.3). The situation gets progressively more desperate, mad and excessive, eventually culminating in the Sostenuto section at bar 256. Cascading descending chromatic lines in the clarinets, bassoons and strings give way to a chromatic, fortissimo cluster chord that closes the movement. This chromatic finish therefore sets up the atmosphere of the second painting at the beginning of “The Crows”. The same transitional process occurs in “Saint-Rémy”. Following the Waltz, which starts at bar 81, there follows a gradual, phasing process back towards intense dissonance. The fact that this Waltz material is transferred from the opera emphasises the notion that the story of Vincent becomes a larger influence for the contrasts and shifts in mood within this symphonic context.

39 Arnold Whittall, ‘Form’.
This process departs from and returns to the colourful worlds of the paintings. In the opera, the orchestral preludes offer stimuli for Vincent’s memories. In the symphony, it works much the same way: the painting exists in space and is fixed, but a musical reaction unfolding from it is more fluid. This process becomes the focal point of contrasts of colour and mood that go beyond Vincent’s story, taking on a new formal potential. Such strategies balance an architectural layout, where there are clearly defined sections, and temporal transformation. This particular balance is one that Rautavaara took care to realise without force, and occurs in most of his large-scale works. As he states:

the final result depends on the maintenance of the delicate balance between these two fundamental principles and the energy of the work is generated by the polemic between them. They must be brought together into a single entity without recourse to violence.\(^\text{40}\)

As the closing movement, “Apotheosis” forms a stage of liberation which derives from Vincent’s psychological journey: disjointed recollections turn towards a celebration of life and colour. The alignment of this finale with the end of *Vincent* sees a return to the musical “present” once again. Much of the narrative in this symphony is based on the relationship between differing musical states, the musical signs for which have been discussed. “Apotheosis” is the culmination of this dialogue, uniting the otherwise distinct parts of this work.

A criticism by Moody of the opera is that it does not end completely with the impression of it being the sum of all of its parts.\(^\text{41}\) *Vincentiana*, however, closes with the

\(^{40}\) Quoted in Aho, *Rautavaara as Symphonist*, 78.

impression of having achieved more than the sum of its parts through its synthesis of elements and culminates in a visual image of bright colour. New melodic patterns, which nevertheless have a deep motivic connection with earlier material, also contribute to its revelatory atmosphere. The DX7 synthesizer (returning in bar 84) now supports the freer diatonic language, having previously been a somewhat ominous inclusion. A subtler influence of narrative is found in the melody in “Apotheosis”, quoted directly from the opera, which Vincent sings to the following words written from van Gogh to his brother Theo, according to Aho:

Death walks in light like a reaper in a surging wheat field; it walks in full sunshine, and light floods over the earth. Look, it is summer and the day of the sun! And whoever dies today is never lost, but joins those who once dared to walk and live! Walk…

In its new symphonic context, this melody continues the impression of acceptance, reflecting more positively on issues previously associated with anguish. The conflation of musical atmospheres ends the psychological conflict. Rautavaara therefore avoids a sense of hard-won, dramatic closure. The reintroduction of Messiaen’s Sixth Mode in the strings in bar 73 (see Ex. 4.4.2) recalls the pictorial opening of “Starry Night” (shown in Ex. 4.4.1) but is combined with a trombone melody – a continuation of earlier melodic episodes. By bar 83 (see Ex. 4.4.3) this combination reaches a new level of intensity when Mode 6 is chromatically superimposed. “Apotheosis” therefore draws together elements that previously were separated.

Ex. 4.4.1: Vincentiana, “Starry Night”, 1st Violin, b. 10
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Ex. 4.4.2: *Vincentiana*, “Apotheosis”, Upper-1st Violin and Trombone, bb. 73-76

Ex. 4.4.3: *Vincentiana*, “Apotheosis”, b. 83
Memory and flux

In its use of visual and spatial techniques the Sixth Symphony challenges the symphonic form in a particular way. *Vincentiana* brings together many complex and diverse strands, including musical material, types of notation, contrasting treatments of musical time, imagery and opera. Such a combination provides a considerable challenge from the perspective of music analysis, which cannot consider the music in isolation.

In discussing the changing nature of time and space in the twentieth-century symphony in the context of radio technology, Daniel M. Grimley outlines the relevance of Henri Bergson’s writing on the ‘permeability of memory and perception’.\(^ {43}\) As Grimley states, Bergson argued that ‘the experience of time was properly a process of active (but unconscious) recollection that collapsed past, present and future into a single, multi-layered flux.’\(^ {44}\) Grimley further points out Bergson’s influence on writers such as Marcel Proust and James Joyce, who sought to abandon linear narrative for ‘a more fractured, fragmentary and self-reflective commentary.’\(^ {45}\) The analysis above has shown that *Vincentiana* does not seek fragmentation or collage, but has a coherence that connects and transforms various visual states. The piece nevertheless conveys a sense of flux and non-linear narrative, albeit one that takes on a different form. The late twentieth-century or twenty-first-century ease with non-linear temporality in other media, notably film and television, also makes *Vincentiana* a product of its time. These alternative temporal strategies chime with the residing emphasis on self-reflection and flashback in *Vincentiana*.

Contrasting light

As with *Vincentiana*, Rautavaara’s *Angel of Light* (1994) also draws heavily on visual stimuli, which here manifest as contrasting atmospheres. As a piece from his “Angel” series, *Angel of Light* draws some inspiration from the recurring childhood image. He described this image of the “terrible angel” as follows:

> The image of “angels” presented by the classical kitsch art, as blondes in their nightdresses with the wings of a swan, is so engrained that the world of fantasy behind the “angel series” has tended to be misunderstood. For the angels I had in mind were akin to the


\(^{44}\) Ibid.

\(^{45}\) Ibid.
terrifying, masculine figures bursting with saintly fury of Rainer Maria Rilke, for whom “…ein jeder Engel ist schrecklich – every angel is terrible…”

As stated at the beginning of this chapter, these angel images do not form any programme for Rautavaara, but a kind of visual impetus. Encapsulated in his description are notions of contrast, light and dark, and disturbance. Contrasts in atmosphere and “light” provide a sense of drama that is an important aspect of the purpose behind the symphony. More broadly, this approach invites spatial connotations of symmetry, opposition and balance – yin-and-yang. Discussing the arts more broadly, Rautavaara states that ‘synthesis, yin and yang, polarities, dialectics have always been the most interesting phenomena in the arts.’

This perspective applies to his view of musical form in the Seventh Symphony, creating a proportional experience that nevertheless unfolds through time.

Musically, the drama in this symphony centres on a melodic figure that Rautavaara terms the “Hymn Motif” (Ex. 4.5). This motif appears in changing contexts, and the symphony has its own balance between the spatial – distinct sections that provide new colour – and the temporal, shown through the continuity in following the progress of the Hymn Motif through these different realms.

Ex. 4.5: Angel of Light, Hymn Motif

This unifying musical embryo, however, never establishes itself as a complete theme and is frequently departed from. When it is sustained in the coda, it is static, prolonged and repeated over two triads separated by a tritone (B♭ major and E major), denying harmonic movement. Rautavaara avoids a traditional “struggle-victory” narrative in which the motif becomes completely resolved. Unity is more subtly achieved – through deep connections between complementary and related pitch collections, which also subsume the motif. As such, the emphasis is less on a progression

46 Rautavaara, Preface to Symphony No. 7.
47 Länsiö, ‘Einojuhani Rautavaara’.
48 See Rautavaara, Preface to Symphony No. 7.
from dark to light than the uncertainty of changes of light. The persistent, but vague, “mysticism” label for the Seventh Symphony is undoubtedly part of its world-wide appeal. However, the fact that resolution is merely glimpsed – a perception achieved through repeating tritone-related triads – creates a tangible sense of eternity and uncertainty that suggests mysticism. The colourful closure, where ascending lines mirror ascension towards light, and the use of Messiaen’s Mode 3 – further emphasises this idea.

Balancing contrasts can be seen in the title itself: Angel of Light. Stępień notes the importance of the opposition between light and dark, which he attributes to oppositions of modal colours, triads and instrumentation. Furthermore, drawing on the work of Michel Butor, Eila Tarasti has discussed the idea that high pitch registers often convey a sense of brightness, while dark registers convey darker shades. This cultural phenomenon is evident in the contrasts in this symphony. The extremities of light in the Nordic regions also have a particular significance for Finnish people, living in an environment alternating between seasonal changes of days that are extremely long and days that are extremely short. This earthly opposition may well have influenced the visual dichotomies of the “angelic” realm in this case.

Much like Vincentiana, 12-tone rows and modes of limited transposition combine and oppose with each other to form different colours of sound. Samuli Tiikkaja identifies six rows in this piece, with Row VI being the most prominent. He labels this row simply as the ‘main series’ in his recent thesis. The use of this row in the opening, with its particular intervallic qualities, recalls the Sixth Symphony in the way it conveys a particular quality, motivated by immediacy and directness. Stępień observes how other rows are used sparingly, and often in opposition to Row VI.

The commonalities between painting and composition are evident in transforming between musical contrasts of light and colour. The contrast is not just a binary one of light versus dark, but a spectrum of various hues and shades, as different scale-types, rows and

52 Previous work has argued that the extreme behaviour of natural light in some Nordic countries can affect the people who live there. For a discussion of the musical significance in Finland of long periods of slowly-changing seasonal states and violent seasonal shifts, and how this can affect humans’ perceptions of time passing, see Howell, After Sibelius, 276 and ‘Magnus Lindberg: Narratives of Time and Space’, 356-357. Howell also mentions how, in interview, Rautavaara was one of a number of Finnish composers who made mention of the particular appreciation of light.
54 Tiikkaja, ‘Paired Opposites’, 256.
55 Stępień, The Sound of Finnish Angels, 141.
textures create different musical characteristics. These shifts can emerge suddenly and more gradually as part of a larger continuity. Whilst it is a source of unity, the Hymn Motif is also the agent through which change is perceived, and fits into different contexts (serial, modal or triadic). For example, the emergence into the Mode 6 harmonic field at bar 93 in the first movement, which supports the first strong statement of the Motif, brings a completely new context. The behaviour of light on a painting is a useful analogy in this respect – the material stays the same, but a different light source alters the perspective.

**Opposition or cohesion?**

Rautavaara brings these visual transformations of light and colour to life by combining them with a large-scale sense of drama. Attempts to assert the Hymn Motif as a fully-fledged theme are repeatedly denied, providing a narrative based largely on opposition. At points where the Hymn Motif interrupts, or is interrupted, a change in atmosphere usually follows. These various transformations in all four movements are summarised in Ex. 4.6. Rautavaara describes the way the theme is curtailed in bar 99, after appearing in bar 93:

> The calm, epic story of the first movement twice culminates in a grandiose hymn motif (that really does seem to have wings) that is, however, always interrupted – as if to avoid having to perform any real feats of strength.\(^{56}\)

The Motif is again interrupted in the Scherzo second movement, over bars 31 to 32 (see Ex. 4.6, movement two). Also in the Scherzo, the theme burns itself out after an attempt to establish itself thematically. The energy from this conflict results in the shift into the new world of section E, beginning at bar 133 in Ex. 4.6. The “theme” then resumes a motivic characteristic, having failed to come to a ‘grandiose’ thematic form. Likewise, in the third movement, a subtle statement of the Motif over bars 62 to 64 coincides with a sudden change into section A1 (see Ex. 4.6, movement three). The capricious atmosphere generated by the waylaying of this musical idea directly informs the dialogues and contrasts that largely define this piece. The finale orientates towards a more luminescent state. A variation of the Motif is straight away re-contextualised in a full brass chorale at the opening of the fourth movement. The role of instrumentation and orchestration are part of this colouristic process and Stępień reinforces the significance of brass in what he terms the ‘disturbance technique’ in the “Angel series”:

> Brass instruments form the most significant orchestral group in Rautavaara’s works in general, but also and more specifically in compositions referring to angels because of their

\(^{56}\) Rautavaara, Preface to Symphony No. 7.
role in the “disturbance” technique. This group thus has two main roles: to “disturb” (i.e., to carry divine messages into the human sphere) and to play chorales (i.e., to carry human praise and prayer back to God).  

The brass chorale at the beginning of the fourth movement in fact grows organically into a homophonic motivic development on the strings. The darkness has not entirely subsided, however. From bars 9-54, shown in Ex. 4.6, movement four, orchestration reinforces the sense of oppositional forces: the rhapsodic, dense web effect in the woodwind alternates regularly with the more stable, generally triadic, cells of motion in the strings.

Although the resolution in the coda is harmonically uncertain, as stated above, it nevertheless forms a kind of apotheosis – the outcome of the contrasts that have taken place over the whole symphony – and there is a visual sense of balanced opposites. Rautavaara combines the repetition of the motif, and the potentially infinite alteration between B flat major and E major with the highly recognisable, prolonged sound of Mode 6. He uses this mode in a static way here, never really allowing it to go anywhere in itself, but building a supporting texture underpinning a temporarily directionless melody and harmony. In this symphony, Modes 3 and 6 notably occur at points of temporary breakthrough or transformation. In this way, the coda mirrors bars (93-98) of the first movement. On these occasions, the Hymn Motif is portrayed in a wealth of colour, through combinations of triads, modes and the motif. Such visual revelations are significant in both the Sixth and Seventh symphonies.

### First movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>1-92</th>
<th>93-98</th>
<th>99-143</th>
<th>144-156</th>
<th>157-163</th>
<th>164-186</th>
<th>187-200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>First cycle</td>
<td>Second cycle</td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch collection</td>
<td>Row VI</td>
<td>Mode 3</td>
<td>Row I, Row VI</td>
<td>Row VI</td>
<td>Mode 3</td>
<td>Row VI</td>
<td>Mode 6 of Modes 1/2/6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Second movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>1-26</th>
<th>27-59</th>
<th>60-109</th>
<th>110-132</th>
<th>133</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch collection</td>
<td>Row VI, Row II</td>
<td>Row VI</td>
<td>Row VI, Row III</td>
<td>Row II</td>
<td>Mode 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Third movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>1-19</th>
<th>20-56</th>
<th>57-64</th>
<th>65-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch collection</td>
<td>Row VI</td>
<td>Row VI, Row II, Mode 6</td>
<td>Row VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fourth movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>1-8</th>
<th>9-54</th>
<th>55-72</th>
<th>73-95</th>
<th>96-108</th>
<th>109-121</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Coda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch collection</td>
<td>Row II</td>
<td>Row V, Mode 6</td>
<td>Row V</td>
<td>Row V</td>
<td>Row V, Mode 6</td>
<td>Mode 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Ex. 4.6: Formal outline of contrasts in *Angel of Light*[^58]

[^58]: Instances of specific rows are taken from Stępień, *The Sound of Finnish Angels*, 142.
**Imagery and genre**

The way the visual stimuli in *Angel of Light* directly influence the formal processes sheds light on the fluidity and boundaries of the symphonic genre. Some balance between unity and contrast is always present in symphonic music, but the importance of duality manifesting on a number of levels in the Seventh Symphony calls to mind concerto-like characteristics. This feeling also arises from its dramatic and dualistic nature where there is not only dialogue centred around the Hymn Motif, but also different instrumental groupings, indicating a close relationship between Rautavaara’s symphonies and concertos. In both genres, the music establishes some kind of reconciliation between forces by the end of the piece. By the end of the work, the intervallic unity running throughout prevails, but that does not detract from a delight in the contrasts along the way. The prioritisation of unity in Rautavaara’s music recalls the tradition that led Hans Keller to state that ‘Great music diversifies a unity; mere good music unifies diverse elements’.

Tim Howell points out a similar dualism in relation to Magnus Lindberg’s orchestral work, *Aura*, viewing the symphony as the diversification of a unity, and a concerto as the striving for a unity from the diverse strands that make up the piece.

Although the musical results might be different, it is this notion of a solo-ensemble relationship as a dramatic one, with each side expressing characters, that Paul Griffiths identifies as an important aspect of the concerto after World War II. A general sense of characterisation between different elements of *Angel of Light* realise a similar idea in a different way. Although the tension here is not between a soloist and a larger ensemble, there are other relationships or dualities at play, which include virtuosic oppositions between instrumental groups, alongside changes in motivic groups, rhythm and texture.

The musical form in *Angel of Light* is manipulated to enhance duality and contrast, enforced through visual connotations of light. Nevertheless, unity plays an important part in this piece. In addition to the Hymn Motif, there are references back to earlier events, often recalling melodies or motivic aspects – see movements 1 and 3 and Ex. 4.6. As Chapter 7 discusses, a complex pitch network also ensures unity in a more concealed way.

---

60 Howell, *After Sibelius*, 261 (n).
While this piece ends on the side of the angels, the “angelic” for Rautavaara is a balance of opposites – dark versus light, unity versus diversity.

**Symphonic dialogue**

The adaptable and controlled manipulations of form in both *Vincentiana* and *Angel of Light* draw extensively on visual influences. They therefore provide a formal experience centred on non-linear experiences. This approach reveals that these works are connected in much the same way as Symphonies 5 and 8 (see Chapter 3) and, to this extent, serve as counterparts to that pairing. An overview of formal approaches in these four works demonstrates a symphonic dialogue, as Rautavaara manipulates temporal experiences depending on his intentions. Rather than perceiving the varying balances between linearity and discontinuity in these last four symphonies as inconsistencies of style, they are actually two sides of the same coin. Uniting these four works is an intention to incorporate something larger and more abstract than music alone, and to channel these ideas through different, but complementary approaches to large-scale form. Rautavaara does not treat the symphony as an isolated genre, but allows the influence of both concerti and opera to feed into them. *Angel of Light* also shares visual techniques with other works from the “Angel series”, including the double bass concerto, *Angel of Dusk* (1980), the title of which highlights a symmetry between these pieces. An appreciation of Rautavaara’s manipulation of formal processes becomes a tangible way of understanding these non-explicit, visual ideas, within a more absolute setting.

Music analysis can only ever be an interpretation with supporting evidence. In this case, though, the contradictory nature of the evidence reveals the most interesting interpretation: Rautavaara’s symphonic forms often centre on a deliberately fragile dividing line between continuity and contrast. These processes are not mutually exclusive and an awareness of one can offer insight into the other, providing an enriched aural experience, but it is important to be aware when one perspective is more prominent.

This dialogue demonstrates flexibility and control over perceptions of continuity and localised contrast as the situation demands. This technique was no doubt learnt and developed within an operatic context, as the fluctuating demands of a drama requires. The paradoxical perspectives discussed indicate that Rautavaara’s later symphonies are not
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62 For a summary of unifying “angelic” characterisations in Rautavaara’s works for angels, including ‘Archangel Michael Fighting the Antichrist’ from the piano suite, *Icons* (1955); the orchestral work *Angels and Visitations* (1978); the double bass concerto *Angel of Dusk* (1980); the brass work *Playgrounds for Angels* (1981), and *Angel of Light* (1994); see Stępień, *The Sound of Finnish Angels*, 173-217.
simply experimentations with some defunct genre, and there is renewed confidence in calling these works symphonies. These pieces show symphonic thinking as a process that does not have one shape, governing characteristic or approach. The visual contrasts in *Vincentiana* and *Angel of Light* reveal the contemporary suitability of the symphonic form in communicating images, thoughts, plots and experiences. This inclusive attitude is part of a larger philosophy of challenging and re-vitalising the symphonic form and ways of expressing unity through time.
Developing themes

Continuous development on the surface level of musical form is a consistent stylistic trait in Rautavaara’s music. The diversity with which this motivic principle appears in different symphonies is striking, with each demonstrating a different “solution” to developmental processes. This chapter examines different approaches in Symphonies 3, 5 and 6.

Much like the symphonies of Sibelius, each symphony stands alone, to an extent, as a different statement, suggesting that thematic development and modern techniques such as serialism and aleatoricism were not mutually exclusive. Traditional motivic development, where there are clearly articulated rhythmic, melodic and intervallic units, and more modern forms of development, such as those used in serial and aleatoric music, are different realisations of the same idea. This compatibility is a further demonstration of Rautavaara’s assimilation of recent and older compositional practice, where he still imposes his own personality by challenging and renewing his style.

Themes and theory

This chapter examines different concepts surrounding the surface development of material, drawing on useful existing theory that has a broader application on late-twentieth-century music. These concepts include transformations of nineteenth-century formal models, especially issues of developing variation and musical narrative. A different symphony will be examined as a case-study for each area.

Developing variation

Arnold Schoenberg defines developing variation as the second of two ways of varying a motif, stating that the ‘changes proceed more or less directly toward the goal of allowing new ideas to rise.’\(^1\) Schoenberg saw this principle as common to both the tonal and 12-tone systems.\(^2\) This compatibility makes this principle durable and relevant to the various stylistic settings in Rautavaara’s output. Developing variation maximises internal, intervallic coherence through various contexts of a given work. In discussing Schoenberg’s *Variations for Orchestra*, Oliver Neighbour states how Schoenberg’s

---


themes, drawn from the series as an expanded motif, consists of rhythmic patterns that can carry any derivation, and that he varied them ‘without endangering their identity’.\(^3\) The fact that this phenomenon applies not just to the development of audible motivic shapes, but also within 12-tone processes, makes it a useful tool for understanding the stylistic evocation of Bruckner in Rautavaara’s Symphony No. 3, which is framed within a serial vocabulary. The flexibility of this way of composing and understanding music derives from the fact that, as Walter Frisch states, developing variation is a ‘flexible compositional procedure whereby the different elements of a basic idea or shape […] are successively modified.’\(^4\)

**Musical narrative**

There has been some debate regarding the application of narrative to music. Differing views centre largely on the question of how closely music must align with the world of literary text, or whether it can only function as a metaphor in relation to non-programmatic music. With Rautavaara, this discussion works on the premise that narrative in music can, firstly, exist in a number of different stylistic circumstances and, secondly, that it can be experienced based purely on the musical processes. Arguments that challenge musical narrative observe the problem of the lack of semantic specificity in music.\(^5\) Perhaps the most strongly-worded example comes from Jean-Jacques Nattiez, who states that ‘in itself, and as opposed to a great many linguistic utterances, music is not a narrative and that any description of its formal structures in terms of narrativity is nothing but superfluous metaphor’.\(^6\) Nattiez ultimately hesitates to indulge a metaphorical idea of narrative on the basis that this has limited relevance. Similarly, Carolyn Abbate carefully addresses how an understanding of literary narrative can relate to programmatic music.\(^7\)

Several writers believe that narrating is a deeply-engrained tool for human cognition. Richard Walsh believes that ‘reflection upon the common features of narrative and music […] can enhance our understanding of the cognitive and communicative force

---


of narrative in general.8 In her argument for narrativity in Rautavaara’s serial music, Sivuoja-Gunaratnam asserts that musical narratives do not require a prior, extra-musical story or programme, although they might also include these specific, semantic elements.9 Addressing the issue of the narrative subject, she refers to a prominent musical figure in Rautavaara’s first serial period, stating that this forms a musical subject which is subjected to numerous transformations.10

The idea of musical narrative as a temporal organisation of material through a series of events forms a useful part of this discussion of thematic processes. In non-programmatic music, causal narrative can exist in purely musical terms, a process of cause and effect or obstruction. Discernible musical agents, notably melody and motifs, convey this experience.

*The process of “Becoming”*

The use of the term “becoming” in relation to musical form draws upon the work of Janet Schmalfeldt who, in her study on form in late-eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century music, asserts the importance of perceiving form as a process.11 For Schmalfeldt, the essence of this idea is a need for ‘retrospective reinterpretation within the larger formal context’,12 and she uses the double-lined right arrow (⇒) found in symbolic logic to indicate a perceived sense of “becoming”. To illustrate this perception, Schmalfeldt says:

> If one were thus to perceive that, say, the opening passage of a movement initially projects the characteristics of an introduction, but retroactively functions as a main theme, one could represent that analytic perception as “Introduction ⇒ MT”.13

The purpose of drawing on this formal theory in the context of Rautavaara is to observe the continuation and re-interpretation of form as process, within which the listener and performer take an active part. This discussion does not suggest any idiomatic alignment with early-nineteenth-century tonal or formal practice. Building on Schmalfeldt’s approach, Nathan John Martin and Steven Vande Moortelle introduce a framework that
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10 Ibid., 157.
12 Ibid.
13 Ibid.
accounts for oscillation between two different form-functional profiles.\textsuperscript{14} In their analysis of Schubert’s String Quintet in C major, D. 956, they ultimately reject the unidirectional notion of becoming, proposing instead a “left-right double arrow” (⇔) to describe a kind of becoming that has no goal. As will be shown, this general experience exists in the altogether different context of Rautavaara’s Sixth Symphony.

**Rautavaara and development**

*Non-symphonic works*

The idea that developing small musical ideas over time can be regarded as a formal impulse, capable of reappearing in multiple stylistic situations, is supported by its presence in orchestral works outside of the symphonic repertory. This larger applicability – viewing content-driven form as existing outside of any one compositional period or genre – falls under what Whittall refers to when describing form as the ‘organizing impulse’ at the heart of a compositional ‘enterprise’\textsuperscript{15}.

Rautavaara’s orchestral works, including *Anadyomene* – *Adoration of Aphrodite*, *Garden of Spaces*, *Cantus Arcticus* – all works written during a time of some creative change for Rautavaara – develop material over time, but each to different effects. In *Garden of Spaces*, a transformative process is centred on scalic configurations from one modal set, through the mixture of controlled and aleatoric cells of material. With its aleatoric counterpoint and emphasis on the spatial organisation of blocks of material, *Garden of Spaces* is generally considered a modernist piece. *Anadyomene* can be regarded as a tone poem but is also a sister-work to *Garden of Spaces* owing to their similarities. It uses the same basic musical material, interspersing the same modal cells, but creates a more continuous sense of ebb and flow, as the music moves in large waves. Both works also resemble each other in their atmosphere, transforming the essentially static harmonic and melodic entity of the Octatonic scale. Furthermore, they follow a similar arc of development, leading to loud modal outbursts. From one perspective, then, these pieces display two sides of Rautavaara, the modernist and the Neo-Romantic, but their strikingly similar arrangements of material illustrate how these personalities exist on opposite sides of one coin.


\textsuperscript{15} Whittall, ‘Form’.
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The first movement of *Ca

ntus Arcticus*, “The Marsh”, sees the continual development and augmentation of modal pitch sets, which illustrate a static landscape. These experimentations with motivic development during a break from the symphonic genre undoubtedly influenced Rautavaara’s thinking with larger symphonic forms. These orchestral pieces project musical ideas through broad statements and visionary gestures.

**The early symphonies**

Thematic development took a firm hold in Rautavaara’s symphonies, beginning with Symphony No. 1 (1956, rev. 1988 and 2003). The alterations he made to the work in 1988, changing it from a four-movement to a more unusual two-movement layout, thus fusing the first two movements into one, strongly recall the similar alterations Sibelius made to his Symphony No. 5 (1919), recognising the need to forge continuity between movements that had previously been separate. A preoccupation with formal compression, thematically and in the larger formal scheme, is therefore also evident in Rautavaara’s music.

Symphony No. 1 demonstrates that stylistic diversity was evident in Rautavaara’s earlier music, but it does not demonstrate the kind of synthesis honed in later works. It shows a clear influence of Sibelius and late-Romanticism, whilst, as Aho, observes, also drawing heavily on the symphonic style of Shostakovich, a voice that, in 1950s Finland, was seen as being at the forefront of the “modern”. This influence is evident in the final Scherzo movement. The two movements of Symphony No. 1 (1988 version) balance these contrasting styles. In this regard, the work establishes a persistent balance in Rautavaara’s music between the slowly-cogitating style and the dissonant, more fragmentary and terse Scherzo style that continued throughout his output. The tendency for these fast movements to be markedly short in duration compared to others in the same work occurs in both *Angel of Light* and *The Journey*. Symphony No. 1 also demonstrates the balance of influences at this point – the organicism inherited from Sibelius versus a more fragmentary, ironic approach to symphonic writing. It also seems significant that Rautavaara should re-address the final form by adding a slow second movement between the existing ones soon after completing Symphony No. 5, a work that explores new approaches of thematic development within a contemporary context.

Bearing in mind the additional weight of Sibelius’s recommendation of Rautavaara for the Koussevitzky scholarship, the idea that thematic, logical development should have
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16 Aho, *Rautavaara as Symphonist*, 78.
17 Ibid., 75.
been a prominent part of Symphony No. 1 seems likely. The way to start expressing something “new”, it seems, was to find a way to combine this motivic principle with the influence from the Russian symphonic style – a fresh possibility that opened a door for other Finns, such as Einar Englund (1916-1999), as one approach to side-stepping the “shadow of Sibelius”. Sibelian formal impulses appear in the first movement. Here, there are expansive orchestral motions, combining both circular and linear orientations by returning to a motif multiple times, but never in the same way. Material introduced at the beginning is deconstructed and varied, whilst there is also one larger developmental process at work. On a motivic level, the development of a small thematic germ generates these motions. Established in this youthful work is also the sense of logic or “journeying” that went on to feature in the later symphonies, as well as operas Thomas, Vincent, Alexis Kivi, and Rasputin.

The dialectical nature of Rautavaara’s first five symphonies explains why Symphony No. 2 does not feature the same kind of organic development. The work is altogether more modern – in terms of atonality – and intimate. The fact that the Second Symphony derives from the Seven Preludes for piano\(^{18}\) accounts for the shorter and more self-contained nature of the final three movements. Long melodies, previously used to develop motivic and thematic material, are largely absent.

Despite this relative brevity, however, the seamless joining of the fourth and sixth preludes in the first movement demonstrates a symphonic instinct for unity, continuity and transformation. The first movement – the longest by some margin – fuses these relatively self-contained movements into a slowly cogitating transformation, finishing with what Aho identifies as a synthesis section.\(^{19}\) This continuity relies on the common use of adjacent notes in the low bass registers, combined with a similar atmosphere, both sections using quiet dynamics and relatively slow tempi. The later parts of the movement culminate in larger and louder statements of the rhythmic idea taken from the opening of the sixth prelude. There is a different temporal experience here, however, to the comparatively unidirectional development in Symphony No. 1, which does not detract from the argument for surface-level continuity. Rather than linear goal-orientation, there is an emphasis on changes in intensity. These temporal processes once again recall Adlington’s ideas of

\(^{18}\) Aho, Rautavaara as Symphonist, 80.
\(^{19}\) Ibid.
perceiving musical time ‘beyond motion’, advocating metaphors of rising pressure and heat.\textsuperscript{20}

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the totally serial \textit{Arabescata}, the orchestral work that Rautavaara later included as the fourth in his cycle of symphonies,\textsuperscript{21} reveals no comparable motivic development with the First, Second or Third Symphonies. Even though the 12-tone row generates variation, the experience is different as a sense of audible, motivic transformation is absent, even if the fact that everything derives from the row means continuous development takes place.

\textit{The Late Symphonies}

The two latest symphonies will be covered in depth in a chapter on how self-quotation affects thematic processes, as both of these works revitalise a large amount of pre-existing material. However, it is useful to outline briefly their thematic processes at face value here. Unity in both of these works depends on highly efficient motivic principles, operating at a deep level. Melodic ideas in \textit{Angel of Light} predominantly orientate around the Hymn Motif, a unifying element working over changes in harmonic colour. The symphony progresses through various shades, finding continuity in motivic connections between melodic passages that pass through contrasting regions. This motif works alongside Row VI and the unifying use of triads to generate much of the thematic material.

As \textit{Angel of Light} centres largely on contrast, albeit using related melodic material, it differs slightly from \textit{The Journey}, even though they have common methods in motivic development. The Eighth Symphony begins with a focused, flexible and highly efficient arrangement of ideas. As argued in Chapter 2, the elemental organisation of this material orientates towards an end-point. This teleological process summarises the work as a whole, but is also at work in individual movements. In terms of pitch, the introduction gives the hexachord G-A-B\textsubscript{7}-C-D-E – a Dorian collection from which the pivotal ascending-fourths motif (A-D-G-C-A) is crystallised. In addition, rhythmic motifs recur through subsequent melodic developments in the whole symphony. These elements connect melodies throughout, alongside those motivic shapes that retain their intervallic and rhythmic properties. The symphony works towards statements of the fourths motif, which forms common ground between different melodic sections and underscores shifting harmonic contexts.

\textsuperscript{20} Robert Adlington, ‘Moving Beyond Motion’, 307.
\textsuperscript{21} Howell, \textit{After Sibelius}, 120.
The movement of the sea

Rautavaara’s emphasis on thematic unity manifests in his Symphony No. 3 (1961), the first work where he synthesised motivic transformation with serialist modernism. This amalgamation went on to influence the final four symphonies. Its second movement is an instructive example of how Rautavaara sought to renew the spirit of Anton Bruckner’s music, especially a sense of tumultuous energy, using a modern vocabulary. Despite being serial, there are clear organic principles of motivic development. In looking to Bruckner’s example for a modern symphony, Rautavaara was finding his own solution to a creative need to write music with a sense of large-scale, broad development:

My Third Symphony came into being from an overwhelming desire to write music that would breathe in long, broad, sweeping paragraphs, in the rhythm of the land and the sea.22

The allusion to nature seems a significant part of this stylistic turning point. The Third Symphony establishes the sense of elemental force and size that also occurs in Rautavaara’s later symphonies, combining motion with broad architectural shapes. Symphony No. 3 is not a programmatic work but, in approaching this more elemental inspiration, Bruckner’s balance of large formal schemes with a sense of melodic motion and broad intervals of fourths and fifths seems a useful frame of reference. This inspiration is reimagined within a highly compressed timescale.

Timothy L. Jackson points out that, in the slow movements of Bruckner’s later symphonies, there is a synthesis of rondo and sonata principles, a technique that he argues was strongly influenced by what Schoenberg termed ‘developing variation’.23 In terms of how this approach to large-scale musical form might have influenced Rautavaara, the experience of the second movement centres on a balance between repetition and dynamism. Each “Statement” in the formal outline (Ex. 5.1) transforms a small amount of motivic material in such a way that it is different from the preceding one – a kind of developing variation. The analogy of waves seems appropriate, as this metaphor encapsulates the sensation of separate sections, alongside simultaneous, continuous transformation that orientates towards a climactic statement. Expanding on this analogy,
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22 Quoted in Aho, Rautavaara as Symphonist, 83.
musical time is orientated towards large orchestral climaxes, whilst the lack of linear, teleological end-orientation creates ebb and flow. Underpinning this linear transformation is a logical harmonic progression, centred on third and fifth relations. The tonality here is also progressive, ending up in a different harmonic place to where it began, thereby reinforcing the sense of constant change within an otherwise static environment. While this harmonic progression invites comparison with early-twentieth-century symphonists such as Mahler and Nielsen, the 12-note row in this piece is ultimately the structure behind this neo-tonal orientation, and the series is used to support motivic principles. Whilst studying serialism with Vogel, Rautavaara arrived at a view that a 12-tone row could be used as a base-level structure for motivic development:

In certain cases the function of the series was to act as a motivic automation that creates coherence at the grass-roots level, at the lowest fractal level, because everything is derived from the series and the intervallic formulations are everywhere in the piece, in the melodies and harmonies, in the vertical and horizontal dimensions. They create a network of intervallic figures; this is a kind of motivic technique on the small scale. Why would I call it an automation? It is because you don’t need to pay any attention to it; you are free to consider other things, viz. larger formal entities and the global form.  

Symphony No. 3 is therefore an early example of using a row to form a base-level structure, guaranteeing unity through its consistent incorporation, but also providing a reservoir of notes that facilitates a more liberal motivic approach. The instinct to create synthesis from an apparent paradox is clear – he instigates a symphonic technique that is not tied to what he regarded as an overly-mechanical formula, whilst that formula nevertheless forms an efficient structure for melodic progression. This efficiency, and variety of pitch over short time periods, is largely responsible for the freshness and reduced timescale in this work influenced by Bruckner.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thematic statement</td>
<td>Statement 1</td>
<td>Statement 2</td>
<td>Statement 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars</td>
<td>1-13</td>
<td>14-25</td>
<td>26-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo</td>
<td>Langsam, doch nicht schleppend</td>
<td>Wieder langsam und breit</td>
<td>Leicht, bewegt, träumend frei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of dynamics</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td>( \langle )</td>
<td>ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonal centres</td>
<td>F# ( \rightarrow )</td>
<td>A- ( \rightarrow )</td>
<td>E- D#, Bb G- ( \rightarrow ) D+ (No clear centre)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Everything grows out of material presented in the first three bars (boxed in Ex. 5.2), comprising of a motif first introduced in the horns, and an oscillating figure in the violins and violas based on a minor third. This opening material is also related to the motivic ideas that span the entire symphony, especially the Horn theme first presented in the opening of the first movement (Ex. 5.3.1) derived from the series, which go through numerous, large, cyclical transformations and broad developments – a process that arguably summarises the entire symphony with its culmination towards the end of the final movement. The similarities between the openings of Bruckner’s Fourth Symphony and Rautavaara’s Third Symphony have been highlighted by Aho and are shown in Ex. 5.3.

Ex. 5.2: Symphony No. 3, 2nd mvt., bb. 1-3

25 Sivuoja-Gunaratnam, Narrating with Twelve Tones, 63.
26 Aho, Rautavaara as Symphonist, 83-84.
Ex. 5.3.1: Symphony No. 3, 1st mvt., bb. 6-10

Ex. 5.3.2: Bruckner, Symphony No. 4, 1st mvt., bb. 1-9

While there is continuity running through the movement, there are also several waves moving away from opening gesture, before the process starts again. Where a sense of overall continuity and dynamism becomes clear, though, is the fact that no two statements are the same and some go significantly further than others, in terms of duration, intensity and dynamic range. The motivic material highlighted in Ex. 5.2 encapsulates the intervallic content (fourths, minor thirds and seconds) that characterise the thematic processes in this movement and the row. The important interval of a third is also outlined
in the last three notes of the motif. Each thematic statement develops from this opening idea.

Melodic continuity grows out of this gesture, stemming initially from the oscillating thirds idea, and then becoming a broad-interval melody that relates rhythmically to the motif, before returning back to the quaver idea. This sense of a small thematic outgrowth is reinforced by a process of ascending and descending in pitch. This process gives way to a restatement of the motif in the bassoons (Ex. 5.4, bar 14) and the oscillating thirds minor in Violin 2 and Viola, this time commencing on A.

Ex. 5.4: Symphony No. 3, 2nd mvt., bb. 6-14

This melodic extension process also occurs at Figure 2 in the score, but the development is different to that beginning in bar 10 (Ex. 5.4). By this point, the idea of a wave-like process taking place at this local thematic level is apparent. These first two thematic statements each have different potential in terms of where they progress to and how far they progress, but ultimately return to the same starting point. In Statement 2 (see Ex. 5.1), the more diatonic process from bars 20 to 25 – arising from the increased use of whole tones and thirds in the melody – orientates towards the fortissimo passage beginning at bar 26, with its development of fifths and fourths in the brass. The suddenness of this fortissimo – the instrumentation goes from strings to the full orchestra in the space of just three bars – adds to the impression of elemental force that Rautavaara alluded to at the time of composition, as a culmination of a sweeping motion ‘in the rhythm of the land the
sea’. In both of these statements, therefore, there is a development from relatively contained interval content towards broader intervals, although, as previously stated, these have totally different manifestations.

Section B opens with a new thematic statement closely linked to the oscillating quavers idea from bar 1, but this time starting with the interval of a second. After a hesitant feeling over bars 34 to 36 (Ex. 5.5), a new thematic idea grows as a cello line. This example demonstrates the relative priority given to rhythm in Rautavaara’s motivic metamorphosis – an idea which will be discussed in more detail. This idea of sections extending to different points is powerfully expressed in Section B. Concerning the repetition of the two-bar phrase from bar 34, Anne Sivuoja-Gunaratnam observes how these moments of repeating, oscillating semitones contain no motivic development, but an alternative reading is that they form part of this larger process of varying waves of motion.

Ex. 5.5: Symphony No. 3, 2nd mvt., bb. 34-38

A new thematic potential is reached during Section B, Statement 2, which works its way back to the material planted in bars 1 and 2. In this statement, there is a thematic arc in the strings alone. As in Section A, the melodic extension coincides with the use of broader intervals, generated by the integration of the 12-note row in this movement. It is therefore possible to see how Rautavaara reconciled dodecaphony with traditional ideas of motivic development. This idea comes back to the concept of developing variation as a renewable element. By harnessing the intervallic diversity of the row, he achieves a thematic development that would otherwise have been impossible. The synthesis of Romanticism and modernism is driven by a continued impulse towards motivic metamorphosis that operates beyond tonal laws without rejecting them. Maximum

27 Quoted in Aho, Rautavaara as Symphonist, 83.
28 Sivuoja-Gunaratnam, Narrating with Twelve Tones, 59.
diversity is achieved from a motivic germ, achieving variety in a concentrated way, and this aesthetic was part of what made symphonic writing so viable.

The developing variation continues in Section A1, where the motif appears closer to its original form, but altered into a lower-neighbour-note idea. As with Section A, Statement 2, this grows rapidly into a fortissimo culmination, shown in Ex. 5.6.

Ex. 5.6: Symphony No. 3, 2nd mvt., bb. 62-68

After a small variant on the motivic material over bars 72 and 73, the final statement ends a perfect fifth above the opening material (see Ex. 5.1), no doubt informed by harmonic symmetry – the movement being framed by a perfect fifth – but also the idea of returning to the starting point, whilst the environment has changed. The overall movement, then, might be seen as one overall motion outwards, before returning back. As a form, this movement clearly draws on an arch-form model, but there are other manifestations of growth and waves of varying intensity at a more local level in this movement that powerfully draw on aspects of nature.

In this movement, repeated ideas are always in transformation – a process that does not recapitulate but presses on through time. In discussing the first movement, Rautavaara mentions his intention to avoid recapitulations:

For me, the recapitulation was an anti-climax, it was too predictable to be anything but disappointing. And the development seemed merely a variation mechanism. The return home is undoubtedly an archetype. […] The journey that does not lead into the great unknown is not worth making, at least in art.29

This comment reveals a critical reflection on both late-Romantic symphonic practice and modernism. For Rautavaara, certain stylistic techniques from each were useful, whilst
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29 Quoted in Aho, Rautavaara as Symphonist, 86.
others were not taken up at a later stage. Nevertheless, the notion of arriving somewhere new, emerging into new contexts, whilst undertaking a journey with a concentrated collection of motivic resources was to prove fundamental to his orchestral development, and an integral facet of his symphonic contribution and independent style.

**Rhythm and motivic metamorphosis**

A trait of Rautavaara’s thematic development is to depart from the melodic contour of a given melody or motif, whilst continuing its rhythmic properties. Although this practice transforms the melodic identity, it enables considerable variation, as the intervallic content can significantly expand and change. This process is combined with the cyclical, “wave” statements outlined in Ex. 5.1. And yet, because rhythmic properties are also highly recognisable, the ideas in their changing formats and circumstances can still be followed and a sense of continuity is not lacking. Another distinctive result of this rhythmic emphasis is the sense of continual transformation. The rhythm can also extend or return in segments, further expressing this notion of out-growth, organicism and economy.

The oscillating quaver idea provides continuity throughout the second movement, even when the intervals change. The idea of motivic continuity expressed primarily through rhythmic motifs is not new. Although Julian Horton challenges the notion that the rhythmic cell, characterising the “fate” motif in Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony is an instigator for thematic unity across multiple movements, there is surely no denying that this rhythm is so distinctive that it can hardly be overlooked as some reference back to the opening bars of this work. Rautavaara finds his own kind of developing variation, moving beyond motivic statements alone, where broad thematic statements, deliberately varying in length, can have extremely differing identities, and yet derive from the same root. Additionally, the musical language is independent of functional tonality.

In discussing the different approach to other composers in Bruckner’s symphonies, Carl Dahlhaus emphasises the importance of rhythm to Bruckner’s thematic development:

> Musical logic, the ‘developing variation’ of musical ideas ... rested on a premise considered so self-evident as to be beneath mention: that the central parameter of art music is its ‘diastematic’, or pitch, structure ... Bruckner’s symphonic style, however, unlike that
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of Brahms’s chamber music or Wagner’s music dramas, is primarily rhythmic rather than
diastematic, and thus seems to stand the usual hierarchy of tonal properties on its head.\textsuperscript{31}

Discussing Bruckner’s Sixth Symphony, Julian Horton builds on observations by
Dahlhaus, stating that ‘the diversity of thematic variants arises not from a systematic
manipulation of interval content, but from the free alteration of pitch and interval around
an invariant rhythmic pattern.’\textsuperscript{32} Retaining rhythm, whilst approaching pitch with relative
freedom, was part of Rautavaara’s experimentations to channel what he felt to be
renewable techniques found in nineteenth-century Romanticism through the catalyst of
serialism.

Through this variation technique, the relatively obvious influence of Bruckner on
the Third Symphony has contributed less visibly to the directions taken in his later
symphonies. This motivic metamorphosis continued, but was treated differently as his
pitch organisation reached a new level in its reconciliation of different systems.

\textit{Reimagining Brucknerian Symphonism}

The motivic processes in Symphony No. 3 – especially the elemental sense of large-scale
motion – reimagine Brucknerian symphonism. A great departure, however, is the
concentrated economy of this movement, not just in its significantly reduced timespan, but
also in the extremely focused use of motivic material which is also uniquely informed by
the economy of the row as the basic structure. The effect of this timespan and the role of
serialism have also been acknowledged by Howell, who emphasises how nothing is lost in
the significantly reduced timescale.\textsuperscript{33} It is worth adding here, though, that this
concentration and efficiency, compared to slow movements in Bruckner’s symphonies,
creates a dramatically intensified process of cumulative energy which seems to reflect and
reinforce Rautavaara’s view that this music should ‘breath in the rhythm of the land and
the sea’.\textsuperscript{34} But perhaps this process happens in a location where natural events happen
rather more quickly and dramatically. Tumultuous orchestral climaxes come as a surprise,
apparently appearing out of nowhere – undoubtedly a result of the concentrated experience
of circular formal patterns alongside continuous development and variation.

\textsuperscript{31} Carl Dahlhaus, Nineteenth-Century Music, ed. J. Bradford Robinson (Berkeley: University of California

\textsuperscript{32} Horton, ‘Cyclical thematic processes’, 211.

\textsuperscript{33} Howell, After Sibelius, 119.

\textsuperscript{34} Quoted in Aho, Rautavaara as Symphonist, 83.
There is also a continuation of the way Austro-Germanic symphonic practices relate to language. Rautavaara’s labelling of each movement as “Satz”, meaning “movement”, but literally translates as “sentence” is in accordance with Bruckner’s own practice, and is a reminder of the way a movement can be regarded as one statement or ‘a complete thought in music’.\(^{35}\) There is also a sense of hierarchy that recalls language, where paragraphs and sentences (thoughts in music) contain sub-constructions, just as the overall statement of the third movement subsumes smaller constructions that can only extend so far. This relationship between music and language also recalls the way Nicholas Cook, in describing semiotic analysis, points out its kinship with the methods by which linguists analyse meaning in speech, which involves breaking down language into its ‘building blocks.’\(^{36}\) With such an emphasis on motivic transformation combined with elemental power, channelled into a new vocabulary, Symphony No. 3 is a prophetic work within Rautavaara’s complete symphonic cycle.

**Melody and narrative**

In a work where there are many levels of activity and contrasts in texture, sections of prolonged melody in Symphony No. 5 stand out. The thematic processes in this work develop, in a symphonic context, his idea of “textural polyphony” that he identifies in *Hommage à Kodály Zoltán (Bird Gardens)* (1982),\(^ {37}\) where a sense of development is informed by the overlapping relationship between different kinds of texture. This aleatoric-influenced approach is continued in Symphony No. 5.

A sense of narrative here derives from a complex process of continuity and transformation that characterises this single-movement symphony on a number of levels. Combinations of, and relationships between, different kinds of texture form much of this surface-level experience. The resulting thematic features are outlined in Ex. 5.7. Rautavaara consequently uses a broad palette for thematic development, using texture alongside motivic cells. This process articulates a particular kind of tension and release. Such interactions of melodic and more static textures, incur a certain energy, generating
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shifts in atmosphere and forcing melodic development to recommence at various stages amidst a constantly-transforming environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Principal thematic features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-11</td>
<td>‘Introduction’</td>
<td>No melodic material. Harmonic progression through triadic and chromatic chords. Rising/ falling dynamics creates textual “ebb and flow”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-138</td>
<td>‘Chorale 1’</td>
<td>New melody grows out of chromatic motif. Pitch generally ascends. Moments of increased rhythmic activity introduce surface-level tension. Arrives at static harmony on C major/ F sharp chord (b. 98) Transition into Scherzo 1 (bb. 136-138) accelerates through triplets and semiquavers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139-97</td>
<td>‘Scherzo 1’</td>
<td>Melodic identity greatly reduced. Chromatic motif from “Chorale 1” recalled in disjunct, homophonic and chromatic chords.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198-312</td>
<td>‘Chorale 2’</td>
<td>Melody in bar 217 re-crystallises around the chromatic set in high strings. Melody continually transforms and develops in polyphonic counterpoint between different orchestra sections. Mobile harmony, generated by melodic motion. Gradually increases speed into “Scherzo 2”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313-402</td>
<td>‘Scherzo 2’</td>
<td>More melodic than “Scherzo 1”. Continues melodic material from “Chorale 2” in a more chromatic context. Melodic development combined with perpetual motion reaches chromatic “saturation point”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403-46</td>
<td>‘Transition’</td>
<td>Returns to prolonged C major chord from Introduction Alternates C major chord with “aftershocks” of “Scherzo 2”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447-93</td>
<td>‘Coda’</td>
<td>Extending/ contracting melody develops chromatic motif over static C major/ A♭ major harmony.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex. 5.7: Outline of thematic features in Symphony No. 5
Motivic processes play a significant part in this narrative. Pivotal to melodic continuity and change is a small motif (occurrences of this motivic germ are highlighted in Exx. 5.8-5.11). There are two aspects that signal the return of this idea. Firstly, this motif is often chromatic and outlines the interval of a minor third. However, this chromatic cell is arranged so that it uses at least one whole tone and one semitone – a configuration that gives this figure a different intervallic configuration when ascending and descending. Secondly, the motif has a distinctive rhythmic identity, frequently using one longer note and three quavers. Over the course of the extended melodic development in the symphony, one or both of these elements can articulate gradual transformation.

Ex. 5.8: Symphony No. 5, Violins, bb. 12-16

This motif is presented at the beginning of the “Processional” section in bar 12 – the first instance of melody (see Ex. 5.8). This idea is highly flexible, without any fixed contour, and therefore builds on motivic processes in Symphony No. 3, but the context here is different. The hybrid nature of this motif, with its chromatic and diatonic potential, is a recurring element in both the “Processional” and “Coda” sections, which share the same basic melodic material. Its compressed interval structure at this point contrasts with those later thematic developments that grow into wider intervals. This dialogue between concentrated chromaticism and more diatonically-orientated melodies runs throughout.

Ex. 5.9: Symphony No. 5, Violins, bb. 17-18
According to Aho, the “Processional” section was so named by Erik Tawaststjerna, owing to its seemingly infinite, searching quality. As this melody extends chromatically, it creates a sense of development. Progress is impeded, however, by the aleatoric “birdsong” figurations in the woodwind, causing the melody to stagnate into a repeating cell. When the chords from the opening are reintroduced, the melody is swamped altogether.

With the dissipation of the chord in bar 40, the melody starts up again, resuming the process by returning to the motif, but using a new chromatic segment (see the violins in Ex. 5.10). This is a fresh attempt to proceed: the melody is new, but formed from the same motif as that beginning in bar 11. The same sense of inertia keeps reappearing (see Ex. 5.7), as a dynamic melody is obstructed by these more static textures.

Ex. 5.10: Symphony No. 5, bb. 39-41

By the third attempt, the melody splits into three voices, introducing the Viola. In its attempt to continue proceedings, it loses some of the linear clarity present at the start of the section. Additionally, the thematic connection highlighted in Ex. 11 is rhythmic, rather than melodic, and no longer outlines a minor third, emphasising the melodic development
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38 Aho, Raatavaara as Symphonist, 99.
39 Ibid.
that has taken place. The context has changed as contrapuntal melodies produce more diatonic-sounding harmonies – the melody tries to transform and extend beyond its compact chromaticism. Adjacent chromatic steps are now used sparingly, while a broader range of diatonically-suggestive intervals are used, including fourths and thirds. Harmonic motion is relatively consonant for the most part, as seen in Ex. 5.11.

Unsurprisingly, the two “Chorale” sections in Symphony No. 5 feature melody prominently, offering the most space for development and transformation, often in multiple voices. These sections again seek to build on the thematic potential of the chromatic motif. The returning melody in bar 77 (Ex. 5.12) uses a varied turn on this motif. Both “Chorale” sections develop this musical idea following opposing textures. Such opposition displaces the thematic potential that seeks continually to develop in one statement. This new, but related, idea repeats, but the statement rises in pitch each time. This is a recurring feature in the work: the melody frequently ascends higher, in combination with increased rhythmic activity elsewhere in the orchestra, which heralds the transformation into a new area, as well as a sensation of some kind of struggle or desperation taking place.

Ex. 5.11: Symphony No. 5, bb. 55-57
Ex. 5.12: Symphony No. 5, Horns, bb. 77-78

Following another relatively static section between bars 96 and 103, a three-part melody commences in bar 111, referring to the motif, but with the intention of growing continuously (see Ex. 5.13). The section ends with a returned focus on this motif, as though regrouping and reassessing its identity in order to propel the music into something new, overcoming some kind of adversity and making progress. The chromatic set is the default, the basis of all development and the point from which to build anew. This germ also has great thematic potential. As shown in the line played by the Cor Anglais in Ex. 5.13 the space created from two overlapping minor thirds can accommodate chromatic, whole tone, octatonic and diatonic possibilities.

Ex. 5.13: Symphony No. 5, Oboes and Cor Anglais, bb. 111-114

The same thematic displacement, re-orientating the chromatic motif in a new direction, also characterises “Chorale 2”, as the melody develops anew. In this section, the melody has the most space and time to develop logically, growing and transforming into a new diatonic character, as evident in Ex.5.14.
Ex. 5.14: Symphony No. 5, Flutes and Piccolo, bb. 217-219

This ability for the melody to exist somewhere between the chromatic and diatonic, never aligning with tonality, whilst not rejecting it either, allows broad development. A sense of Neo-Romantic subjectivity, articulated in a new way, emphasises the moment, the drama of which becomes especially powerful over bars 296-312, where the melody moves higher, whilst a triplet moto perputuo begins elsewhere in the orchestra, resulting in an acceleration effect into “Scherzo 2”. Such surface-level processes, which orientate the listener, demonstrate the striving towards synthesis that characterises much of this piece, assimilating thematic development with aleatoricism and chromaticism.

The Scherzo sections, which form antitheses to Chorales 1 and 2, bring a complete change in texture and melody is contained to shorter bursts. But a larger thematic continuity can be traced through these more chromatic and fragmentary sections, especially in “Scherzo 2” (see Ex. 5.7). Fragments of material combine with a violence of expression in the form of advanced instrumental techniques. As with all of Rautavaara’s Scherzi, and much of his fast music in general, these sections could be described as more outwardly “modern” than the slower sections. Therefore, part of the “narrative” in this symphony is a dialogue between the traditional and the modern within the symphonic form. Indeed, during the “Transitional” section (bars 403-446), there is a struggle between the Scherzo elements outlined above and the triadic, sustained chords from the opening – these chords being an instigator for melodic continuation. The saturation point in “Scherzo 2” sees the culmination of a struggle between dynamic and static textures, resulting in an
expressive outburst. This moment marks a point of change in the symphony, informing the tone of the “Coda”.

After the various tensions and releases between different textures over the entire symphony, the “Coda” does find some reconciliation. Melodic ideas at this point are finally given a seemingly infinite space to develop but the repeating, static chords restrict them from truly progressing harmonically. This process results in a synthesis between freedom and control. In short, thematic processes confirm on a local level the spiral process (see Chapter 3) – the larger experience of progressing somewhere and returning again – but it also brings a dramatic and expressive surface-level narrative.

More broadly, this notion of coming full circle might reflect Rautavaara’s relationship with the symphonic genre: it was natural to return to a symphonic way of thinking, but this has been shaped and coloured by the experiences along the way. The thematic narrative articulates this procession, making the Fifth Symphony simultaneously a reflection on and a reinvention of past compositional principles. Such an autobiographical perspective is also suggested in Rautavaara’s own summary of the piece:

> During the course of the journey we visit the different strata of European culture: from the chaotic opening, typical of contemporary music, we penetrate further back in time and finally return, not without irony, to a state of serenity.⁴⁰

**Processes of “becoming”**

As discussed in Chapter 4, *Vincentiana* is primarily an absolute symphony that nevertheless draws on the non-linear narrative of the opera *Vincent*. The level of motivic and thematic transformation supports this larger sense of narrative, which departs from and returns to the more static “paintings” taken from *Vincent*. An important part of the surface-level experience is a process of *becoming*.

Much of the 19-minute first movement of *Vincentiana* demonstrates a very similar psychological phenomenon as that outlined by Schmalfeldt (see the beginning of this chapter), but this is reimagined in a contemporary context, outside of the conventions of nineteenth-century formal practice, helping to shape a modern and complex musical narrative. Significant stages of arrival in “Starry Night” become, retrospectively, transitional in nature. Therefore, the listener constantly has to re-evaluate what they have
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⁴⁰ Aho, *Rautavaara as Symphonist*, 100.
heard and the promise of arrival or resolution remains highly illusive. In this sense, thematic processes show the influence of the dramatic structure of an operatic plot.

Schmalfeldt’s description of an experience, relating to early-nineteenth-century music, potentially has a far broader application for later music, and helps emphasise the sensation of continuous transformation, without necessarily ever truly arriving anywhere. Extra-musical associations and psychological development also resonate with the visionary narratives that influence the Sixth Symphony. Such a wider application of “becoming” to an altogether different context takes this way of thinking about formal process into a new direction. Suzannah Clarke summarises the concept broadly, stating that it is ‘relevant to those passages that invite a listener to settle on a formal category of a section of music while hearing it in the moment, only to rethink the category once more as the piece continues.’141 Although “formal categories”, in Clarke’s precise meaning, are not present in Vincentiana, there are nevertheless episodic sections within a larger design, which subsequently lose their suggested formal hierarchy as time moves on and the symphony progresses.

An example of this “false-arrival” phenomenon occurs at bar 67. As shown in Ex. 5.15, there is a comparatively static texture from this point and a change in atmosphere is enhanced by arpeggios on the harp, whilst the horns begin an ascending fourths idea. But, by bar 83, it becomes apparent that the music is moving somewhere new and still developing. This idea is indicated by the continued variation of motivic material in melody, whilst there is an intensified surface-level activity, bringing a sense of forward momentum once again. There is also a shift in harmony, after a long pedal point, which further suggests dynamism, rather than stasis.

This retrospective reinterpretation is confirmed by the beginning of the following section (b. 92), which enters into quite a different mood, but nevertheless continues melodic development. The details of how motivic principles factor into a process of “becoming” will be discussed below, but the relationship can be summarised as follows. Motivic development generates continuity, which has a deliberately discursive thread, like a connected series of thoughts that ultimately return to a different, but similar, place. This process fits alongside that of “becoming” as there is an unlimited potential for melodic development, as one stage leads into the next.

Ex. 5.15: Vincentiana, “Starry Night”, bb. 72-79
This experience is crucial to the larger form of the piece. Although the global formal process is non-linear, the local level – the dynamic, moment-to-moment process – removes this clarity. This surface-level perspective brings a sense of subjectivity – a stream of consciousness that has logic, but lacks clear orientation. Drawn-out themes, based on motivic transformation, invoke a narrative element in “Starry Night” which, retrospectively, never feels like it has reached somewhere for definite.

Given the particular way in which “Starry Night” transforms over time, departing from and returning to “ hazier” atmospheres, there is a broad alignment with Nathan Martin and Steven Vande Moortelle’s double-arrow view on processes of “becoming”.42 When the movement eventually culminates in a return to the atmosphere of the opening, it reaches a saturation point of musical intensity: in the constant effort to reach a goal, the process eventually burns itself out.

Motivic “DNA”

Following the introduction, the melody continues to unfold as the music moves through contrasting sections, giving the illusion of goal orientation. Motivic components in both rhythm and pitch cause this sensation, but it is part of Rautavaara’s technique of manipulating motivic “DNA” that these two elements sometimes work independently. As with the Third Symphony, rhythmic ideas are recognisable in different melodic contours, while the rhythmic “shaping” of a short melodic figure can be flexible. This flexibility is ultimately what causes the local-level form to move through contrasting scenarios, whilst retaining an important sense of continuity and subjectivity.

There are a number of rhythmic cells that recur throughout “Starry Night” and, for example, “Apotheosis”, where there is a more diatonic emphasis. Triplets are especially important to this melodic continuity. This triplet idea can be augmented and is frequently, though not always, combined with conjunct melodic motion – see Ex. 5.16.
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42 Martin and Moortelle, ‘Formal Functions and Retrospective Reinterpretation’: 148.
Ex. 5.16: Rhythmic connections in melodic passages, *Vincentiana*, “Starry Night”

The pitch set (013) also occurs consistently, and frequently coincides with the triplet idea. The Forte notation here is used for convenience; the point is that this set spans a minor third, within which is a semitone and one whole tone. This small germ is found within most melodic passages in this movement. Its flexible intervallic structure makes it appropriate for a variety of chromatic and modal settings, thereby instigating surface-level development. The conjunct emphasis – using notes close together – also helps provide a linear orientation, a point of reference bringing the sense of transformation through constantly-changing surroundings.

This economy is, to an extent, responsible for the continuous ambiguity between chromaticism and modal diatonicism in “Starry Night” and is therefore central to the colouristic, visionary combinations of pitch materials. The capacity to have a continuously regenerating stream of consciousness is potentially infinite with this technique. This pitch set is found to be a common element between the otherwise highly contrasting harmonic realms in this movement, including the hexachord from the 12-tone row used from bar 31 (012458), as well as all diatonic collections (013568T), Mode 2 (0134679T), and Mode 6 (012468T). Chapter 7 explores this pitch compatibility more fully.

*Vincentiana* re-imagines efficient local-level transformation, establishing an audible sense of both unity and continuity running throughout. The dramatic inspiration behind this symphony results in another new “solution” to this apparent creative need to transform material over an extended period of time, in a symphonic way. Form as a process and notions of “becoming” can assume many manifestations – they can also broadly be applied to the Fifth Symphony (a continuous process of cause and effect). In *Vincentiana*, this process suits the peculiar, psychological narrative of this piece. Surface-
level operations confirm that, although new scenarios are encountered, which are certainly not devoid of drama, the overall form returns to the same place, but is changed as a consequence. This approach echoes the introverted narrative from the opera. The process of moving through a series of states is crucial to appreciating the final stages of light and colour. As “form as process” and conceptions of narrative are important traits of Romanticism, it is clear that Rautavaara found a way of renewing this notion. In this regard, “Neo-Romantic” – one of the labels readily attached to him – has a more tangible meaning.

**Developing themes**

This chapter has shown that motivic and thematic developments are persistent features of Rautavaara’s symphonies. These processes demonstrate economy over large time-spans to bring continuity and change in particular ways. Traditional notions of motivic development are given new realisations, often prompted by the overlapping aims between symphonies and other genres, as well as between various compositional techniques such as dodecaphony and aleatoric counterpoint. The combination of recent and older techniques for these surface-level processes is also an important experimentation.

Thematic development has different realisations in different symphonies. In Symphony No.3, novelty derives from the combination of Brucknerian principles and serialism, while Symphony No. 5 presents a new narrative through textural counterpoint. In *Vincentiana*, deeply-embedded transformation takes place within a dodecaphonic setting. These purposes demonstrate the enduring internal logic of thematic development, which can accommodate older and newer techniques. There are overlaps between these approaches, however. Some kind of narrative exists in each, as does melodic metamorphosis. This technique largely relies on the flexible organisation of pitch materials, as Rautavaara worked independently of both functional tonality and strict serialism.
Self-quotation and Rautavaara’s symphonies

It has been reasonably well-documented that Rautavaara had a habit of repeating himself musically. Musical ideas frequently re-appear, often crossing into completely different genres. Although a particular hallmark of his later music, this technique featured right across his output.¹ He goes beyond writing music that simply recalls the atmosphere of a given piece, utilising similar gestures; there is usually an explicit reproduction of these passages. Furthermore, he does not simply cut-and-paste material, nor does he use quotation purely as a means of writing music quickly, although this motivation was an additional factor, given the large number of commissions for orchestral music in the late-1990s and early-2000s. There is real effort to incorporate the quoted material in a coherent way and to transform it.

An area that this chapter will explore in detail is how self-quotation influences symphonic processes, particularly at the level of thematic development. Above all, how does Rautavaara incorporate seemingly disparate musical ideas to create symphonic unity? This will lead on to what this technique might say about the continued relevance to him of organicism, linear transformation, and economy of material. In re-casting ideas into symphonic forms, Rautavaara frequently exhibits a command of his material to link and develop this over large timespans.

Musical “narcissism”?

Sivuoja-Gunaratnam describes Rautavaara’s self-quotation as a kind of musical “narcissism”, stating that he ‘enjoys his pieces and has a constant habit of quoting himself’.² Qualifying this idea by stating that she is not referring to the composer’s psyche, she highlights the similarity between the story of Narcissus looking in the mirror and the way Rautavaara’s pieces “mirror” or “reflect” each other.³ Whilst the reasoning behind this evaluation is clear, the self-obsessive association of narcissism could become a red herring. Although he was undeniably focused on fully exploring his own ideas, he was not closed-down to the musical world around him. It is also surely fair to say that he

² Sivuoja-Gunaratnam, Narrating with Twelve Tones, 240.
³ Ibid., 240-241.
would not be unusual in being a composer who enjoys hearing his own music. Whilst
other composers might not quote themselves so literally, it is common for similar gestures
to recur within one oeuvre, especially when that body of work is prolific.

This chapter therefore proposes an alternative, but related, interpretation to musical
narcissism: that Rautavaara’s self-quotations demonstrate a creative need to explore his
ideas and musical language to their maximum potential. In fact, this use of self-quotation
could even indicate a kind of modesty and industriousness: he works to get the most out of
the material that “presents” itself at that given moment. Economy of this kind is
significant in the larger context of Finnish music, especially the influence of Sibelius’s
symphonism, and will be discussed at a later stage in this thesis. This view aligns with that
of Sivuoja-Gunaratnam, who describes the auto-citations as a way of remaking his
compositions. 4 Similarly, Tiikkaja regards them as an attempt to make his musical ideas
live longer, whilst also ‘emphasising their form in the now’, 5 while Leatherbarrow states
how Rautavaara viewed his music as being somehow alive. 6 The approach here considers
the significance of producing such different manifestations of the same idea, where two or
more contexts incorporating the same material are mutually supportive, whilst at the same
time often move closer to a “perfected” statement of that material, as he sees it in that
moment. As Rautavaara’s self-quotations always seeks to give new life to the music in
question, providing a kind of creative reinterpretation, this technique demonstrates
enormous efficiency, attaining maximum variation.

Nature versus design

Rautavaara believed that the composer is to be guided by their musical ideas – that they in
some way grow – and he balances this natural process with structural elements of design.
In discussing his approach to Autumn Gardens (1999), he explained how his own motifs
influence him:

Maybe I could start with explaining the title of the work, which is a quotation from the
libretto of my opera The House of the Sun. There is a line in that libretto, by myself, which
goes “Like a butterfly in a dark autumn garden.” The musical motive to which these words
are sung is the theme for the variations in the first movement [of Autumn Gardens]. My
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4 Ibid., 241.
5 Tiikkaja, ‘Postmodern Intertextualist’: 49.
ideas and motives behave quite often this way. They don’t want to be left. They want to reappear in a new context, and maybe to grow and develop into something else.\footnote{Quoted in Leatherbarrow, ‘Angels and Transformations’, 127.}

Self-quotation becomes a way of dealing with the problem that a musical idea can only take on one realisation at a time. Often, though, the material could just as easily have gone into a different direction. This issue is highly relevant if the composer believes their material to have a will of its own. In this way, Rautavaara balances craft and intuition and saw no reason to deny this kind of inter-textual variation from happening. In relinquishing a certain amount of control, he achieved more with his ideas.

This idea of acting upon the multiple possibilities of musical ideas is supported by the way Rautavaara often disseminated the same material within pieces that were written in close succession, producing small networks. Ex. 6.1 shows a segment of interconnecting pieces around Symphony No. 8 that together form a kind of family of resemblances. This example also illustrates the predominantly unidirectional flow of self-quotations, with symphonies fusing ideas that were previously self-contained. A fascination with dichotomy is evidenced in much of Rautavaara’s output, and self-quotation demonstrates a larger balance, where two or more works become different branches connected through common material. This makes it all the more important to consider his output as a whole – earlier pieces can be partnered with later ones. This notion tallies with Sivuoja-Gunaratnam’s view that Rautavaara’s oeuvre forms one “macro-text”, which is ‘suffused by a network of auto-allusions’.\footnote{Sivuoja-Gunaratnam, Narrating with Twelve Tones, 239.} The complexity of these interconnections means citations from two separate pieces can then amalgamate in a later work, as one statement. See, for example, how an idea from \textit{Thomas} joins with part of \textit{Nirvana Dharma} (1979) to help form the conclusion of the first movement of \textit{Symphony No. 8}. The transference of material from \textit{Nirvana Dharma} into \textit{Thomas} is less explicit, however, so this is shown with a dotted arrow in Ex. 6. 1.
Ex. 6.1: A network of Rautavaara’s self-quotations
The role of orchestration is also significant. Considering another network around the Seventh Symphony, *Notturno* (1993), written for piano and solo violin, had a new life in the third movement of *Angel of Light*. The movement explores contrasts in high and low register – a source of opposition that would go on to feature prominently in the later symphony. But there is a fundamentally different sound between the intimate setting of the piano and violin versus the restrained and controlled orchestration of the third movement (*Come un sogno*) in the symphony. Harmonies on the piano, as a percussive instrument, do not behave in the same way as the sustained upper string chords. Rautavaara therefore allows the material both settings, acknowledging that each realisation can co-exist. But he is not simply using the piano as a medium for hearing harmonies and their imagined settings: he fully embraces the fact that they have different purposes and aural results.

**Self-quotation or similarity?**

As this chapter argues that quotation is primarily driven by the idea of progress – to advance the overall material – it follows that auto-citations might function in much the same way as ideas or gestures that are merely similar that might inevitably recur between works. The balance between nature and design discussed above therefore leads to a hierarchy of quotation practice that contributes towards the same overall process. There is a spectrum between direct self-quotation and similar musical ideas. This ambiguity adds to the rich network of interconnected ideas.

**“Fragmentos de Agonía” and Symphony No. 7**


The opening of “Fragmentos de Agonía” forms the starting point of the Seventh Symphony and uses the same 12-note row that structures much of the symphony. This row is also treated in the same way as in *Angel of Light*, moving through a transformation
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process. As identified by James Leatherbarrow, the first triad contains the first three notes of the row, and each subsequent chord introduces a new note from the series. This process can be seen in Ex. 6.2, where each note of the series is circled. Significantly, then, this process was introduced in the choral work first. A statement of this row in “Fragmentos de Agonía” then leads into a new section. The deep bass registers, orientated around the pitch centre of a low D, forms an effective starting point. The first difference in the new symphonic setting is the immediate contrast of this deep register with the high sound of the glockenspiel and vibraphone, which are first heard in bar 4 of the first movement. This contrast of pitch register, which emanate the contrasts of dark and light, sets up a dualism for the symphony as a whole.

Ex. 6.2: Harmonic transformations of “Row VI” in Angel of Light, 1st mvt.

Also, Rautavaara develops this material substantially in the symphony, extending the process to form a 92-bar opening section that slowly orientates towards the pivotal first statement of the Hymn Motif in bar 93. A sense of continuity between these two sections comes from the use of triads, firstly in the use of Row VI between bars 1 and 92, and then outlined in the Hymn Motif, beginning at bar 93. By contrast “Fragmentos de Agonía” is more static, which is unsurprising given its relatively self-contained role as a short movement within a larger choral work.

The Gift of the Magi and Symphony No. 7

Another example of the thematic integration of self-quoted material is the appearance of the closing part of the televised chamber opera The Gift of the Magi in the opening of the final movement of Angel of Light. As these two works were written around the same time, it is difficult to determine for which piece the ideas were first intended, but somehow this ambiguity seems to be an important element of Rautavaara’s creativity. At some point, he must have imagined two realisations of the same material. Furthermore, the vocality

11 This example is a reproduction by the present author of part of Ex. 2.3 in Leatherbarrow, ‘Angels and Transformations’, 18.
deriving from quoted extracts from *Die Erste Elegie*, *The Gift of the Magi* and *Canto IV*, helps achieve unity and thematic continuity within the symphony.

Rautavaara gives two completely different realisations of this material from *The Gift of the Magi*. The passage is a succession of homophonic triads. This harmonic movement has been described as “plainchant-like” by Leatherbarrow, while Stępień uses the term “chorale”. The hymn-like nature of this theme is made clear by being sung in the opera. This quotation in the Seventh Symphony evokes religious connotations, due largely to the homophonic vocality and parallel major and minor motion that recalls religious vocal practice from the Renaissance. Rautavaara seems to use the religious connotations as part of a variety of devices in the Seventh Symphony to evoke mystical subject matter, to suggest the angel through a musical archetype. This vocality – the “hymn” associations of both the motif and the chorale idea – also helps establish thematic continuity, as well as frequent mediant and triadic relationships. The third movement ends on an E minor triad and the opening brass statement of the motif leads to a D major chord (enharmonically, a minor third). This harmony also has a mediant relationship with B major, which harmonises the Hymn Motif. This D/C chord then becomes the start of the chorale, which previously featured in *The Gift of the Magi*.

In the opera, the extract emphasises the intimate ending to the story, which focuses on a husband and wife exchanging Christmas gifts. The music exists largely in the background, underneath dialogue, supporting the warmth and happiness of this domestic story. Rautavaara seems to play with diegetic expectations of the music, having the theme sung by carol-singers, but also commenting on the character’s emotions. As a television chamber opera with a small cast, this work focuses on an intimate, human story.

Comparing Symphony No. 7 and the conclusion to the opera demonstrates how Rautavaara re-shapes his ideas, which have remarkable flexibility, as though there was never just one possible outcome, because thematic connections allow for infinite re-organisation. At the very end of *The Gift of the Magi*, the material recalls the opening of the Seventh Symphony, although this is not so clearly a quotation as in other examples. But, the essential musical idea that forms the end of the opera forms the beginning of the symphony and brings two different characters. In both cases, this extract is fully integrated with its surroundings, either as a point of departure or a point of arrival.
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12 Ibid., 114.
**Canto IV and Symphony No. 7**

Although the Seventh Symphony quotes passages from *Canto IV* (1992) for strings, written two years earlier,\(^{14}\) most will have heard the symphony first. Aside from its substantial commercial success, the mere fact that it is a symphony means it is more noticeable. Retrospectively, it is therefore easy to see *Canto IV* as an earlier catalyst for ideas that were eventually perfected in *Angel of Light*. Certainly, the symphony represents a unified, large-scale development of these ideas, but *Canto IV* is, in its own right, a focused and compelling large-scale musical form. Written in one continuous movement, there is a clear symphonic way of thinking: its balance of continuous, slow transformation and contrasting sections of material actually recalls the Fifth Symphony (see Ex. 6.3). However, its reduced instrumentation and shorter timescale – it is approximately fifteen minutes shorter than Symphony No. 5 – makes it especially concentrated and yet it still manages to convey much of the same experience as that work.

\(^{14}\) Leatherbarrow, ‘Angels and Transformations’, 126.
Two sections from *Canto IV* (labelled Sections B and D in Ex. 6.3) appear in the final movement of *Angel of Light*, retaining the D-B-D order of the earlier work. Thus, the material forms part of a much more expansive symphonic continuity. As mentioned in relation to *The Gift of the Magi*, thematic continuity in Symphony No. 7 often comes from the triadic connection between various sections (see Ex. 6.4), and especially the unifying Hymn Motif, the triadic make-up of which is a particular generator of unity.

Rautavaara seamlessly integrates these sections from *Canto IV* with the “chorale” found in *The Gift of the Magi*, discussed above, and channels these into new thematic evolution, as one idea leads naturally into another, building to a final, emphatic statement of the Hymn Motif, which appears in all four movements. *Angel of Light* therefore not only unifies old and new material but establishes a thematic logic between ideas composed separately. In this symphony, the chorale follows a variant of the Motif and then develops substantially over the first 54 bars of the movement. For example, there is an audible continuity between the opening of the fourth movement and the theme that begins at bar 55, quoted from *Canto IV*, as shown in Ex. 6.4. This continuity is achieved through triads and the use of rhythm in low string registers. Also, bars 4-10 circle through Row II in its
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1-61</td>
<td>Introduces thematic idea. This relates to the melody in Symphony No. 8, movement 3. Slowly transforms into Section B through Mode 6 flurries. <em>Early version of “Hymn motif” from Seventh Symphony hinted at in b. 64.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>181-201</td>
<td>Section B material returns but adds <em>tremolando</em> flurries recalling Section C. Hereon in, the order of events is as Seventh Symphony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>202-214</td>
<td>Broad melody from Section D returns, but Mode 6 flurries are now discontinuous. Builds and ascends into Section A1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 (Coda)</td>
<td>215-226</td>
<td><em>Material used in Seventh Symphony, final statement of “Hymn motif”</em>. Alternates pitch centres E and B. Develops thematic idea from Section A. Mode 6 flurries are continued. Ends with <em>tremolando</em>, Mode 6 ascent, accompanied by <em>diminuendo</em>, as in Seventh Symphony.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ex. 6.3: Formal summary of Canto IV**

Two sections from *Canto IV* (labelled Sections B and D in Ex. 6.3) appear in the final movement of *Angel of Light*, retaining the D-B-D order of the earlier work. Thus, the material forms part of a much more expansive symphonic continuity. As mentioned in relation to *The Gift of the Magi*, thematic continuity in Symphony No. 7 often comes from the triadic connection between various sections (see Ex. 6.4), and especially the unifying Hymn Motif, the triadic make-up of which is a particular generator of unity.

Rautavaara seamlessly integrates these sections from *Canto IV* with the “chorale” found in *The Gift of the Magi*, discussed above, and channels these into new thematic evolution, as one idea leads naturally into another, building to a final, emphatic statement of the Hymn Motif, which appears in all four movements. *Angel of Light* therefore not only unifies old and new material but establishes a thematic logic between ideas composed separately. In this symphony, the chorale follows a variant of the Motif and then develops substantially over the first 54 bars of the movement. For example, there is an audible continuity between the opening of the fourth movement and the theme that begins at bar 55, quoted from *Canto IV*, as shown in Ex. 6.4. This continuity is achieved through triads and the use of rhythm in low string registers. Also, bars 4-10 circle through Row II in its
entirety, bringing the harmony back to C♯, meaning that this passage becomes a point of departure as the movement continues. There is a common relationship between the section beginning at bar 9 of the fourth movement and that beginning at bar 55 – which uses Row V – based on shared use of alternating major and minor triads. This section from bar 55 develops into a full statement of the Hymn Motif and sounds one stage closer to this idea. This orientation is audible mainly through the return of brass, but there is also a thematic connection in the descending minor third in bar 58, which relates to the first two notes of the motif. The main difference between these two works is that the symphony ends emphatically – the result of a motivic argument spanning four movements. Furthermore, the use of the full orchestra makes these equivalent concluding bars more dramatic.

bb. 1-10

bb. 18-22
This experience raises some questions about Rautavaara’s music that perhaps only arise with this composer. For many, it is impossible to hear *Canto IV* without the expectations of what happens at the end of Seventh Symphony – a final, large statement of the Hymn Motif (see Ex. 6.5.2). Its prolongation helps forms the culmination of the whole work, suggesting defiance, light or triumph, but certainly a dramatic closure. The concentrated instrumental and formal resources of *Canto IV*, however, mean this earlier piece has a totally different purpose. The equivalent moment in this earlier piece, following the same build-up, returns to the opening melodic fragment from bar 1 (see Ex. 6.5.1). This work for strings ends relatively unfulfilled, as the melodic gesture at the beginning is unable to develop into a full statement. This result aligns with its general character; the more intimate instrumentation of a string orchestra does not permit the same loud conclusion of this process that happens in *Angel of Light*, as shown in Ex. 6.5.2.
Ex. 6.5.1: *Canto IV*, bb. 215-216
In the space of two years (1992-94), Rautavaara wrote six pieces of music, one of which was a symphony and another was an opera. This immensely productive period followed closely from Vincentiana, also written in 1992. Bearing this productivity in mind, it hardly seems surprising that he should recycle ideas from several works written around the same time. While Symphony No. 7 is one of Rautavaara’s most well-known pieces, very little of the material in this work was completely original at the time that it was composed. This situation turned into an interesting opportunity, however, to use five pieces of music to form a compositional workshop of sorts – a rich pool of ideas that grew into new forms and combinations. In this sense, composing the “other” work, apart from The Gift of the Magi, seems to be the process by which he arrives at the Seventh Symphony, as it forms the maximally unified potential for all these ideas. This large-scale work also brings this material into one unified expression, both musically, and extra-musically – Angel of Light.
is the largest work based on the angelic archetype that so strongly captured Rautavaara’s musical imagination. A symphonic, orchestral setting also matches the “size” of the music in multiple senses (time, dynamic range and pitch range). But these other, smaller works are in no way lesser; they are separate branches that incorporate the material in completely different ways, and he needed these other works to take their separate forms. This process encapsulates this composer’s belief in helping works come into being, rather than just “creating” them. The result is a set of widely different pieces that demonstrate the range of possible expression from a focused collection of material. Given the significance of the symphony in Finland, and to Rautavaara specifically, this expansion and unification seems a natural inclination.

This way of working seems to demonstrate on a broader level what he was trying to achieve in individual pieces. After describing his Cantos as ‘one-movement symphonies’, he says of Canto IV specifically:

I wanted them [musical structures] to be like trees: growing and branching organically, in contrast to architectural forms. This is indeed what happened: the opening bars were the result of a morning whim, a poetic notion or veiled thought devoid of any conscious plan or goal. It wove itself gradually into something larger without me knowing for a long time what would come of it, until it finally announced its arrival as this snapshot out of life’s album, the Canto IV.\(^{15}\)

The complex inter-connections between all these pieces demonstrate how this branching viewpoint permeates across one oeuvre. This musical weaving seems at odds with the clear architecture at work in this piece, but it also shows the flexibility with which they can lead into one another and provoke new excursions within different settings.

**Thomas and Symphony No. 5**

Rautavaara’s fourth opera, *Thomas*, was a particularly fruitful resource for future development. The opera follows the emotional and physical journey of Bishop Thomas as he seeks to establish a Finnish nation under the church in the thirteenth century\(^ {16}\) and it is easy to see how this dramatic narrative indirectly influences symphonic processes in both Symphony No. 5 and Symphony No. 8. The story, which intertwines multiple groups of people, presents a clash of culture between the Magi – the ancient Finnish people, presented in the opera as pagans – versus the order, sophistication and dogmatism of the

\(^{15}\) Rautavaara, Preface to *Canto IV* (Espoo: Fazer Music, 1992), ii.

Christian church. Sivuoja-Gunaratnam describes this polarity as that between nature and culture.¹⁷ Perhaps most significant, though, is the emotional journey towards synthesis that takes place in Thomas’s character – a narrative that influences a new, absolute expression in the Fifth and Eighth Symphonies. The opera begins with Thomas on his deathbed, haunted by memories of his actions in the past. It then proceeds in flashback and returns to Thomas as he eventually finds peace, remembering a girl – one of the Finnish magi – that he met in Finland and who accompanied him on his exploits.

The Fifth Symphony borrows a very small, but highly recognisable, harmonic gesture from the opening section of the opera. This is a different relationship to that between the Sixth Symphony, Vincentiana, and the opera Vincent, where the symphony draws heavily on earlier material. Despite the subtlety of the quote in Symphony No. 5, however, it proved to have enormous symphonic potential. This chord change comes after prolonged, mid-range, harmonic stasis. Its operatic function is partly to return as an immediate gesture to help in following the progress of the narrative, but this moment also has a powerful operatic function in bringing a sudden change following prolonged harmonic stasis. In the Fifth Symphony, Rautavaara expands this small idea to form the entire opening section, developing the principle of mounting intensity during prolonged harmonic stasis. As each chord builds, it reaches a point of fracture and pushes the harmony into another triad before the process repeats again. Tim Howell provides a summary of the harmonic voice leading processes at work in this introduction,¹⁸ as each chord “slips” and emerges into a new one, but it is worth emphasising the dramatic narrative that comes from the way each chord pushes into the next.

In this new context, Rautavaara incorporates something of the visionary influence of the opera. The Fifth Symphony is an undeniably absolute piece of music, and a modernist take on the symphonic process, addressing problems of large-scale unity in an altogether different fashion, but harmonic transformation remains fundamental, taking the music into new contexts and realms. The effect of changing light, which might have literally taken place in the opera, still resides in the more absolute process of harmonic change in the opening of the symphony. The enduring significance of visual influences on symphonic processes is also apparent in the fact that this symphony grew out of what was to be the orchestral piece, Monologue with Angels.

¹⁸ Howell, After Sibelius, 129.
**Thomas and Symphony No. 8**

The largest quoted passage from *Thomas* used in the Eighth Symphony is taken from Act 2, where Thomas sings the words “This journey goes on…whose is it? Of one who wanders beyond the journey, beyond time?”¹⁹ In the preface to this symphony, Rautavaara states that he sees the notion of journeying as a fundamental part of the symphonic process.²⁰ This quotation forms a substantial part of the third movement, but connects thematically to the rest of the movement, which also quotes from the second movement of *Cancion de Nuestro Tiempo*. The unifying fourths motif also forms a common element here (see Chapter 3). The material therefore forms a new context. It also musically “remembers” Thomas’s reflection on his journeying, integrating this aesthetic within the four-movement symphony as one unified statement.

**A common root in opera**

*Thomas* is a root for both the Fifth and Eighth Symphonies, meaning these two symphonies share a strong connection. The metaphor of musical genealogy – as ideas grow and develop between Rautavaara’s pieces – is important, and symphonic processes, slow transformation and coherence were durable and renewable. In both of these symphonies, material is incorporated as part of a linear projection of musical form. This material is both extended in these later, symphonic branches but also reconfigured. Material that goes on to close the end of the first movement of Symphony No. 8, albeit not as a direct quotation, initially precedes the idea that went on to define the introduction to Symphony No. 5. The striking feature here is the way material is re-ordered to achieve new developments and gestures.

**Repetition versus dynamism**

A second quoted extract is taken from Act 1 of *Thomas*. Following a brass introduction (also reproduced in the symphony) the chorus repeat the first line of the antiphon “Ecce sacerdos magnus”. The exact same material is used in the opening section of the fourth movement of Symphony No. 8, played by the orchestra. The opera emphasises the repetitive nature of this idea. Context is crucial to this perception and the inclusion of voices, repeating the same line, creates a ritualistic atmosphere. Apart from its orchestration, this material is completely unaltered in *The Journey*. Its new context,

¹⁹ Rautavaara, Preface to Symphony No. 8.
²⁰ Ibid.
however, gives it a totally different purpose, emphasising forward momentum that pushes the musical journey onwards. This new function is revealed in the section that immediately follows. In *Thomas*, this section reaches a peak of intensity, before subsiding, whereas in *The Journey* it is channeled into an ever-broadening realisation of the fourths motif over the whole symphony. Orchestration is significant, as it immediately alters the sound of the material, adding to the impression of evolving, broad ideas. This quoted extract forms part of the culmination of Symphony No. 8, whereas in the opera, it is a theme introduced early on.

This comparison also reveals the notion that will here be termed *retrospective organism* – the organic and developmental integration of pre-existing material, retrospectively, into a new symphonic context. The strongest example of this thematic integration is the relationship between the theme that opens the finale of *The Journey* and the fourths motif, set out at the very beginning of the symphony. Ex. 6.6 shows the common ground between these ideas, as the fourths at this point come from the same pitch set as a D natural minor scale. This combination of retroactive organisation and composition is significant, given that Rautavaara describes the opening of the fourth movement, taken from *Thomas*, as a ‘variation on the fourth motif’.²¹ Although a variation in the context of the Eighth Symphony, the fact that this music had in fact already been written reveals the flexibility in the “synthesised” musical language that he strove to achieve, affording flexibility and control.

Ex. 6.6: Motivic relationships in *The Journey*, 1st and 4th mvts.

²¹ Ibid.
It is not always clear whether Rautavaara knows he will incorporate the quote early in the writing process, or if he reaches a point in the composition process that seems to generate the same gesture. However, given the care taken to make these quoted ideas sound a natural part of their new contexts, it seems likely that some kind of retrospective orientation took place to ensure total coherence within the larger projection of the piece. If so, self-quotation is another demonstration of manipulating a balance between intuition and organisation. This technique also demonstrates Rautavaara’s emphasis on finding renewable ways of expressing broad forms and linear development, as passages in the middle of the work can be points of departure in terms of the compositional process, showing how he frequently orientates his material towards important structural points.

**String Quintet No. 1 and Symphony No. 8**

A section from the first movement of the First String Quintet (1997) is quoted in the second movement of *The Journey*. Again, both pieces were written in close proximity. Rautavaara also incorporates another less obvious quote from this piece, but reverses their order and reduces the number of thematic statements. This results in a far more concentrated timescale and enhances the sense of acceleration and aggressive dynamism that characterises this movement as a more densely orchestrated, complex context. There is a focused continuity – a process of cause of effect culminating in an explosive statement of the fourths motif, which re-orientates the process. This concentrated melodic continuity comes from motivic unity established through triplet figurations that develop throughout the movement. Ex. 6.7 shows some of these connections.

![Ex. 6.7: Motivic development in The Journey, 2nd mvt.](image)

Ex. 6.7: Motivic development in *The Journey*, 2nd mvt.
Theme 2 in Ex. 6.7 is one of those less-explicit quotations. This melody, which forms the initial thematic thrust in the Scherzo of the Eighth Symphony is not a literal quotation from the earlier piece and therefore re-opens the issue of exactly what constitutes a quotation versus a related gesture. The moment in question seems more than a similarity, though, especially in the handling of the melody and perpetual rhythm underneath, as well as the fact that Rautavaara clearly returned to ideas from this piece when writing Symphony No. 8. This section is therefore subjected to the same treatment of renewal and extension in a symphonic process. It is precisely this ambiguity, however, that seems to be at the heart of his self-quotation. He approaches this technique as a way of re-imagining previous gestures to contribute to the aims of their new context, more than wishing to allude to previous pieces for that purpose alone, or in any self-ironic way.

**Nirvana Dharma and Symphony No. 8**

The meaning of the first part of the title of the work for chorus, soprano and flute *Nirvana Dharma* (1979) is easy enough: “Nirvana” describes a transcendental, perfected state, beyond suffering. “Dharma”, however, does not translate easily into English and the meaning is quite multi-faceted in Buddhism and Hinduism. Essentially, it describes a sense of order, either enforced by law, or a personal moral code. Broader connotations of justice and balance link with this idea, the musical associations of which must have appealed to Rautavaara. Balance is shown clearly, especially in the more-or-less equal division of two harmonically static sections.

The sensation of emergence into a “Nirvana” state is replicated in the first movement of *The Journey*. Much of the musical purpose in *Nirvana Dharma* is to bring about the transition from the first section into the second section, which contains the quoted material in the end of the first movement of the Eighth Symphony (see Ex. 6.8). In the choral work, the long solo soprano melody almost has a *vocalise* effect and purpose. The fermata in Ex. 6.8.1 emphasises this transition point. The piece ends with the same open-ended D♯ pedal that closes the first movement of *The Journey*.

In the symphony, orchestration and an increased melodic orientation makes this moment an audible goal. The clear harmonic emphasis of this section in its new setting recalls practices of progressive tonality. Whilst triadic, directional tonality is avoided in both pieces, there is still a broader use of harmony to impose structural and aural markers, which help create the illusion of motion. This goal-orientation is emphasised by the louder dynamics in this sustained harmony of Symphony No. 8, whereas it is marked by reduced
dynamics in the choral work. This process is also shown through the quartal harmony in bar 96 (Ex. 6.8.2) of the symphony, which Rautavaara retroactively presents as an expansion of the fourths motif introduced at the beginning. The symphony retains the sense of harmonic arrival but makes this a result of a more symphonic, thematic argument – much of the melodic ideas earlier in the first movement are similar to those rhythmic ideas in the “Nirvana” melody, emphasising the orientation towards this moment. Both of these works have their own purpose: the Eighth Symphony reaches this moment as a more gradual, linear transformation, whereas *Nirvana Dharma* expresses opposition or balance between the two halves of the piece.
The experimental notation in *Nirvana Dharma* means the score does not include bar numbers. This moment can be found in Rautavaara, *Nirvana Dharma* (Helsinki: Fennica Gehrman, 2003), 9.
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22 The experimental notation in *Nirvana Dharma* means the score does not include bar numbers. This moment can be found in Rautavaara, *Nirvana Dharma* (Helsinki: Fennica Gehrman, 2003), 9.
Ex. 6.8.2: The Journey, 1st mvt., bb. 96-98

This chord change in *Nirvana Dharma* recalls that discussed earlier in both *Thomas* and the opening of Symphony No. 5. There is an undeniable similarity visible in Ex. 6.8, which leads to a new consideration: as *Nirvana Dharma* was written before *Thomas*, Rautavaara must have been experimenting with this harmonic device before he wrote that opera. This idea shows how, through a manipulation of shared material, *Nirvana Dharma, Thomas, Symphony No. 5* and Symphony No. 8 are all linked through their material. Small but recognisable gestures help generate larger statements and logical developments of musical ideas. Rautavaara seems to need more space than one piece to achieve the most from one short musical idea. Considering all these examples, these four works became four different “solutions” to organising root material.

Of course, although audibly similar, the brevity of this harmonic gesture that connects these works must be taken into account. It is clearly not a quotation in the sense of others discussed in this chapter. Harmonically, this is simply a chord change but, as an overall gesture (containing harmony, dynamics, texture and duration), it recalls the sensation in *Thomas* and the Fifth Symphony of a build-up and winding down of tension. This connection illustrates Rautavaara’s control of a spectrum of explicit versus implicit self-reference. Self-quotation in this case is simply an extension of ways in which many composers build on their previous practice. It is partially credit to his highly flexible motivic approach and pitch organisation that this gesture is expressed in different ways.
Cancion de nuestro tiempo and Symphony No. 8

This discussion of Nirvana Dharma leads to another quotation in the first movement of The Journey, which takes the music virtually right up to the moment that that former quotation begins. Material taken from the final movement of the choral work, Cancion de nuestro tiempo (1993), which also contributes to the Seventh Symphony, forms a substantial portion of the first movement of The Journey. Another significant area to explore here is the relationship between these choral works – sources of material with extra-musical associations through text – and symphonies.

In synthesising these musical ideas, taken from different works, into one symphony, Rautavaara forges an on-going thematic process, establishing continuity based on the rhythmic and lyrical character of melodies from previous pieces. These all become part of a unified expression spanning multiple movements in the Eighth Symphony. This analytical retrospection is somewhat in keeping with Rautavaara’s practice of self-borrowing generally, as suddenly there is a need to consider this material in a different order to that in which it is presented to understand its construction. Like the Seventh Symphony, the higher profile of Symphony No. 8 – the final instalment in a cycle of symphonies and the result of a commission from Wolfgang Sawallisch and the Philadelphia orchestra – somewhat overshadows the 1993 choral work. Rautavaara was also aware of the resonance of writing an “Eighth” symphony, given that Sibelius never completed his.

Hearing the final movement of Cancion and recognising the material used in the Eighth reveals just how different they are, and prompts a re-evaluation of the first movement of The Journey. Most noticeably, looking at these two works side-by-side reveals the importance of vocality to Rautavaara in instrumental contexts. The Eighth Symphony retains, virtually unaltered, the lengthy melodic lines, and quartal harmonies. The Spanish language, taken from the poem Ciudad sin sueño by the poet Federico García Lorca, might also have been a factor. Spanish lends itself to long, melismatic and slightly unpredictable phrases, somewhere between singing and speech. It is likely that Rautavaara engages with some sense of a natural musicality in this language and poetry, especially as he returned to Lorca’s poetry for Balada (2014), a choral work that Aho regards as a high
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24 Duffy and Rautavaara, ‘Composer Einojuhani Rautavaara’.
point in his later output, owing to its expression. With this poetic connection in mind, it is clear that, often, Rautavaara is readdressing a vocal work, which carries extra-musical messages, into the non-vocal, more absolute setting of symphonic writing. This essence of vocality, then, visible in Ex. 6.9, explains the consistent lyricism in the Eighth Symphony.

Lorca’s text might have had a more literal significance on symphonic narrative. The Lorca poem used for “Ciudad sin sueño” refers to a sleepless city, but Rautavaara subtitled the movement “Nocturno del Sarajevo” to mark the warfare in that city in 1992, the year before he wrote the choral piece. The combination of quiet harmonic textures, underpinning loud melodic interjections evokes the desired sense of unrest. The placement of this musical association at the beginning of the Eighth Symphony is significant, as it enters into an overall symphonic journey towards optimism. This context is reflected in the way the melody is less fragmentary and softer in tone in comparison with “Ciudad sin sueño”.

Ex. 6.9.1: Cancion de nuestro tiempo, “Ciudad sin sueño”, bb. 11-15

Ex. 6.9.2: The Journey, 1st mvt., bb. 12-15
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Interview with Kalevi Aho, April 2018.
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25 Interview with Kalevi Aho, April 2018.
That Symphony No. 8 draws heavily on previous ideas undermines the independence of this piece, but it also results in an introspective kind of symphonic process that would otherwise have been impossible. This piece fuses extracts from Nirvana Dharma and Cancion de Nuestro Tiempo into one, coherent unity. The final movement of Cancion ends with a sense of expectation in-keeping with the text. Bar 96 of the first movement of Symphony No. 8, which quotes from halfway through Nirvana Dharma, follows on seamlessly from where the Cancion extract ends. The recurring vocal-influenced use of melody contributes to a larger thematic process, where melodies across different movements, from different pieces and time periods have a connection. This connection is shown through their similar use of expression, rhythm, conjunct motion and phrase length. This thematic device is part of how he uses melody to orientate the listener.

The difference in instrumental resources – a choir in Cancion de Nuestro Tiempo, versus a full orchestra in the symphony – contributes to the two different realisations of the material. The small-scale purpose of the former might result in the closed-off approach, which contrasts with the extended version of the symphony. In The Journey, Rautavaara returns to this pregnant sense of expectation that closes Cancion so effectively but this time builds upon this natural impetus. Both realisations of the material are equally effective, and it takes two pieces of music to realise both possibilities, one cogent, open-ended and musically rhetorical, the other fully-fledged and optimistic.

A quoted passage that neither Sivuoja-Gunaratnam nor Tiikkaja have specified is that taken from the second movement of Cancion de nuestro tiempo (‘Meditación primera y última’) in the third movement of The Journey. The incorporation of this idea just before a quoted section taken from Act 3 in Thomas is further demonstration of thematic interconnection, without significantly altering the material. To summarise the connective moment in Symphony No. 8, a small germ gradually evolves and grows into full melodic statements, while the orchestration gradually expands. The opening melody (quoted from Cancion de Nuestro Tiempo) grows out of the fourths motif, departing from the note E. When the quoted extract from Thomas begins in bar 37, the opening phrase shares the same interval content as the material from Cancion that opens the third movement. Therefore, the broader, lengthier melody from Thomas, which appropriately is sung to text about journeying, becomes a natural development of that passage coming from a different piece. This movement then works towards a louder statement of the fourths idea, confirming once again its ability to fit into numerous, changing harmonic contexts. The
final “resolution” chord is a superimposed tertian harmony based on D. Arriving at this tertian chord also facilitates a flexible thematic integration, where notes can form part of an adaptable common ground.

Again, Lorca’s text might have significance. The poem used for ‘Meditación primera y última’ (‘First and Last Meditation’), discusses time and timelessness. In the self-contained choral work, there is a sense of musical timelessness, achieved through a static harmonic backdrop, whereas, in the third movement of the symphony, there is a more linear sense of musical time. Firstly, the theme transitions into the quoted material from Thomas, to which it is related in intervallic structure and contour. Secondly, the quotation takes its place within a larger formal scheme, being influenced by what has come before, and influencing what comes after – the movement orientates towards a climax in a new statement of the fourths motif, which sets up the atmosphere for the fourth movement. Finally, in direct contrast to the harmonically static soundscape in ‘Meditación primera y última’, the quote is not only re-harmonised in the symphony, but also introduces linear harmonic changes.

**Symphony No. 3 and Angels and Visitations**

This chapter has so far examined self-quotations that have gone on to contribute to an extended, symphonic form and thematic process. An auto-citation that stands out therefore is that of the dramatic conclusion to Symphony No. 3 (1961) in the later orchestral work *Angels and Visitations* (1978). This quotation works in reverse to other examples, as the Third Symphony already emphasises large-scale development, whereas the extracted passage emphasises the dramatic, contrasting character that defines the later orchestral work. In his programme note to *Angels and Visitations*, Rautavaara draws attention to the importance of a ‘narrative continuum’, as well as the fact that, despite the image of angels that inspired this work, he sees it as being primarily absolute. This single-movement orchestral piece, running to approximately 20 minutes, comprises a continuous large-scale formal process, but also works like a tone poem through visionary inspiration that informs the dramatic processes in the piece. Rautavaara describes this work as a set of variations, but the overall character is that of interruption and opposition. Fragmented
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26 Quoted in Stępień, *The Sound of Finnish Angels*, 104.
27 Ibid.
28 Ibid.
themes are violently interrupted by full, quasi-aleatoric, orchestral outbursts and attempts at ascending, more tonal, brass themes never properly manage to assert themselves.

This is the context surrounding the quoted extract, taken from the bar 154 of the fourth movement of Symphony No. 3 and reappearing in the brass in bar 311 in *Angels and Visitations* (see Ex. 6.10). In the latter, the brass theme is cut off, moving into another orchestral wash of sound. The purpose of the quoted extract in *Angels and Visitations* is to reinforce its overall oppositional nature and, like the historical relationship between symphony and tone poem, both works represent balanced counterparts to each other. Although Stępień states that the only real changes to the extract in question in this new context is in the rhythm, the section is actually re-harmonised and some of the notes are changed, most notably the new chromatic clashes in bars 314 and 318. These alterations significantly contribute to the changed atmosphere of this closing extract, making it less optimistic than the earlier symphony. Furthermore, this new context adds a colouristic harmonic expression, achieved through the chromaticism, to the row from which this quotation derives in the Third Symphony, undermining the triadic serialism of the earlier work.

Ex. 6.10.1: Symphony No. 3, 4th mvt., bb. 153-157
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Ex. 6.10.2: *Angels and Visitations*, bb. 311-320

The “polarities” that Rautavaara refers to in *Angels and Visitations*, which he says bring about ‘logic of opposition’, echo the relationship between these two large-scale orchestral pieces and present another manifestation of balance in Rautavaara’s work. As evident in so many examples of his auto-citations, there is a kind of dialectical process that the material goes through. As Rautavaara describes himself as the “midwife”, rather than the mother, of his works, it follows that *Angels and Visitations* uses this material to a completely new dramatic purpose. This thesis-antithesis-synthesis narrative is so crucial to Rautavaara’s output generally, and is one that, for example, Aho observes in the way
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Symphonies 1 and 2 are ‘direct opposites to each other’.\textsuperscript{32} Similarly, taking a broader view, Howell summarises Rautavaara’s output as a journey from something old to something new, and back again.\textsuperscript{33} Stępień also notes this philosophy in Rautavaara’s arch form: ‘The arch form plays an important role in the composer’s philosophical outlook according to the theory of organic music as a birth and its oppositional reflection, death.’\textsuperscript{34} Reflecting on the orchestral music, the synthesis that comes from these two works derives from the way they differ from, but complement, each other.

**Contexts of musical borrowing**

Musical borrowing or quotation has been around for a long time. There are many examples of composers borrowing from pieces written by others, to various extents and to varying degrees of complexity. In such cases of intertextuality, there are similar issues to Rautavaara’s practice surrounding the balance between integration and segmentation. Additionally, there is also the question of authenticity and ownership. Sam Richards highlights the notion of “disownership” in relation to musical quotation, presenting the notion of off-setting someone else’s idea to either contrast or support.\textsuperscript{35} Like using quotations in written text, it can be a way of contributing a musical opinion.

This chapter has shown that Rautavaara’s self-quotations differ from such cases of intertextuality involving music written by someone else. Not only was it impossible for him to disown his ideas, he made a conscious effort to take total ownership over them. He does this by commanding and re-shaping them in the various ways that he sees possible, thereby entering into a dialogue with himself and exploring the new potential of the same ideas. As Tiikkaja observes, although Rautavaara does not seek to hide his citations, he also wishes them to be completely at home in their new surroundings, as part of a coherent musical structure.\textsuperscript{36} Based on this evidence, this quotation practice seems unusual and distinctive. At the same time, there are similarities with two composers who were important to Rautavaara – Stravinsky and Copland – in the self-referential emphasis of recasting earlier material in some way.\textsuperscript{37}

The symphonies also build on experiments in

\textsuperscript{32} Aho, *Rautavaara as Symphonist*, 75.
\textsuperscript{33} Howell, *After Sibelius*, 141.
\textsuperscript{34} Stępień, *The Sound of Finnish Angels*, 105.
\textsuperscript{35} Sam Richards, ‘From Quotation, through Collage, to Parody: Postmodernism’s Relationship with Its Past’, *Perspectives of New Music* 53, no. 1 (2015): 77-78.
\textsuperscript{36} Tiikkaja, ‘Postmodern Intertextualist’: 48.
\textsuperscript{37} While these composers did not employ self-quotation to the extent identified in this chapter, Joseph N. Straus analyses how Stravinsky’s ‘self-borrowings’ enhance the coherence of his late work – see Joseph N. Straus, *Stravinsky’s Late Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 86. In a symphonic
smaller-scale works, for example the way that a speaking-chorus technique and graphic notation builds texture in *Nirvana Dharma*. He could be bold in these smaller pieces, before synthesising such experimentation into the more unified and balanced expression of a symphony. Tracing this intertextual thematic complementation shows just how fertile these ideas were. The idea that material needs to be cultivated, and that the composer is not always in control of the shapes and motifs they find, was an on-going belief for Rautavaara. There is also a broad spectrum between direct quotation and similarity, but he draws all of this together towards the same purpose of personal progress. As a device, self-quotation helps Rautavaara continue the symphonic genre and there is a clear intention to channel ideas into extended forms.

An important unifying principle within this stylistic trait is the idea of expressivity. Rautavaara utilises ideas that are at his fingertips, and realises the new developmental potential of these in a particular moment. This constant self-reflection seems to bear out his statement that, while Mahler said the symphony should contain the world, he should be content if his symphonies contained all of himself.38 His auto-citations also build on his view that symphonic music is a more than a journey through the world, but also a ‘journey through human life’.39 Through inter-textual variation and development, quoted extracts work like motifs on a larger level. In each case, he creates a piece that has not existed before, forging connections through a common musical language. Rautavaara confronted, challenged and refined his contribution to those musical aspects that, clearly, he felt somehow compelled to see through to their actual end. Nothing is wasted and nothing is repeated in the same way.

On some level, Rautavaara does not wish to see all of his works as totally separate, as is shown in the overlapping functions of his operas and symphonies. Different approaches to the material show how he sometimes makes transformations happen more slowly and other times more suddenly. The metaphorical influence of changing light patterns, happening in different ways in different pieces, seems to permeate Rautavaara’s orchestral music. This phenomenon helps in building on non-musical ideas (such as journeying or angels) so that they can be expressed in an absolute way. Therefore, tracing
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38 Quoted in Aho, *Rautavaara as Symphonist*, 75.
39 Rautavaara, Preface to Symphony No. 8.
self-quotations is an alternative approach to grouping Rautavaara’s works other than by time period or musical significations.
Rautavaara’s break with serialism following a creative crisis means his music is frequently divided into two serialist periods, as he resumed using 12-tone rows again the 1990s. However, this chapter argues that he sought to cultivate his own synthetic approach around the 12-tone vocabulary after abandoning strict serialism that continued to draw upon a dodecaphonic way of thinking. An enduring belief in some other potential of the technique never quite left him. As such, 12-tone rows that appear in later music, sometimes termed the “second serial period”,1 such as the Sixth and Seventh Symphonies, are one consequence of this larger continuity. These examples comprise a stricter prior organisation of the 12 tones, but similar, less strict, strategies are evident in the Fifth and Eighth Symphonies. As such, this chapter uses two understandings of the term ‘dodecaphony’. The first is the more common understanding of ordered successions of the 12 tones, while the second is that of the harmonic availability of the chromatic set as a broader resource. Such a distinction is also observed by Paolo Susanni and Elliot Antokoletz who, in addition to the kind of serialism used by the Second Viennese School, discuss the ‘unserialized twelve-tone languages of Debussy or Stravinsky’, where the chromatic continuum as an ‘all-encompassing source’ can be broken down into sub-collections such as modes and interval cycles.2

After introducing the notion of an “accessible network”, this chapter reviews the significance of dodecaphony in Rautavaara’s collective symphonic output, beginning with the ‘non-atonal dodecaphony’3 of Symphony No. 3 (1961). It assesses which aspects of serialism have been continued or modified and to what extent, analysing how Rautavaara implements alternative and fresh strategies.

**An accessible network**

As discussed in Chapter 2, Rautavaara believed the 12 tones to be the ‘vocabulary’ of the twentieth century, and that each composer could find their own organisation of that larger resource. Rautavaara’s own approach to the question of pitch organisation allowed him to
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1 Sivuoja-Gunaratnam, *Narrating with Twelve Tones*, 62.
3 Quoted in Heiniö, ‘Rautavaara, Einojuhani’.
interchange fluently between different pitch configurations. The notion of accessibility is useful here and this phenomenon is evident in two senses. Firstly, as Rautavaara builds on his dodecaphonic practices of the 1960s, he uses a 12-tone vocabulary that can access different pitch organisations, helping him build an extensive and rich palette with which to approach large-scale harmonic and melodic structures. He navigates these collections to achieve maximum diversity through re-organisations and derivations of common pitch material. The second kind of accessibility is that of the music from a listening point of view. Rautavaara’s synthesis of familiar pitch collections (triads, diatonicism, modes of limited transposition, tertian and quartal harmonies) into a larger organisation of the 12-tones shows how he renews tonal gestures through his experience of dodecaphonic thinking, achieving familiarity without recourse to functional tonality and originality without abandoning tradition.

**Symphonies and serialism**

Rautavaara’s Symphony No. 3 crystallised at an early stage his own brand of symphonic serialism and therefore looks towards the synthesis in works from the Fifth Symphony onwards. As such, this piece is an important case study for the musical issues in this chapter. The tonal-sounding dodecaphony and overt reference to Bruckner’s sound world through broad sweeps, brass-centric melodic climaxes and tonal centres, meant it was somewhat coolly received. However, this work looked ahead in imagining how serialism might re-shape the symphonic genre and maintain references to tonal harmony. According to Aho, Rautavaara was open about his admiration for Bruckner’s music, having immersed himself in studying his symphonies. Vogel – Rautavaara’s former serial teacher – felt his pupil had taken a wrong turn, and Bergman, although not forthright in his criticism, remained distant and factual in his assessment. As Sivuoja-Gunaratnam says, the reception was not all negative, but perhaps the question of Rautavaara’s modernist status in Finland at this time was opened up to debate. Rautavaara stressed the need for “far-reaching” thoughts and “broad paragraphs” and, for him, such Neo-Romantic gestures could be renewed through serial thinking.

---

4 For a more detailed account of its reception, see Sivuoja-Gunaratnam, *Narrating With Twelve Tones*, 63-66.
5 Aho, *Rautavaara as Symphonist*, 83.
6 Sivuoja-Gunaratnam, *Narrating With Twelve Tones*, 64.
7 Ibid., 65-66.
The Third Symphony was therefore not a stylistic retreat. Still a young composer, Rautavaara had success with serialism in works like String Quartet No. 2 and *Modificata*, not to mention the totally-serial *Arabescata* which followed Symphony No. 3 a year later. With Symphony No. 3, he felt serialism had something else to offer. It is important, therefore, to see the Third Symphony as being at the heart of Rautavaara’s experimentation with serialism at this time. The work indicates how Rautavaara saw the potential to channel modernism to his own ends, rather than worrying about a *zeitgeist*. The similarities between this work and later symphonies illustrate how this approach of synthesising tonality, broad gestures and motivic development with serial thinking was to be a significant element in his symphonies.

The series in the Third Symphony works organically, developing motifs through large-scale structural events. Sivuoja-Gunaratnam states that ‘the series functions to guarantee organicism, for Rautavaara, the highest value in any piece of music.’ He generates a derived row, the “fifth series” from the original – a technique he had learned from Vogel. As shown in Ex. 7.1, this “fifth series” is created via an “auxiliary row” made up of the chromatic scale and the circle of fifths. Taking each note from the original series in turn, those matching notes in the chromatic scale from the auxiliary row are substituted for their vertical alternative, unless one does not exist, in which case the note remains the same. Completing this process produces a new row that is generated from the original.

Original series:

Auxiliary series, combining the chromatic scale and the circle of fifths:

---

Fifth series:

Ex. 7.1: Production of the “Fifth series” in Symphony No. 3

Rautavaara liked the obscurity of this technique and the “mystical” way in which the prime form could transform into something else.\(^\text{10}\) No doubt he also appreciated its ability to relate broadly to tonality – by using the circle of fifths and the chromatic scale – but also its difference from them. The relationship between the prime row and the fifth series provides two complementary but assimilated rows, one using more open intervals, the other more step-wise and melodic. Consequently, Rautavaara explores a new framework for managing the balance between the vertical and the horizontal in music and for achieving significant variation from a single set of notes.

Furthermore, the original row, introduced in the opening Horn theme (bar 6), emphasises tonally significant intervals, including perfect fourths, thirds and fifths. These intervals bring harmonic emphasis, and Rautavaara freely forms triads by harmonising notes from the series. This harmonic prominence brings shifting harmonic contexts and symphonic development. In a way, the serialist processes are more accessible than many serial works, as they are codified in symphonic terms. Paul Griffiths discusses how, often, serial processes are difficult to perceive due to not using intervals that listeners are more conditioned to recognise, for example octaves and fifths.\(^\text{11}\) Griffiths also notes that there is often little redundancy in serialist works, making it potentially easier to miss certain important pitches.\(^\text{12}\) Rautavaara preserves a sense of cogency here but being able to recognise the harmonic properties of parts of the row, in addition to its thematic qualities, is an important part of the communication.

Sivuoja-Gunaratnam observes that this work also foreshadows Rautavaara’s later combinations of serialism and other systems, including Mode 6, diatonicism and mediant relations.\(^\text{13}\) The assimilation of these elements here is an early indicator of how he selects

---

\(^\text{10}\) Sivuoja-Gunaratnam, *Narrating with Twelve Tones*, 36.


\(^\text{12}\) Ibid.

\(^\text{13}\) Sivuoja-Gunaratnam, *Narrating with Twelve Tones*, 62.
techniques he finds useful in developing a style that was more durable than temporary public approval. Symphony No. 3 therefore anticipates later works such as the Seventh and Eighth Symphonies that use tonal-sounding intervals in its synthesis of pitch collections, making them different qualities of one 12-note vocabulary.

Rautavaara later expressed his satisfaction with this long-sighted achievement of symphonic serialism, suggesting its significance on later works:

I consider my third symphony as one of the most characteristic of all my compositions. I hardly ever have succeeded in writing down so accurately the music I wanted to hear. Almost nowhere else do I hear myself with such exhaustiveness and completion – as a composer.14

Finally, serialism influences the directness and relative brevity of this work. A lack of preamble and superfluity, coupled with maximising motivic potential in a focused amount of time, remains a prevalent symphonic pursuit in Finland. Synthesis of the new and old renews both, and the Third Symphony illustrates how dodecaphony could be channelled in different ways, even if this significance was not completely recognised at the time.

Serialism and motivic development

If Symphony No. 3 is an important early indication of the synthesis of the modern and traditional in Rautavaara’s symphonies, Symphony No. 5 is one of the watershed pieces that marks the establishing of this synthesis in his later music. Rautavaara states that the Fifth Symphony was one of the most significant works in this regard:

It [serialism] was hanging around as one option, but I did not find an unforced relationship to it, such that serialism could have been a part of my musical language...I was looking for a synthesis of neotonality and serialism at the end of the 1970s, and finally I found it, it seems, in the operas [Thomas, Vincent, The House of the Sun] and the Fifth Symphony.15

That Rautavaara refers only to large-scale works here indicates how this issue was largely centred on reconciling serialism with established, traditional notions such as symphonic development, operatic narrative and the relationship between tonality and form. This is the exact duality that Rautavaara experimented with in the Third Symphony and the kinship between these works once again challenges the periodisation of his music. In Symphony No. 5, Rautavaara’s new, ‘unforced’ relationship to serialism instead relies on his flexible

---

14 Quoted in Sinouja-Gunaratnam, Narrating With Twelve Tones, 65.
15 Ibid., 106.
approach to structuring pitch. The debt to serialism means he became free of tonality –
diatonic and triadic elements are not limited to any scale or functional organisation – while
the corresponding debt to tonality and motivic development meant he was equally free
from serialist restraints, especially the avoidance of repetition and the emphasis on the
linear progression of the series. The inclusivity of Rautavaara’s pitch network meant he
could re-assert harmony and take it beyond diatonicism.

In-keeping with the spiral form of the Fifth Symphony, the pitch organisation
combines progress and stasis. The 12-tone vocabulary is a static constant and, like the
concept of Mandala, brings an over-arching order. Dynamic processes can be generated
from this system, however. Edward Pearsall explores the seemingly paradoxical
relationship between symmetrical pitch organisation and goal-directed motion. Pearsall
analyses music by Béla Bartók and George Crumb who, like many twentieth-century
composers, gravitated towards symmetry and away from tonal protocol whilst still
preserving motivic development. Pearsall explores how these two issues support each
other, stating:

Combined with symmetry, motivic variation constitutes a powerful means for generating
goal-directed motion in music that is not organized around tonic/ dominant relations.\(^{16}\)

Rautavaara’s Fifth Symphony also combines symmetry and motivic development in its
own way. Ultimately, as discussed in Chapter 3, whilst Symphony No. 5 appears to move
in a slow transformation, its spiralling form means it arrives at a transformed version of its
opening material. The use of harmony emulates this more static experience, whilst the
melody emphasises dynamism. This perspective indicates how Rautavaara preserves
symmetry with the temporal channelling and transformations of pitch configurations it
contains.

Whilst Samuli Tiikkaja identifies both a prime and a derived row in Symphony
No. 5,\(^{17}\) there is a relatively free and chromatic melodic foundation in this piece (see
Chapter 5) that is approached with varying degrees of strict construction. This melodic
foundation drives a musical narrative, where chromaticism interacts with broader, tertian
harmonies. The two rows that Tiikkaja identifies emphasise the chromatic and the triadic,
respectively, and he says that the prime row ‘is not present in any plausibly analysable

\(^{16}\) Edward Pearsall, ‘Symmetry and Goal-Directed Motion in Music by Béla Bartók and George Crumb’,
*Tempo* 58, no. 228 (2004): 33.
\(^{17}\) Tiikkaja, ‘Paired Opposites’, 238-239.
The most important aspect here, therefore, is the presence of the full, chromatic set and its systematic organisation at certain points. However, the serial mentality behind the chromatic “Processional” melody (Ex. 7.2) from bar 10 is crucially approached to emphasise organic, motivic development. The fact that a serial mentality can be identified here aligns with Whittall’s assertion that “Serialism” is more than a series of 12 tones. This melody gradually extends in range, thereby living up to the term “Processional”. The infinite cycle of the nevertheless 12 semitones has a part to play in this motivic experience as it extends slowly outwards.

Ex. 7.2: Symphony No. 5, bb. 12-21

---

18 Ibid., 249.
As discussed in Chapter 5, the melody in Ex. 7.2 is generated by a recurring, chromatic motif, outlining a minor third – a rich source of intervallic sub-configurations including three semitones and two whole tones. This combination produces a quasi-diatonic sound, but one that operates outside of any diatonic system. Through a process of extension, transpositions of this chromatic pitch set [0123] build on one another, eventually completing a full 12-note, chromatic cycle, as shown in Ex. 7.3. This extension proceeds in counterpoint from bar 16 between the first and second violins. A particular, new-serialist way of thinking is evident in the systematic transposition of the motif, which generates the motion through the chromatic cycle. The emphasis on symmetry – inherited from serialism – is also felt in the chromatic orientation around the notes B and F, respectively, which, by being a tritone apart, split this 12-tone cycle into two hexachords, one in each voice. Crucially, however, Rautavaara channels this within the overall drama of this single-movement symphony.

Ex. 7.3.1: 12-note collection and motivic transposition, Symphony No. 5, bb. 12-22

Ex. 7.3.2: Motivic development, Symphony No. 5, bb. 12-21
Because Rautavaara reconciles dodecaphony with a motivic process, where a melody continually seeks to grow and resolve into something else, there is a quasi-tonal energy. The linear tension in this melody draws on what Brian Hyer refers to as the ‘energetic tendencies of the semitone.’ When this motif recurs at other points in the symphony, such as the “Chorale” sections, it is clear that the potential variation of this motif is infinite. The Neo-Romantic, symphonic drama deriving from linear tensions between tones and semitones, co-exists with an underlying, symmetrical and democratic pitch system.

The dichotomy of combining the fixed row with principles of organicism and transformational logic was something Schoenberg wanted to achieve with the new serial technique. Something of this mentality for derivation is seen in his “combinatoriality”, where hexachords from the row can be combined with other hexachords from different row transpositions. Ethan Haimo also argues that the apparently paradoxical combination of developing variation and a fixed series occurs in Schoenberg’s Moses und Aron. Such manipulations are, in many serial contexts, extremely difficult to hear, so an important factor in Rautavaara’s case is using a similar principle of continual, free development to directly impact the listening experience.

Non-serial dodecaphony

The Journey draws on a 12-tone vocabulary, organised in a different way, to access various harmonic regions. This symphony does not use a row but pitch collections, especially stacked fourths, form an underlying structure, allowing far-reaching harmonic and melodic progressions and a relative democracy. This helps build the impression of broad horizons and symmetry as the journey progresses. While the interval of a fourth generates development in this piece, it does not produce a homogenous harmonic world – fourths are reconfigured to access different realms, resulting in considerable diversity whilst retaining inner, symphonic coherence. As shown in Chapter 2 (Ex. 2.1), a section of seven consecutive perfect fourths generates a seven-note diatonic collection.

---

The all-important interval of a fourth is first presented as an ascending motif over bars 12 and 13 (Ex. 7.4). As well as re-configuring and combining fourths with other pitch systems (diatonic, modal and chromatic) and expanding into one large vocabulary, everything grows out of this interval. The infinite resource, viewing all 12 tones as equally accessible, lends itself to the tonally-free, long melodies that characterise much of this piece. This organisation admits free tonal progression – for example, each statement of the ascending fourths motif resolves down by a minor third to return to the starting note of that figure. This minor third fall in Ex. 7.4 drives a harmonic shift to an A minor sonority. Over bars 62 to 63, the same process drives a harmonic change to E minor, further illustrating how harmonic diversity arises from reconfiguring tertian pitch collections.

Ex. 7.4: *The Journey*, ascending-fourths motif

Rautavaara does not deny tonality, but he is ultimately independent of it, and his broader 12-tone vocabulary is frequently apparent. For example, quartal harmony sheds light on the tonally-illusive coda from the fourth movement. This section becomes an ever-broadening harmonic expanse, utilising symmetrical stacked fourths and fifths. The metaphor of broad horizons and projecting material through a large, temporal “space” became prominent with the Fifth Symphony onwards and looks back to Symphony No. 3. Kalevi Aho quotes the composer who discusses the Fifth Symphony:

> Aphorisms and miniatures, bagatelles and preludes, even single movements seemed to me to be a symptom of short-windedness and myopia. I wanted broad horizons, long journeys, far-reaching thoughts.  

Rautavaara's description of this coda at the end of *The Journey* as ‘flowing on to a broad estuary, the everlasting sea’ reveals a similar symphonic purpose. This closure is achieved by emancipating the fourth interval to assert harmonic stability and symmetry, as well as dynamism. Diatonic collections are passed through, but they all stem from this

\[\text{Ex. 7.4: The Journey, ascending-fourths motif}\]

---

24 Quoted in Aho, *Rautavaara as Symphonist*, 98.
25 Rautavaara, Preface to Symphony No. 8.
governing intervallic expansion. While harmonic regions are approached symmetrically, there is a simultaneous sensation of moving within such an environment, re-casting the durable notion of slow transformation. Bar 130, for example, alternates two quartal chords (Ex. 7.5.1). When considered as superimposed fourths, they form a symmetrical pitch space, with the harmonic transformation moving from different groups it, as shown in Ex. 7.5.2. Accessing temporary diatonic regions, such as C Aeolian in Ex. 7.5.1, is a natural occurrence, given that any seven-note segment of the circle of fifths contains a diatonic set. The same technique occurs in bars 134 and 140, as part of an emancipation of fourths that drives towards a non-triadic “estuary” at the end of the symphony.

Ex. 7.5.1: *The Journey*, 4th mvt., Brass, b. 130

D G C F B♭ E♭ A♭

Ex. 7.5.2: Pitch space based on fourths, *The Journey*, Brass, b. 130

Further evidence that a network of fourths drives harmonic change is seen over bars 131 to 132 in Ex. 7.6.1, where quartal techniques achieve a seamless transition from a harmonic centre on C to C♭. Again, although diatonicism is suggested – a minor sonority on C emerges in bar 131, and a C♭ collection appears in bar 132 – the predominance of stacked perfect fourths makes the bass note centricity less audible. Fourths therefore form pathways between different collections, simultaneously demonstrating an underlying
structure that is also approached freely. The return of the altering quaver chord idea in the Horns and Trumpets in bar 132 has a chromatic pull ($B_b$-$A$-$B$), driving the harmony somewhere new. As Ex. 7.6.2 shows, this motion is structured around the maximally-expanded region of fourths at this point, although it is arranged to achieve the most efficient voice leading.

Ex. 7.6.1: *The Journey*, 4th mvt., bb. 131-132

\[ \begin{align*}
B_b & \quad F^\# & \quad A \\
F & \quad C^\# & \quad E \\
C & \quad G^\# & \quad B
\end{align*} \]

Ex. 7.6.2: Harmonic motion, *The Journey*, Horns and Trumpets, b. 132
These open chord alterations operate like symmetrical harmonic pillars – affirmations of stability in a seemingly ever-changing context. They also reinforce the unity of the fourth interval, which becomes a way of rationalising harmonic construction through symmetry and stability. The pitch structure, structuring the harmonic and melodic range, is a different manifestation of Rautavaara’s view of dodecaphony as an ‘antidote to chaos’. While Rautavaara is not using 12-tone rows in this piece, he organises the notes to gain deep levels of stability, approaching this system less strictly, whilst also drawing on symmetry as a larger order. Arranging diatonic collections symmetrically, in fourths, becomes a kind of pandiatonicism – a practice that avoids centricity in the diatonic system. According to Rautavaara, he uses ‘pandiatonic fields’ in the opera Thomas. The final chord in The Journey returns to D but is not a triad. The closing cluster chord consists of the notes D-E-F♯-A-B and, given the significance of fourths, it can be no coincidence that this harmony can be rearranged into superimposed perfect fourths, thereby forming a symmetrical harmony. This pitch network brings a different form of resolution to functional tonal harmony.

**Modal middleground**

As discussed in Chapter 2, Modes 2 and 6 of limited transposition are a hallmark of Rautavaara’s later style. The hybridity of these scales, bearing relations to chromaticism and diatonicism, is part of how he navigates between large harmonic structures and the melodic detail, forming an important middleground layer in the larger pitch network. Forging this common ground helps achieve the processes of transformation that are so fundamental to the experience of these works.

In Symphony No. 5, the chromatic “Chorale” melody relates (by common pitch classes) with the accompanying Mode 6 in the strings and woodwind (bar 77 in Ex. 7.7.1, for example). This mode (shown in Ex. 7.7.2) is also used in Symphonies 6, 7 and 8 and Rautavaara would have been drawn to its symmetry. In Angel of Light and The Journey, he places more emphasis on using these modes to achieve shifts in colour. Like any mode, its intervallic qualities give it a highly distinctive sound. Mode 6 is often used in scalic, arabesque-like configurations within a larger texture, as in Ex. 7.7.1. This relationship

26 *The Gift of Dreams*, 25:00-26:32.
28 ‘Middleground’ is not used here in a Schenkerian sense, but refers to the mediations between various pitch collections.
between Mode 6 and the melody relies on commonalities between pitch configurations. In Ex. 7.7.1, the melody is familiar, but the modal element signifies that events have moved forward.

Ex. 7.7.1: Chromatic melody with Mode 6 accompaniment, Symphony No. 5, bb. 77-78

Ex. 7.7.2: Mode 6, as used in Ex. 7.7.1

The way these scales unite pitch organisations in the Fifth Symphony is a vital part of the synthesis Rautavaara sought between ‘the modern and the more or less tonal.’ The Journey builds on this language, as it navigates between different pitch collections. This accessibility is made possible through the common use of fourths and Mode 6, enhancing its journeying process.

In the expanded neo-tonal language of the Eighth Symphony, common sub-sets connect multiple pitch collections. Harmonically, triads and non-triad harmonies (for example, deriving from Mode 6) are both accessible and somewhat interchangeable as part of a larger vocabulary, owing to their common tones. Triadic harmony is no guarantee of

resolution – such security is dependent upon a larger context and can be achieved by non-triads. This ambiguity is reflected in the way that important notes from C# major fit within the Mode 6 collection given in Ex. 7.8 (allowing for enharmonic alterations).

Ex. 7.8: Mode 6 in ascending order

The accessible network also enables harmonic shifts between diatonic collections and Mode 6. Ex. 7.9 illustrates the transition from an essentially pentatonic harmony, with surface melodic chromaticism, to Mode 6. This transition happens as part of a fast-changing harmonic progression and achieves the effect of breaking into a new area, but both zones have notes in common. Furthermore, the bass notes shift from the tritone-related A♭ and D, revealing again symmetrical divisions of the 12 tones. Concurrently, however, the shift to a Mode 6 harmony in bar 52 also introduces harmonic tension, recalling tonal processes of tension and relaxation.

Ex. 7.9: Motion into Mode 6, *The Journey*, mvt., 4 bb. 51-52
Another example of Mode 6 achieving continuity, bridging diatonic and non-diatonic collections, is bars 58 and 59 (Ex. 7.10). Common tones bring a smooth transition between A major and Mode 6. This transformation retains the common tone in G♯/A, and uses a semitonal pull in the inner voices, using smooth voice leading.

Ex. 7.10: Motion into Mode 6, *The Journey*, 4th mvt., bb. 58-59

Mode 6, which could so easily become a kind of harmonic barber’s pole, running up and down infinitely without ever actually going anywhere, is projected as part of a dynamic process. Again, linear motion co-exists with symmetrical stasis – a paradox that musically illustrates moving through a visionary landscape: the journey is mobile, while the land is static. A more static backdrop is often underscored through pedal points, whilst melodic and voice-leading motion in both the Woodwind and Horns is more dynamic. Over the top, as in bars 52-69, various harmonic colours transform, interchanging between Mode 6 and diatonic collections.

Finally, symmetry links the use of fourths with Mode 6. This mode is rearranged (T-S-S-T-T-S-T-S-T) or divided into sub-groups (T-T-S-T-T/ S-S-T-T-S-S-S) to emphasise its symmetry, as in Ex. 7.11.1. Rautavaara does exactly this by reformulating the mode in the string runs (T-S-S-T-T-S-S-T), within phrases – see Ex.7.11.2. Because of their hybridity, modes of limited transposition afford efficient access to quasi-tonal pitch configurations and, for Rautavaara, were a fundamental way of connecting neo-tonal and dodecaphonic thinking.
A kaleidoscopic view of harmony

Triads are admitted as part of Rautavaara’s “synthesis”, but harmonic change happens in a non-diatonic way. Strict diatonicism and functional tonality result in linear melodic and harmonic processes. Rautavaara’s approach is more kaleidoscopic in that he draws on the 12-tone vocabulary outlined earlier in this thesis – a cycle of harmonic possibility. He shifts between different harmonic configurations within this, much as the colours in a kaleidoscope can alter the perspective. Such an understanding of harmony, essentially in a more static, spatial sense, recalls Neo-Riemannian models, where networks of harmonic motion are determined by common tones between chords, and accessing a new chord is determined by changing the smallest number of notes – a concept that Richard Cohn terms ‘parsimonious voice leading’.  


31 Cohn, ‘Introduction to Neo-Riemannian Theory’: 172.
Although Symphony No. 5 opens with a C major triad, it is not ‘in C major’ in any functional tonal sense, as the total absence of any real diatonicism and the breadth of the harmonies (some of which are highly chromatic) show. This triad is admitted as part of the much broader harmonic system outlined in Chapter 2 of this thesis. However, there is also self-awareness in using C major, as Rautavaara states that the Fifth Symphony returns ‘not without irony to a place of serenity’. But Rautavaara’s system allows this chord to sound new as we are encouraged to re-evaluate this “familiar” triad, and tonality itself.

Similarly, while the Eighth Symphony ends with an emphatic D pedal, this piece is not ‘in D.’ However, while the vocabulary might be arranged symmetrically and cyclically, Rautavaara expresses this vocabulary as part of a dynamic, symphonic journey. This dichotomy plays out on a number of levels.

Further evidence that triads are simply one harmonic organisation in the Fifth Symphony is shown in the way a recurring gesture from the opening appears in different harmonic configurations of a symmetrical, 12-tone system. Ex. 7.12.1 shows the motion from a C major triad to a chromatic chord. A similar harmonic gesture as the opening occurs over bars 35-36 (Ex. 7.12.2) but the chord is essentially constructed from larger organisations around the circle of fifths.

Ex. 7.12.1: Harmonic motion, Symphony No. 5, bb. 1-2

---

32 Quoted in Aho, *Rautavaara as Symphonist*, 100.
Free from expectation to resolve back to a C major triad at stages within the symphony, the harmony builds on this triad at various stages, incurring a sense of familiarity. Beginning at bar 98, the music arrives at a relatively static harmony. This section uses and repeats the “Petrushka” chord (a C major triad combined with an F♯ major triad). But the strings also use an equivalent tritone-based collection on B, therefore symmetrically splitting the pitch space in half. As Tiikkaja observes, the vibraphone and violins use two additional chords (E♭ major and G major) in addition to B major and F major. Symmetry is preserved in that 11 of 12 notes from the chromatic set feature in this section, organised around triads. This approach to large-scale harmonic transformation emphasises a more kaleidoscopic process than the linear harmonic progression of functional tonality.

The use of fourths in the Eighth Symphony impacts the overall formal process of arriving somewhere new using familiar materials. From bar 5, a repeating melody, taken from *Thomas* (see Chapter 6) is transposed systematically. Beginning on a D minor harmony, transpositions progress through a repeating pattern of a descending major third followed by a descending minor second. This process reveals a larger pattern of interlocking fifths, as shown in Ex. 7.13. At the same time, the experience centres on the journey through changing harmonic contexts. This more dynamic perspective results from the linear drive and voice leading in the melody that frequently moves by step, before the new chord is harmonised underneath. This voice-leading motion into each new chord is indicated with arrows in Ex. 7.13. Although the harmony appears to move a great deal, it takes a rather scenic route, and is actually cyclic. For example, the inevitable arrival back to D minor in bar 30, generated by this highly structured pattern, itself completes a kind of progressive circle.
Ex. 7.13: Harmonic and voice-leading summary, *The Journey*, 4\(^{th}\) mvt., bb. 5-32

Harmony, therefore, reinforces the dichotomy in this piece between a teleological destination and a journey. This clearly resonates with the nature of a spiral – something that is always in motion but also a complete, unified shape. This dichotomy between unity and diversity might also be expressed in the context of Jonathan Kramer’s classifications of linear perceptions of time versus non-linear, or circular, perceptions of time.\(^{33}\) Whilst linear harmonic processes are clearly in action, the use of repetition encourages a non-sequential understanding of musical time. Circular perceptions of time, perceived as repeated cycles of days, months and years – are a striking part of the temporal psyche of many Nordic composers. Referring to his conversation with Kaaja Saariaho, Tim Howell observes the juxtaposed perspectives of the slow, cyclic changing of light in the Nordic countries and abrupt seasonal changes.\(^{34}\) He further states how Saariaho and Lindberg both acknowledge the significance of extremes between light and dark.\(^{35}\) The concept of Mandala, the ‘circle of life’, imposing order, symmetry and continuity throughout musical processes, illustrates the same larger idea.

The dynamism over bars 1-32 is also enhanced through metrical value. The number of bars spent on each chord decreases as the section unfolds (first four bars, then three, two, and finally one), creating the illusion of accelerated motion.

This kaleidoscopic principle works at the level of local harmonic change. In the *Sciolto* section of the fourth movement of *The Journey* (bb. 70-95), the harmony constantly shifts between different triads. This passage orientates towards the coda, and

---


\(^{35}\) Ibid.
the rising melody brings a sense of increased urgency. However, the harmonic structure behind this process is cyclical, and frequently centred around symmetry.

Consecutive triads in this section often form mirrored hexachords – see, for example, the relationship between A minor and F major triads in Ex. 7.14. This practice recalls Rautavaara’s studies with Vincent Persichetti and ideas of mirror harmony. Consequently, chords shift within a diatonic (or tertian) “zone” of the circle of fifths. Principles of Neo-Riemannian theory can illustrate many of the chord changes in this section. Indeed, the chords that are used in basic operations of Neo-Riemannian theory, such as the Leading-note (L) or Parallel-Leading-note (PL) transformations, together form a symmetrical space.

Ex. 7.14: Symmetry between A minor and F major triads

More broadly, common-tone preservation between consecutive chords – a crux of Neo-Riemannian theory – adds to the flow of this progression. More dramatic harmonic shifts at work here omit these common-tone preservations. These occasions therefore shift from one diatonic area to another – an effect achieved through a particular use of voice leading. In Ex. 7.15 (bar 71) for instance, Rautavaara shifts from B♭ major to G♯ minor. Due to the gravitational pull of horizontal chromaticism, the violin line steps from A to G♯, thereby accessing the G♯ minor harmony. The effect is a sudden transformation of colour.
The transformational emphasis in Neo-Riemannian theory might have helped the new directions of neo-tonal music, where the avoidance of a governing tonic is frequently preferable. Frank Lehman speculates that the music of such post-tonal composers as Rautavaara, Roy Harris, Jón Leifs and Alan Hovhaness might respond to analysis using a Neo-Riemannian model that emphasises harmonic change above melodic development. It is important to emphasise the importance of melody in Rautavaara’s music, however.

Navigating harmonic vistas

While both the Fifth and Eighth Symphonies express a journey, relatively static sections along the way open up harmonic vistas that reflect on the progress undertaken. On these occasions, the circular and symmetrical pitch vocabulary becomes more evident. In The Journey, the relative harmonic stasis in such sections re-asserts the interval of a fourth. The closing section of the first movement, from bars 96 to 108, uses pandiatonicism, where diatonic regions are present but avoid tonal centricity. In using fourths, Rautavaara also uses pandiatonicism in a symmetrical way. But he also takes this idea further by using the pitch region indicated in Ex. 7.16. This is a segment of the circle of fifths that contains diatonic collections but also extends beyond them. Consequently, this resource logically incorporates both F♯ and F♭, as well as a B natural and a B♯. The relative priority of the note D is indicated by its taking up the centre of this space, further emphasising symmetry.

---

Bars 96 to 98 use the G major diatonic set shown in Ex. 7.16 (the first seven notes from left to right in this section of the circle of fifths) underscored by a pedal on D. Meanwhile, in bar 99 the harmony switches and uses the F major diatonic set (the first seven notes from right to left). Functional tonality is absent, owing to the use of static tetrachords in the horns. This stability is emphasised by harp glissandi up and down the diatonic collection. That Rautavaara draws on the notes in Ex. 7.16 as one large collection, rather than two diatonic regions, becomes clear in bar 102, where this entire spectrum is used simultaneously.

In bar 109, this closing section moves into the symmetrical Mode 2 – a different, static orchestral field, underpinned this time by an F♯ pedal. This final section is able to occupy multiple collections simultaneously, including quartal harmonies, octatonic and chromatic, thereby contributing to the sense of temporary stasis at this point. Ending the first movement on a D♯ pedal forms a kind of large-scale symmetry in the major third relationship with the pitch centre (G) at the beginning.

Bars 40-51 of the final movement re-work this Andante passage and have a similar kind of stasis. The stasis comes from the temporary confinement to harmonies centred on the bass notes E♭, E, F, respectively, followed by centres on D (bar 48) and A♭ (bars 49 to 51). Upon closer inspection, it is possible to apply the fourth-based model in Ex. 7.17 Again, this is a diatonic region that is extended by one step, introducing a note from outside (in this case, the note E) that adds a certain colour. Such an approach further demonstrates the independence from diatonic tonality, as this systematic approach centred on fourths is comparable to serialism, but it also leaves a considerable amount to the composer’s discretion.

Ex. 7.16: Symmetrical pitch structure, The Journey, 1st mvt., bb. 96-108

Ex. 7.17: Symmetrical pitch structure, The Journey, 4th mvt., 40-51
As the fourth movement works towards the conclusion, various harmonic vistas happen along the way. The function of these sections can be seen in an outline of harmonic features in Ex. 7.18.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Con grandezza  ( \dot{\text{=}} ) c. 56</th>
<th>Poco più mosso  ( \dot{\text{=}} ) c. 66</th>
<th>Sciolto  ( \dot{\text{=}} ) c. 112</th>
<th>Tempo primo  ( \dot{\text{=}} ) c. 56</th>
<th>Coda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bars</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>5-32</td>
<td>33-39</td>
<td>49-53</td>
<td>54-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant pedals</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D-C( \flat )</td>
<td>C( \flat )</td>
<td>E( \flat )</td>
<td>A( \flat )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex. 7.18: Harmonic summary, *The Journey*, 4\(^{th}\) mvt.
Many of these passages expand out, allowing the cycle of fifths to extend to a wide range. This is particularly effective in the final movement, which musically broadens into the closing passage that Rautavaara termed ‘the ever-lasting sea’. During bars 33 to 38 (Ex. 7.19), perfect fourths and their inverted fifths are stacked to form towers, broadening the musical horizon. This passage produces all twelve notes of the chromatic scale (see Ex. 7.19). Again, this approach aligns with a dodecaphonic mentality whilst emphasising harmony.

Ex. 7.19: The Journey, 4th mvt., bb. 33-38

Counterintuitively, this harmonic stasis in Ex. 7.9 also incurs a relative lack of harmonic reference. Pedal points temporarily drop out, resulting in a suspension of harmonic clarity. Again, the visual impetus behind this music invites comparison with a change of landscape – a more open environment as the harmony seems almost to become airborne. This section phases between implied diatonic collections, including C♯ major (bar 33), E major (bar 34), and C♯ minor (bar 35). These temporary settlements derive from a complementary dialogue between free diatonicism and the systematic, sharpwards direction of the ascending fifths and descending fourths. Again, quartal harmonies access different pitch organisations.

37 Rautavaara, Preface to Symphony No. 8.
The series returns

In contrast to Symphonies 5 and 8, Symphonies 6 and 7 each use 12-tone rows more prominently, but still with considerable freedom. Continuing in the spirit of his String Quartet No. 2 and Symphony No. 3, Rautavaara’s rows in his later music also have a tonal quality, frequently structuring these around triads. The fact that he was able to write music that did not use rows prompts the question as to why he used them on these other occasions. He was experimenting with different ways of organising pitch and musical ideas around this time and rows brought a particular organisation without being the only option. In this sense, the method might be slightly different to works such as the Eighth Symphony, as the organisation of pitch is stricter, but the purpose is essentially the same, and is influenced by such notions as Mandala, order and symmetry.

There are several reasons why rows were useful to Rautavaara in these symphonies. Above all, they bring structure for harmonic and melodic organisation. However, because Rautavaara approaches these freely, without following strict serial practice, these are essentially a framework rather than rigid structure. The renewed interest in 12-tone rows coincides with operas such as Thomas, Vincent and The Gift of the Magi. These operas, especially Thomas and Vincent, use rows to assist the story, establishing complex character relationships indicated within the deep levels of the musical DNA. This technique also shows the common thinking between the symphonies and the operas around this time. Rautavaara also used more than one row in a piece, thereby drawing on the unity of the 12 tones but using different organisations to establish musical characters and atmospheres that relate to each other. In Angel of Light, for example, multiple rows and the Hymn Motif interact or fuse together with Messiaen’s modes of limited transposition. This compatibility is especially important considering Rautavaara’s prevalent use of self-quotation from the 1990s onwards (see Chapter 6). As the majority of Angel of Light derives from a range of pre-existing and separate pieces, rows that are common to these works establish unity operating at a deep level. Finally, these rows also bring a sense of mysticism. Stemming back to Symphony No. 3, the idea of a semi-autonomous potential, based on the prior organisation of pitch, still held great value for Rautavaara.
Modal dodecaphony

The main row (Row VI) in Angel of Light is connected to another row via the “fifth series” technique, according to Tiikkaja. This technique, learned from Vogel, is also used in Symphony No. 3. Rows V and VI are structured around triads, lending a tonal soundworld. An important part of this process is the use of interchangeable sub-sets, such as triads, that can connect different pitch organisations. The prioritisation of certain intervals such as fifths and thirds makes the harmonic properties of these rows recognisable and relatively accessible. As such, these rows can be said to have modality, even if they are not modes in the usual sense of falling into seven-note patterns. If a mode is a particular scale, then modality is the intervallic qualities of that combination of notes. This is exactly what happens with the D minor chord – drawn from Row VI – that is outlined at the start of the first movement. Tiikkaja refers to the D minor triad as the “common chord” which is drawn from the row and appears as a centre point throughout the various contexts. Row VI can, in certain cases, be aurally recognisable. This recognition comes not just from its predominantly minor quality but also the way the series governs its harmonic transformation. The same systematic harmonic transformation of this row in Angel of Light (see Chapter 6) is used in other works, such as Die Erste Elegie and Manhattan Trilogy (2004). In Manhattan Trilogy, the row is the same but Rautavaara does not use self-quotation, using a completely new melody. All of these works use a D minor harmony to begin.

The deep-rooted properties of Row VI also establish a connection between the opening melodic section of the first movement of Angel of Light and the slow third movement. Again, minor triads feature prominently here. This explains the apparently mystical way in which these movements sound related without direct recurrences of melodic material, aside from occasional statements of the Hymn Motif.

In Angel of Light, there are subtle shifts in such modal qualities, resulting in a transformation of musical colour. As with The Journey, Rautavaara uses his pitch organisations to represent the visual impetus behind the piece. Common sub-sets, usually triads and specifically major thirds, forge connections between different rows and modes of limited transposition, resulting in a kind of genetic relationship. While Row VI relates to D minor, Row II is related to both the Hymn Motif and Mode 3, as shown in Ex. 7.20.

38 Tiikkaja, ‘Paired Opposites’, 256.
Ex. 7.20.1: Hymn Motif in Mode 3, *Angel of Light*, 1st mvt., bb. 93-95
Row II:

Ex. 7.20.2: Connections between different pitch collections, *Angel of Light, 1st mvt.*
Similarly, the Hymn Motif fits into Mode 6, forging connections between different modes of limited transposition (see Ex. 7.21). The same cohesive, developing mentality occurs in the derivation and combination of rows. For example, Stępień observes how, in the fourth movement, when Rautavaara combines Row VI and Row V; he creates new, but related, material. This technique again emphasises organicism, as new “colours” open up, growing out of other pitch collections.

As with The Journey, this is not simply a mixture of pitch collections that are cleverly stitched together. A concern for unity absolutely resides in this piece. However, Rautavaara also explores ways of getting the most variety out of his organisations as possible, as he accesses different modal qualities through common sub-sets. Intervallic and thematic characteristics make this coherence more perceptible.

**Hymn Motif:**

![Hymn Motif](image1)

**Mode 6:**

![Mode 6](image2)

Ex. 7.21: Common chords between Hymn Motif and Mode 6

---

40 Stępień, The Sound of Finnish Angels, 155.
**Rows as pigments**

An emphasis on intervallic colour, thus making 12-tone processes more communicable, also characterises *Vincentiana*. As specified in Chapter 4, this symphony draws its material extensively from the opera *Vincent*, which includes three 12-tone rows that form the pitch foundation of that opera (see Ex. 7.22). As in the opera, Rautavaara combines the qualities of the rows in various ways, treating their different timbres as pigments. In describing his approach in *Vincent*, he stated that ‘Each row is so conceived that it has its own strong interval content distinguishing it from others…Mixing, combining the rows thus produces the musical hues of the opera.’ As Ex. 7.22 shows, each row is made up of two hexachords with the same pitch class set. Rows B and C are also all-combinatorial.

![Ex. 7.22: 12-tone rows in *Vincent and Vincentiana*](image_url)

---

The complex combination of these different rows, their derivations, and the relatively free way in which he approaches them, can obscure their presence at times. However, this complexity adds to the sense of mysticism, as Rautavaara uses these prior pitch structures to derive subsequent development. Their effect, however, is often audible. Furthermore, they contribute to the dramatic narrative associated with this symphony, recalling the twists and turns in the story of *Vincent* that ultimately culminates in a celebration of colour.

As Sivuoja-Gunaratnam points out, each row has a particular intervallic quality, with Row A using ‘almost all the intervals’, Row B using mainly ‘major seconds and fourths’ and Row C using ‘predominantly major seconds’.\(^{42}\) Row A uses a far wider range of intervals than Rows B and C in Ex. 7.22, which are considerably closer to the diatonic system in that they contain intervals that are closer together. Row B in particular is the most tonal, as each hexachord contains notes that fit into a diatonic scale. Consequently, as with the use of fourths in *The Journey*, these can be re-organised symmetrically into fourths or alternating major and minor triads. The diatonic character of Row B, where each side makes up a diatonic set, prompts the question of why there needs to be a row at all. But, on the occasions where this row features prominently, the music is unconfined to any one set and constantly morphs into new, quasi-diatonic, settings. Given the complex interaction between the qualities of these rows, from which much of the drama of the piece is derived, it is likely that these changes in atmosphere would not have been possible without the careful structural basis of these pigments.

Overall, the Sixth Symphony ends in luminescence, but completely outside of functional tonality. Dodecaphony forms a pivotal role here in renewing this tonal and symphonic principle. While the relative triadic tonality of the fourth movement, “Apotheosis”, is highly contrasting to other parts of this symphony, there is a coherent evolution based around the structure of the rows. 12-tone series form the foundation of transformations in musical colour, moving towards the clarity of “Apotheosis”, where the diatonic basis of Row B is given the most development than at any other point in the symphony.

So, to understand this process, it is worth beginning with the end. In the closing bars of “Apotheosis”, the diatonically-based Row B wins through. Over the course of the whole movement, the register gets higher, achieving a sense of moving into light.

\(^{42}\) Sivuoja-Gunaratnam, ‘Vincent’: 8.
Additionally, from bar 73, Mode 6 is added as an extra layer in the violins. Used to build texture, rather than a harmonic or melodic device, this added element increases the luminescence of this coda. This brightness is achieved through the high register and the use of tremolo which brings a shimmering quality. In contrast, the more chromatic Row A earlier in the symphony introduces tension in its contrast to the more diatonic, and therefore familiar, sounds that emerge at later points, offering a broader approach to notions of consonance and dissonance. In the first movement, “Starry Night”, Row A is used as part of a chromatic, 12-tone melody with wide leaps for two solo violins, as well as being distributed vertically in the harmony. This melody is juxtaposed with a relatively diatonic-sounding melody in the lower strings. This movement, which has an altogether murkier atmosphere, is more ambiguous in its use of the rows. Transitions towards relative diatonicism and “bright” textures happen gradually and, when the clarity and familiarity of Row B arrives in bar 66, it soon disappears. During the non-linear journey of this piece, therefore, these transitions between colours alternate to some extent throughout, moving between bright and murky qualities. For example, the opening painting in “Starry Night” also uses Mode 6, the musical colour of which seems to allude to the brightly-coloured painting of van Gogh in both the opera and the symphony.

A new equilibrium

The various pitch organisations discussed in this chapter demonstrate how Rautavaara built on his experiences of serialism in a number of new and different ways. Throughout these examples, it is clear that the most productive method for him was to approach the 12 tones and rows with considerable freedom, whilst still relying on some kind of structure. Other aspects of dodecaphony preserved include a belief in using the 12 tones as a vocabulary, complete independence from the tonal system, symmetry, unity and efficiency. At times, such as the “Processional” melody in Symphony No. 5, something of the systematic, calculating tendencies of the earlier serialist emerge, but this mentality is renewed through later experiences.

The corresponding novelty of Rautavaara’s approach centres on the notion of an “accessible network” that this chapter has introduced. This music accesses triadic, diatonic, modal and chromatic collections all under the umbrella of one governing system in an original way. The resultant breadth of this language makes it possible to express a range of different symphonic experiences. Whether using rows or not, this system varies the level of strictness, helping him hone a particular balance between control and freedom.
in each case. This new equilibrium was a significant factor in enabling Rautavaara to continue the symphonic genre.
Neo-tonality and harmonic resonance

Neo-tonality is a particularly important feature of Rautavaara’s music. This chapter explores how this stylistic aspect demonstrates both a renewal of past practice and continued experimentation with sonority. The harmonic examples discussed here, though often brief, are highly distinctive and highlight important moments within larger formal schemes. The cumulative nature of these occurrences also makes them difficult to overlook. By continuously exploring ways in which harmony could evolve and be expressed, it becomes a driving motivator for Rautavaara’s neo-tonality. Melody also plays a significant role in the transformation of these harmonies. Reflecting on his problematic relationship with serialism, he emphasised the enduring importance of this element to him:

But there was always the problem that harmony was extremely important for me, so important that it was impossible for me to follow the path the avant-garde took in the late ’50s and ’60s. I had to keep harmony.¹

As Rautavaara moved towards what he described as a ‘synthesis between the modern and more-or-less tonal’,² there are two perspectives regarding his neo-tonal approach. The previous chapter argued that dodecaphonic ways of thinking, based on the wider vocabulary of the twelve tones as an expanded pitch resource, as well as clear manipulations of sub-groups to project the music into different contexts, are clearly present. Simultaneously, however, these approaches to pitch organisation do not deny the harmonic emphasis that can be realised in a freer way.

The audible results of Rautavaara’s neo-tonality have, understandably, often been the object of discussion and contention in identifying traditional or retrospective aspects of his music. The unapologetic use of triadic harmony, lyricism, hierarchical orchestration and broad structural gestures invoke pertinent comparisons with Romantic symphonism. It is in these elements, though, that Rautavaara’s personality and individualism often come through the strongest and neo-tonal pitch configurations continue to express a fascination with symmetry that ran through his career. Further, harmonic and melodic aspects

¹ Reilly and Rautavaara, ‘Music: The Composer of Angels’.
² Ibid.
continue from his earlier pieces, such as piano works like *Icons* and the two Piano Sonatas.

**Terminology**

“Neo-tonality” is a broad concept and an eclectic range of music could fall under this label. The term applies most obviously to Rautavaara’s harmonies, which are often memorable through their depth and space. They use a wide pitch range, drawing on the full expression of the orchestra as an instrument. This technique looks to neo-tonality in recalling specific tonal aspects – triads, fourths, i.e. tertián harmony, the spacing of which forms those large, colourful chords that can be controlled through time. Such moments reassert harmonic identity, and chords often have some kind of centre, although this is not always the case. Melodically, stepwise motion in whole tones and semitones also recalls tonality. Crucially, though, these progressions operate outside of functional tonality. As such, the notion of “resonance”, largely inherited from tonality, is significant. An important factor of Rautavaara’s neo-tonality is the qualitative reaction to chords as sonorous or resonant. The enduring importance of this principle to him of course demonstrates a second kind of resonance.

In this neo-tonality, there is an emphasis on sonority. Sonority is taken to be a generic, catch-all term for the collective sound heard at any one time. This might include, but not be limited to, combinations of harmony, register, orchestration and dynamics. But this term also has a qualitative meaning that is important to this discussion; this is the quality of a chord being sonorous or resonant, and therefore being emphasised as part of a neo-tonal hierarchy.

“Sonority” is often used interchangeably with “timbre”, taken here to mean the character or quality of a given note or chord, but timbre is also understood as part of the umbrella-term of sonority, as it contributes to the overall sound. Another synonymous term in relation to harmonic quality is “colour”. Whilst this term could be regarded as a synonym, parts of this chapter discuss “colour” as a more specific and subjective phenomenon, especially notions of dark versus light in the treatment of harmony.

**Rautavaara and the piano**

Kalevi Aho has stated that Rautavaara principally composed at the piano, as harmonic development was so important to him. When writing orchestral music, he would also write
a piano short score first, as he somehow needed to physically feel the harmonies that he was hearing and creating.\(^3\) When Rautavaara turned to a more tonal frame of reference in the late-1960s, it seems significant that this stylistic change coincided with a number of works that prominently feature the piano, notably the Piano Concerto No. 1 and the two Piano Sonatas, *Christus und die Fischer* (1969) and *The Fire Sermon* (1970).

This chapter argues that the timbral qualities and physical layout of this instrument influenced his harmonic approach, especially in exploring cluster chords, which feature so prominently in the first Piano Concerto, for example. Heininen recalls how part of Rautavaara’s motivation for writing this work was so that he himself could perform it, thereby proving to himself and others his abilities as a composer/performer.\(^4\) In reaching his “crisis-point” with serialism, it might not be surprising that he should return with renewed vigour to the instrument that had produced the likes of such pivotal early, characteristic works as *Icons* and the *Seven Preludes*. In doing so, he was also returning literally to a more “hands-on” way of composing, in contrast to the extensive theoretical work that took place for such pieces as *Arabescata*. The piano had a proven success for Rautavaara and therefore must have embodied a kind of safe place for his creativity.

**Harmony, sound properties and duration**

Although Rautavaara did not use spectral techniques, at least not to the same extent as Saariaho or Lindberg, he incorporates something of this mentality, especially in the emphasis on the behaviour of sound itself, and there are parallels between his works for piano and orchestra in this regard. In the opening bars of Symphony No. 5, there are alterations between consonance and extreme dissonance. In these cases, chromaticism derives from overlapping triads that contrast black- and white-note collections. Each of these highly dissonant chord combinations is articulated with considerable impact using the full orchestra and a dynamic marking of *fortissimo*. During these opening bars, Rautavaara contrasts “chaos” and “serenity”.\(^5\) Sound duration, especially the way in which the sound naturally dies away, and changes, over time, is influential in the way this opening seems to “breathe” in large motions. As shown in Ex. 8.1, a new triad emerges from the impact of each chromatic chord.

---

\(^3\) Kalevi Aho, email message to the author, October 29\(^{th}\), 2018.

\(^4\) Interview with Paavo Heininen, April 2018.

\(^5\) Preface to Symphony No. 5.
Ex. 8.1: Harmonic summary of Symphony No. 5, opening

These chromatic chord combinations can be shocking on first hearing. But this impact comes just as much from dynamics, orchestration (especially percussion) and an awareness of timbre as harmony. Collectively, these elements provide the expression of this opening gesture, following the purity of the initial C major chord. Such an intention to create a percussive, sensory overload that dies away recreates, in a new orchestral context, the loud, dense cluster chords in the piano music.

This process aligns with sonic experimentations in Rautavaara’s piano music of the late 1960s and early 1970s. In the first movement of The Fire Sermon (Ex. 8.2), a cluster-chord encompassing over an octave is held down in bar 125, whilst the sustain pedal is released. This extreme cluster-chord technique was something Rautavaara was experimenting with in his piano music around this time, appearing most prominently in the First Piano Concerto, where the whole arm is used to play white-note cluster chords, maximising the sonority of the piano. In the Sonata, as the extremely dissonant chord dies away, subsequent triads resonate with those strings still ringing. The major seventh chord in bar 129 consequently assumes a completely new persona, augmented through harmonics. Much like the opening of the Fifth Symphony, triads and seventh chords are therefore “extracted” from a larger, background sonority. The effect is that intense chromaticism –prolonged by the still vibrating strings – transforms into a more consonant and (literally) resonant harmony.
The opening of the Fifth Symphony cannot fully recreate this natural process of sound decay. With an orchestra – where many instruments do not have the durational limitations of the piano – the effect is basically an illusion, controlled through orchestration and dynamics. Nevertheless, the pace of these chord transformations is heavily influenced by this natural principle and the music is given space to transform. A full orchestra allows harmonies to overlap between individual sections, whilst the number and range of instruments intensifies the impact of these chromatic chords. Furthermore, the use of instruments such as the Tam-Tam on each of the fortissimo chords shown in Ex. 8.1 emphasises this percussive characteristic of sound changing over time, as this instrument has a minimum amount of decay time, which influences the pace of the harmonic process.

The larger purpose in both cases is the expressivity behind the percussive impact of extreme dissonance, whilst that dissonance still has a sense of harmonic grounding and resonance within it. An overloaded, uncomfortable sonority transforms over time in compelling ways. Perhaps for this reason, triads and tertian chords are emphasised, due to their “resonance” in both natural and cultural senses – natural, through their structure around fifths and octaves, and cultural, through traditional notions of “purity” surrounding triadic harmony. The triads retain a notion of purity, whilst chromatic chords have a

Ex. 8.2: Piano Sonata No. 2 – The Fire Sermon, mvt. 1, bb. 125-130

The opening of the Fifth Symphony cannot fully recreate this natural process of sound decay. With an orchestra – where many instruments do not have the durational limitations of the piano – the effect is basically an illusion, controlled through orchestration and dynamics. Nevertheless, the pace of these chord transformations is heavily influenced by this natural principle and the music is given space to transform. A full orchestra allows harmonies to overlap between individual sections, whilst the number and range of instruments intensifies the impact of these chromatic chords. Furthermore, the use of instruments such as the Tam-Tam on each of the fortissimo chords shown in Ex. 8.1 emphasises this percussive characteristic of sound changing over time, as this instrument has a minimum amount of decay time, which influences the pace of the harmonic process.

The larger purpose in both cases is the expressivity behind the percussive impact of extreme dissonance, whilst that dissonance still has a sense of harmonic grounding and resonance within it. An overloaded, uncomfortable sonority transforms over time in compelling ways. Perhaps for this reason, triads and tertian chords are emphasised, due to their “resonance” in both natural and cultural senses – natural, through their structure around fifths and octaves, and cultural, through traditional notions of “purity” surrounding triadic harmony. The triads retain a notion of purity, whilst chromatic chords have a
deliberately “muddier” quality and, in this regard, there is a reimagining of consonance and dissonance, outside of a functional, tonal framework. In an orchestral context, this durational effect takes on a new lease of life.

This whole distinction between “obscured” and “pure” triads recalls Kaija Saariaho’s discussion of the interpolated relationship between timbre and harmony. Saariaho draws a distinct, but mutually reliant, relationship between noise and sound, referring to a noise/sound axis. She equates a ‘rough, noisy texture’ to an idea of dissonance and a ‘smooth, clear texture’ to consonance. She also posits that timbre is vertical, while harmony is horizontal, as it provides the impetus for movement. This perspective would seem to align to some extent with the “extraction” of triads in both the examples from The Fire Sermon and the Fifth Symphony opening, which enact horizontal changes in the sonority.

Renewing the triad

Colour, especially notions of dark and light, is a dominant feature of Rautavaara’s harmony. Specifically, musical colour becomes a way of renewing triads, which are a part of his highly recognisable style. The original way in which he treats these harmonies derives largely from controlling the sonority itself, specifically issues of register and orchestration. Rautavaara frequently places triads in low registers. In piano works such as The Fire Sermon, these occupy the general area in the second, left-hand quarter of the piano keyboard – roughly the general zone where the left hand would usually operate. Using a triad in this range, especially in root position, achieves a totally different timbre to the same chord in the middle or upper parts of the piano. The greater number of overtones brings a “fuzzy” quality to the chord – there is less clarity than if it were in a higher register. It also possibly brings a kind of “warmth”, deriving from the lack of a piercing quality from a muddier use of harmony. Most significantly, though, this a psychologically “darker” triad, likely explained both by the richer sonority of the chord, as well as the low register. Each note of the triad, however, is distinguishable.

Rautavaara uses the same technique with the full orchestra, exploiting the low, resonant and rich timbres of the cellos and double basses. This unusual designation of a triad brings a different treatment to a common chord, as it occupies the bass register, but

---

7 Ibid.
also, over the top of this, a deep and dense sonority is built. In occupying the bass register, rather than the middle, the sonority expands. Such an example occurs in the first movement of Angel of Light, bar 153, as shown in Ex. 8.3. The triad in bar 153 is expanded by the horns and flutes to form a larger harmony.

Ex. 8.3: Angel of Light, 1st mvt., bb. 152-154

This device is consistent, especially from the late-1960s onwards. Careful control of register is partly how Rautavaara achieves a new sense of colour at strategically significant stages within large-scale forms, as well as an expansive use of orchestration. Layers of orchestral activity form a complex texture that is outwardly simple, an effect that derives from an emphasis on vertical space.

The progressiveness of such a technique comes from the experimentation with acoustic sound. This “protospectralist” thinking recalls the way that, as Julian Anderson argues, Sibelius foreshadowed spectral compositional techniques in his awareness and incorporation of natural sounds, realised in acoustic, orchestral textures. The use of resonant timbres in the lower strings also recalls the orchestral music of Sibelius. The result of this awareness of sonority, Anderson states, is an emphasis on continuity and change. Rautavaara’s attention to harmony as a catalyst for slow transformation continues this musical way of thinking. Continuity and change is shown through the colouristic alterations of register in the use of triads and the periodic use of Messiaen’s modes of

---

9 Ibid., 197.
limited transposition which are used in scalic runs to form a background texture. As discussed in relation to other parameters, such as form and serialism, Rautavaara combines traditional elements and reconfigures them according to a personal expression. The notable effect here is making a common triad sound new and distinctive.

This treatment of sonority and tertian harmony also pervades the opening section of the first movement of the Seventh Symphony, and supports the reading by Leatherbarrow discussed in Chapter 6 (see Ex. 6.2) who analyses this passage as a series of systematic transformations through three-note chords, based on the 12-tone row. Rautavaara thus combines serial pitch progression with a powerful impulse to transform harmony and maintain an expansive register through carefully supported orchestration. Throughout this opening section, bass-register triads help emphasise these colouristic transformations.

The same use of register happens in Symphony No. 5 – over bars 103-104 in Ex. 8.4, the sonority expands. There is an opposition in this example between the high and static register of the upper strings and vibraphone and the darker, ascending line of the lower strings that grows out of the A₄ major triad, introduced in bar 103. The relationship between dark and light seems particularly powerful in this example. Rautavaara continued to manipulate the notion that humans perceive high pitch as light and low pitch as dark, a larger cultural notion highlighted by Eila Tarasti and Stępień. Furthermore, there is contrast between the “sharp”, higher chord of C major and F₄ major, in contrast to the “flat” A₄. The ascending line in the lower strings – following this logic, a journey out of darkness for this section of the orchestra – brings a different dimension to an otherwise predominantly static texture. In this sense, the A₄ triad has a function distantly related to traditional tonality, as it becomes a temporary protagonist. The clarity of this chord is also soon thwarted, again suggesting a kind of tonal journey. Rautavaara’s neo-tonality continues principles from earlier music – especially large-scale harmonic references that recall a Romantic subjectivity – but channels these into a fresh expression. This expression is based more on the objective, colouristic transformation of sound objects. This technique of ascending from a lower to higher register, supported by a journey in dynamics, to incur a feeling of travelling from dark to light is one that Rautavaara frequently utilises.

---

Pantonal voice leading

Building on tonal principles, Rautavaara frequently employs his own kind of highly-efficient voice leading. This practice often balances structure and freedom. From the 1980s, he again synthesised the 12-tone technique with tonality (this synthesis was explored in Chapter 7). In *Angel of Light*, 12-tone rows provide the backbone of numerous passages, but as these are distributed harmonically, often as triads, they operate spatially, as a combination of vertical and horizontal movement.

Serialism is harnessed in a way to support and release neo-tonal impulses. Although the rows bring a structure, they are approached with more flexibility, with a focus on the efficient motion from one chord into another. In this respect, residual voice-leading principles are part of a broader solution to the crisis with the serial technique,
which incorporated Rautavaara’s view that the composer should, to an extent, be guided by the music itself.11 There is also a connection with the previous chapter’s discussion on his belief in 12-tone space as one vocabulary, but that this somehow has to be organised in a certain way.

In serial and non-serial cases, the broad concept of *pantonal*ity is a useful point of reference. Rautavaara is unconfined to individual scales and tonalities, but still draws on tonal-like methods (triadic harmony, synthetic collections and a loose sense of voice leading) to achieve this, believing such techniques to have new applications. The precise nature of this balance of freedom and control is worth exploring, as it shows the particular way in which Rautavaara synthesises serialism and tonality. Tiikkaja’s use of the “Harmonic Circle” (see Chapter 2) as a model for his harmony highlights the way triadic chords are often ‘paired’ with those on the opposite side of the tertiian cycle (i.e two interlocking cycles of fifths).12 To add to this work, voice leading is a pivotal part of this practice. By approaching each new chord linearly, via step-wise motion, Rautavaara emphasises the harmonic transformation into a tertiian chord on the other side of the circle of fifths. This practice not only reveals an expansive neo-tonal network, but creates a kaleidoscopic experience of harmonic, colouristic revelation.

Smooth harmonic transformation is an integral part of Rautavaara’s practice and emphasises the horizontal orientation towards significant structural moments within the symphonic form. In the years after abandoning serialism, his subsequent harmonic emphasis was to prove highly influential when he later reconciled 12-tone rows with triadic harmony. Non-diatonic chord successions build an impression that the music is going somewhere, constantly opening up new harmonic realms. The influence of voice leading, inherited from tonality, has an important role to play in the way chords seamlessly transform. Whilst developing approaches to harmonic motion during these in-between years, the physicality of the piano is likely to have had some influence.

Ex. 8.5 shows a passage from the second movement of the Second Piano Sonata. A combination of Modes 2 and 6 in the right hand provide continuity and order. While chord changes underneath broadly fit with these modal patterns, they are relatively free. These harmonic shifts in the left hand show the kind of continuity that derives from freer voice leading practice, when compared to diatonic tonality. The influence of the spatial layout of

the keyboard also means the left hand stays in the same approximate position during this section.

Ex. 8.5: *The Fire Sermon*, 2nd mvt., bb.78-81

A similar process happens in the second movement of *The Fire Sermon*. Harmonic continuity comes from step-wise motion, using intervals that are close together (whole tones, semitones, major and minor thirds). Synthetic modes, applied with varying degrees of strictness, are useful here as they expand beyond diatonicism but draw on its linearity. This parsimony, combined with the use of common notes between adjacent chords, aligns with principles of Neo-Riemannian Theory, but differs from this model in other ways. As Richard Cohn argues, the retention of notes in the three basic Neo-Riemannian operations naturally aligns with notions of voice leading,\(^\text{13}\) but, as these examples show, this principle expands beyond semitonal relations between triads to step-wise motions between all notes of adjacent chords. The first chord change in Ex. 8.6.1 is not easily analysable in Neo-

---

\(^{13}\)Richard Cohn, ‘Introduction to Neo-Riemannian Theory’: 174.
Riemannian terms, but is no less the result of a step-wise voice leading relationship between the triads C♯ major and E minor. The same principle of voice leading – through logical movement of whole tones and semitones – occurs in Ex. 8.6.2.

Ex. 8.6.1: *The Fire Sermon*, mvt. 2, bb. 18-20

Ex. 8.6.2: Voice leading in *The Fire Sermon*, mvt. 2, bb. 18-20

**Voice leading and serialism**

The harmonic practice demonstrated in *The Fire Sermon* results in a pantonal framework that combines with serial processes in later music, such as *Angel of Light*. This kind of “floating” tonality exists outside of tonal laws but, in certain cases, it is more highly controlled, either through rows or keyboard symmetry. In *Angel of Light*, like the much earlier Symphony No. 3, the rows bring a stricter sense of order that Rautavaara felt he needed, but they are still approached with more freedom than his earlier serialist pieces. Heininen suggests that Rautavaara felt he needed the prior structure that rows brought.\(^{14}\) This idea seems likely as, once this structure was in place, he could then focus on how that

\(^{14}\) Interview with Paavo Heininen, April 2018.
structure could be brought to life in a continuous way, allowing a harmonic emphasis to emerge.

One such passage, beginning at bar 55 in the final movement, uses another 12-tone row, Row V. This row is structured in a way to outline four triads alternating major and minor chords (Ex. 8.7). As Stępień notes, these chords are transposed, being introduced vertically from bar 55. Rautavaara uses these chords – the entire row – to instigate an 18-bar passage where there is a sense of ascension and orientation towards some future moment. The fact that each new triad is determined by the row means these shifts – which predominantly make use of efficient, stepwise motions – operate outside of functional tonality, resulting in a series of revelatory harmonies that express the angelic subject matter.

Ex. 8.7: Triadic groupings in Row V, *Angel of Light*

This section is later repeated between bars 96 and 108, where it leads to the final statement of the Hymn Motif. In both occurrences, the use of Mode 6 in the upper strings and woodwind ascending in rapid semiquavers creates a dense texture that contributes to the overall sense of weight and motion. But principles of voice leading also contribute to this dynamic process. Ex. 8.8.1 shows the first cycle of this row and Ex. 8.8.2 shows the transformation between each chord. This process continues throughout the section. This harmonic motion, which is derived from the structure of Row V results in the “expanded” diatonicism of the melody. The row essentially forms a maximised, quasi-diatonic scale, enabling a reimagined harmonic emphasis. Harmony and melody also work together as one unit. Furthermore, unlike Symphony No. 3, the final movement of *Angel of Light* does not emphasise one pitch centre in the same way.

---

16 Ibid., 156.
Ex. 8.8.1: Angel of Light, 4th mvt., bb. 55-58
Triads: $G_{b}+$ $E-$ $G_{#}-$ $D-$ $E_{b}-$ $F+$

Ex. 8.8.2: Voice leading in *Angel of Light*, mvt. 4, bb. 55-58

Ex. 8.9 reveals how this passage from bar 55 is structured by a series of transposed repetitions of the four chords that make up Row V. However, this example also shows the relative harmonic flexibility that is possible within this framework. Not only is the strict ordering of the series often not observed, but the motion from one chord to another is driven by harmonic and voice-leading reasons. Small deformations of strict serial practice reveal engaging aspects of Rautavaara’s harmonic progressions.

It is also impossible to ignore those deviations from the row itself, such as during the linking harmonic passages in bar 69 and between bars 71 and 72. The B₇ chord in bar 69 sees a colouristic change from the major to minor mode, enhancing a sense of illumination. This chord is therefore an important part of this passage, but it deviates from the otherwise structured use of the row. Bars 71-72 use chords that have already been generated by the series, but the motivation behind them is continuity, as a link into a new section, with a very different atmosphere, beginning at bar 75. Overall, using different transpositions of Row V opens up new harmonic possibilities, resulting in a continuous process of transformation and orientation that reflects the purpose behind the whole piece.

The deviations from the row in Ex. 8.9 are also where the most interesting harmonic events take place. It enhances those revelatory chords, such as the A major chord in bar 70 and the E₇ triad in bar 71, both of which are not directly in accordance with strict serialism at this point. This section emphasises the sense of luminescence that is part of the harmonic technique in this symphony.
Ex. 8.9: Triadic motion, based on Row V, in Angel of Light, mvt. 4, bb. 55-72

In this balance between serialism and tonality, Rautavaara draws upon the suggestive potential of the semitone in melodic writing. The semitone represents the chromatic but is also partly characterises functional tonality. Brian Hyer discusses how the 'energetic tendencies of the semitone' represent a fundamental component of the mutation from modality to tonality and that from tonality to atonality.\(^\text{17}\)

Rautavaara’s melodies are often conjunct, making use of diatonic-sounding intervals such as semitones, whole tones, as well as thirds and fourths. Simultaneously, this continued sense of diatonic logic, experimenting with principles of resolution combines with harmonic clarity. Linear, stepwise “resolutions” are unconfined to any one harmonic centre, resulting in a theoretically endless process of transformation and harmonic motion, all through the catalyst of prior 12-note structures. This practice of reconciling dodecaphony with diatonic elements strongly recalls Berg’s Violin Concerto

\(^{17}\) Hyer, ‘Tonality’.

---

### Bars | Triads
---|---
55-57 | G\(_\sharp\)+ → E\(-\) → A\(_\sharp\)+ → D\(-\)  
      | Row V
58-60 | F\(+\) ← E\(_\flat\)- → G\(+\) ← C\(_\sharp\)-  
      | Row V
61-64 | A\(+\) → G\(-\) → C\(_\sharp\)+ → F\(-\)  
      | Row V
64-68 | D\(+\) ← C\(-\) → E\(+\) → A\(_\sharp\)+  
      | Row V
69-71 | B\(_\flat\)+ ← A\(+\) → F\(-\) → E\(_\flat\)-  
      | Freer
71-73 | E\(_\flat\)+ ← D\(_\flat\)- → C\(-\) → G\(_\flat\)-  
      | Freer
Perhaps building on Berg’s own practice, the prioritisation of voice-leading principles in the Seventh Symphony is a result of Rautavaara’s own dialogic approach to composition, taking on diverse elements from past practices, but not at the cost of inner coherence.

**Voice leading and symmetry**

The relationship between voice leading and harmonic symmetry in Rautavaara’s music has yet to be explored in detail, and this relationship reveals an important balance between horizontal and vertical manifestations of harmony and melody. Piano music can once again help illustrate this notion, as the physical space of the keyboard has influenced harmonic configurations. The role of keyboard symmetry has been examined by Brandon Paul, but this principle also influenced processes in the symphonies.

As Paul highlights, both bars 95 and 96 of *The Fire Sermon* are symmetrical constructs, but the symmetry also achieves a new kind of voice leading, especially the pull of whole tones to move from chord to chord. Although both bars occupy different symmetrical zones of the keyboard, they are connected by smooth harmonic motion. Again, whole-tone motion in the top of the right hand ensures a horizontal logic. Also, connecting these bars is an implied, albeit not literally carried out (it would be impossible on the piano), harmonic, step-wise expansion outwards. This visual expansion is again motivated by symmetry. As Ex. 8.10 shows, the implied voice-leading function in the right hand is to proceed down to the B♭, shown in parenthesis.

---

**Ex. 8.10: The Fire Sermon, mvt. 1, bb. 95-96**

---

19 See Paul, ‘Bilateral Keyboard Symmetry’.
20 Ibid.
This relationship between symmetry and voice leading is also present from bar 55 of the fourth movement of Angel of Light. As the comparison in Ex. 8.11 shows, Row V is not symmetrical, unlike Row VI.

Row V (not symmetrical):

Ex. 8.11.1: Asymmetry in Row V, Angel of Light

Row VI (symmetrical retrograde inversion):

Prime form

Ex. 8.11.2: Symmetry in Row VI, Angel of Light

However, by distributing the row as triads, Rautavaara explores a different kind of symmetry, based on symmetrical properties of the physical keyboard layout. This different conception of dodecaphonic symmetry is shown in Ex. 8.12 and builds on the keyboard layout that informed his earlier compositions. Considering the spacing of these four chords from bars 55-57 on a piano, they extend outwards – see Ex. 8.12.1. As shown in Ex. 8.12.2, the collective interval set, placed on a keyboard, is symmetrical, demonstrating the influence of this particular, spatial symmetry.
Ex. 8.12.1: Row V (P5) arranged vertically, *Angel of Light*, mvt. 4, bb. 55-57

Total interval set for four triads:

Ex. 8.12.2: Symmetrical keyboard space for Row V in *Angel of Light*, mvt. 4, bb. 55-58

More generally, this principle of the music being informed by the spacing of the piano, especially inward and outward motions, is continued throughout this passage from bars 55-73 (inward and outward motions are indicated by arrows in Ex. 8.13 below). As discussed earlier, certain chords in this section express a kind of luminescence, and the outward motion serves to emphasise these moments, especially the A major chords in bars 61 and 70, the G minor chord in bar 62, and the E₃ major chord in bar 71. As this process is also driven by horizontal stepwise motions, the visual keyboard symmetry is used in conjunction with those voice-leading principles discussed above.
Consonance and dissonance

New conceptions of consonance and dissonance are an important part of understanding recent tonal practice. In discussing broader notions of these perspectives in Saariaho’s *Lightbogen*, Eric Drott observes how she is able to foster new kinds of tension and resolution in the acoustics themselves. In terms of pitch, “consonance” and “dissonance” are relative terms. In functional harmony, consonance implies a hierarchy which prioritises triads, especially the tonic. By contrast, in Rautavaara’s music, perceptions of consonance and dissonance rely far more upon the overall context. Harmony is inseparable from such parameters as timbre, articulation, register, orchestration, pitch duration, articulation, dynamics and the placement with large formal schemes. And yet, there is strong kinship with traditional tonal practice in the attention to large-scale harmonic motion and evolving pitch centricity. Rautavaara still believed in the communicative power of contrasting harmonic elements. Dualism, as with so many aspects of his writing, continues to permeate the use of harmony, which is part of a larger sense of balance and symmetry.

A highly ambiguous sense of harmonic function allows more transitional, fluid phasing towards a sense of harmonic resolution. In this way, cluster chords assume multiple and subtle roles: they can have both consonant and dissonant functions in broader ways. Cluster chords can provide resolution at important moments – endings, for example – and triadic harmony can sound more unresolved than might be expected. A good example of this fluctuation is a comparison between the end of the first movement and the end of the fourth movement of Symphony No. 8. In the former (see Ex. 8.14), the closing harmony contains clusters but also has a tertian structure. Although the harmony helps establish a sense of destination at the close the first movement, the orchestral context here helps create a general lack of resolution. As well as being the end of the opening movement, intermittent “foreign” notes in the woodwind also add to this ambiguity.

---

Ex. 8.14: The Journey, mvt. 1, bb. 134-137
Conversely, the closing chord of the final movement has an undeniable sense of closure and establishes D as a harmonic centre. Both harmonies in Exx. 8.14 and 8.15 are similar in structure but Ex. 8.15 brings a more emphatic sense of consonance. This, again, is explained by the context, i.e. the closing bars of the piece, with a dynamic marking of *fortissimo*.

![Ex. 8.15: The Journey, mvt. 4, bb. 145-147](image)

To add to this complexity, although *diatonic* cluster chords – those that belong to a seven-note collection – often enact consonance in Rautavaara’s music, *chromatic* cluster chords can also do this, as well as providing deliberately abrasive dissonance in other circumstances. An example of cluster chords assuming a dissonant function is the opening of the Fifth Symphony (see Ex. 8.1). The dissipation of chords in the opening section also recalls the “additional” sounds (the overtones and harmonies versus the “played” triad or chord). The chromatic cluster-chords in the series of harmonic shifts in the opening of this symphony, take on an undeniable sense of dissonance, giving way to consonant triads, as discussed earlier.

In contrast, in the Seventh Symphony, harmonies made up of dissonant minor seconds can sound consonant in a broader sense. When the Hymn Motif first appears, it is harmonised chromatically. Although, as Leatherbarrow observes, this initial statement of
the motif stands out from the D minor background harmony in the strings, the motif is meant to have a sense of augmented consonance. The result is that it sounds deliberately out-of-tune – a quality enhanced by the fact that this first instance of the motif is played on the Glockenspiel and Vibraphone, giving it a bell-like sonority. The rich overtones within pitched percussion and bells add to this impression of enriched consonance – see Ex. 8.16.

Ex. 8.16: *Angel of Light*, 1st mvt., bb. 1-7

The manipulation of idiomatic cluster chords reaches an extreme level in the piano music. The “enriched consonance” in the opening of Piano Concerto No. 1 features full-octave cluster chords, using white notes, as shown in Ex. 8.17. The exclusively white-note

---

collection in the right hand clashes with the notes F, F♯ and B, in the opening, as well as the semitonal clashes in the right hand. But this dissonance paradoxically helps form unified sonorities and expanded consonance through a reinterpretation of consonance outside of triadic writing, but with a retained sense of harmonic grounding. There is no doubt that the harmony is centred on D, and contains both the triads D minor and D major. The multitude of notes struck at the same time enhances this enlarged consonant function. This extreme use of diatonic tone clusters – maximised at the end of the movement by being performed with the entire right arm – means the First Piano Concerto epitomises an experimental, somewhat extreme re-assertion of harmony in the late-60s. But these gestures are not simply there for the sake of being different; the larger result – consistent throughout the concerto – is a sense of wide harmonic space and symmetry. Symmetry is actually visible in Ex. 8.17. Combined triads also continue bi-tonal thinking in mixing triadic colours together, but symmetry forms a unifying rationale throughout.

Ex. 8.17: Piano Concerto No. 1, mvt. 1, bb. 1-2

This practice seems to build on what Straus terms the ‘non-functional diatonicism’ used by Stravinsky in works like *Petrushka*. In these examples, there is also a complex integration of collections (triadic, chromatic, diatonic, octatonic or Messiaen’s Mode 6)

---

23 © by Breitkopf & Härtel, Wiesbaden.
and the seamless transformations of harmonic colour that are so important to the processes of Rautavaara’s music. Straus observes how, by changing the larger referential set (diatonic, octatonic, hexatonic or whole tone), ‘the composer can create a sense of large-scale movement from one harmonic area to another.’ Similiarly, Ulrich Scheideler discusses how in Henze’s music, consonance and dissonance is redefined to describe those tensions and resolutions that operate on a higher structural level, in the form of competing tonal layers that provide conflict and drama, as opposed to specific interval content. Rautavaara manipulates harmony to create fluid consonant and dissonant functions depending on the context and purpose.

Harmonic “planing”

Rautavaara frequently uses parallel intervals in melody – known as “harmonic planing” (see Chapter 2). Often, he uses minor seconds. A melody is doubled, usually by another instrument a semitone below, and the horizontal melodic line will often have some kind of diatonic connotation. Such doubling sounds dissonant, such as the opening movement of the Seventh Symphony, and the device is used consistently in Rautavaara’s more dissonant Scherzi.

James Leatherbarrow argues that the effect in the second movement of the Seventh Symphony is that the listener grows accustomed to the dissonance of parallel minor seconds and eventually accepts the sound as a kind of compound tone. He further states that this produces a timbral effect, rather than a harmonic one. The notion of augmentation seems an important theme in this chapter – the idea of making neo-tonality sound somehow larger than more conventional diatonicism. In this spirit, Rautavaara is augmenting these melodic lines. The harmonic tension of parallel minor seconds intensifies their direction and orientation, thereby adding to a larger sense of expression. The tone of the melody is expanded and given a new quality. Furthermore, there is the strong impression that, without this clash, the melody in such cases would be found wanting somehow.

Harmonic planing also features other intervals – fourths and seconds, for example, in the outer movements of the Eighth Symphony, or tertian chords in works such as

---

25 Ibid.
28 Ibid.
Anadyomene. In all cases, the purpose is to enhance the horizontal, melodic line. The expansion of melody to full parallel chords using doubling with different intervals is another hallmark of the way in which Rautavaara builds a sense of scale and size, making chorale-type themes take on an even greater stature and weight. In an orchestral context, he gives these parallel intervals a completely new life-form, sourcing colouristic orchestral combinations.

Perceptions of modality

Modality is a durable concept that occurs both within tonal and non-tonal music. Modes also often bring distinctive sound qualities and are therefore an important part of how listeners might orientate towards harmonic centres. For a composer as expressive as Rautavaara, a broader understanding of modality offered potential, as it enabled subtle alterations to harmonic regions within dramatic symphonic processes. The closing section of the Fifth Symphony manipulates the relationship between modal stasis, resolution and his natural inclination for steady and seamless harmonic transformation.

In Ex. 8.18, two triads (C major and A♭ major) combine to form a continuous drone underneath the wandering violin melody. C is a frame of reference, undoubtedly as C major is so clearly planted as a sustained sonority at the beginning. However, two things happen in this closing section, where the music has returned to this ‘familiar’ place. Firstly, the importance of sonority as a fundamental compositional device to the listening experience and overall narrative of this piece is confirmed. Secondly, what was previously just a C major triad has expanded into a hexatonic, double-triad chord, both featuring C as an important harmonic pivot – first as the root of C major and second as the major third of A♭ major. But this expansion of the chord brings a darker, deeper and less assured sound. It also helps manipulate the psychological sensation of returning to the same place that the symphony began but that this place has been changed irreversibly by the process that the whole symphony has undertaken. This notion is supported by a new harmonic element, as the addition of the A♭ major chord introduces a “flat” side to the harmony. The psychological associations of light and dark with high and low pitch, respectively, seems significant again, as a part of creating an atmosphere of conclusion without “positive” resolution. This expansion of C major gives the impression of the chord being out-of-tune – another emphasis on sonority that could not be possible without the referential role of the C major triad, given a different life-form.
Ex. 8.18: Symphony No. 5, bb. 447-465
Through these shifting modal centres, this closing section combines stasis and progress. The melody logically explores these areas, opening up new possibilities. The role of the semitone as an instigator for linear motion returns again, but a sense of drama comes from its inability to generate new harmonic contexts. This section never settles, but never truly progresses beyond ‘C’ as a centre point, instead working through various modal shifts around this note.

Melodically, this passage also plays on the uncertainty between total chromaticism and modal shifting. This is realised most powerfully in bar 485, following a build-up over the sustained triads. C major fails to regain its original purity and simplicity and a new note, A, is introduced in the cellos which competes with the A♭, as shown in Ex. 8.19. The chromaticism builds on the localised chromatic groups which feature throughout the entire symphony, and are put to expressive use in melodies.

But this chromaticism, as well as further enriching the altered C major harmony, also suggests different modalities, adding to a searching quality. The A natural could be heard almost as a Phrygian, lowered-second relationship to the A♭. Alternatively, it could be understood as a competing root note suggesting a tertian harmony centred on A. A third interpretation is that the new note A simply enriches the sonority, building up the centred cluster chord.

Ex. 8.19: Symphony No. 5, bb. 484-485

One easy solution would be to say that Rautavaara adopts a free, atonal technique. But modal references and pitch centricity undoubtedly emerge in this closing section and, furthermore, this seems a deliberate part of expressing a harmonically complex resolution. Paradoxically, the Fifth Symphony sounds fully concluded and yet is shrouded in
harmonic ambiguity. Rautavaara therefore sees resolution as being possible in a broader sense. There was, however, always little in the way of a promise of tonal or modal clarity, once the initial shattering of the C major chord takes place in bar 10. C major also sounds as though it would be somehow an incorrect, false or unnatural ending point.

As discussed in relation to notions of consonance and dissonance, competing modalities on C operate on a broader level, driving harmonic transformation. The simultaneous perception of change as something non-directional – in that C forms a referential centre point as change happens around it – versus an on-going narrative is a strong feature of the neo-tonal journey in Symphony No. 5.

Non-tonal prolongation

The 12-tone rows in Angel of Light are used in a way that emphasises harmonic shifts, but this organisation of material is still serial. While the Seventh Symphony is serial, Rautavaara synthesises dodecaphony with broadly tonal concepts of large-scale prolongation. In the Scherzo second movement of Angel of Light, the pitch centre of E has an audible significance. It becomes a memorable, referential centre, around which there are changeable and unsettled musical states. This temporary, but recurring centricity adds to moments of clarity or luminescence and becomes a reference point for harmonic transformation. This centricity is based on E as a bass note, rather than a functional triad. Ex. 8.20 highlights these large-scale connections and how they fit alongside other points of harmonic clarity.

The pitch centre E is first planted in the bass register as a pedal over bars 17-18, seemingly as a temporary harmonic resting point in a chain. E then suddenly emerges momentarily, but brilliantly, in bar 59 as a fortissimo E major triad with added major second and seventh in the full orchestra. Stępień has observed the use of E major as one association of light in this piece, pointing out how composers have frequently been drawn to this sonority as evocative associations of light and warmth.\textsuperscript{29} However, this triadic version of E has another function: it establishes this note as an audible, referential centre, subject to prolongation and transformation.

\textsuperscript{29} Stępień, The Sound of Finnish Angels, 209.
### Ex. 8.20: Formal and harmonic summary of *Angel of Light*, mvt. 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bars</strong></td>
<td>1-31</td>
<td>32-59</td>
<td>60-91</td>
<td>92-109</td>
<td>110-132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tempo</strong></td>
<td><em>Molto allegro</em> $\frac{\mathbf{4}}{\mathbf{4}} = 112$</td>
<td><em>Energico</em> $\frac{\mathbf{4}}{\mathbf{4}} = c.96$</td>
<td><em>L'istesso tempo</em> $\frac{\mathbf{4}}{\mathbf{4}} = 96$</td>
<td><em>Animato</em> $\frac{\mathbf{4}}{\mathbf{4}} = 132$</td>
<td><em>Furioso</em> $\frac{\mathbf{4}}{\mathbf{4}} = 144$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prominent harmonics/pedal points</strong></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="MIDI notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="MIDI notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="MIDI notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="MIDI notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="MIDI notation" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Large-scale connections:**

**Bars:** 11-16 17-18 19-20 32 38 41 46 48 50 55 59

| 131 | 133-157 |
The sudden tonal reference triggers a complete shift in the mood with the onset of a new section (L’istesso tempo) at bar 60 and this “brightness” does not disappear from the remainder of the movement. E is passed through again in bars 73, 75 and 78, but the harmony and melodic progression is fleeting.

The build-up and dissipation of energy in this movement is characterised by the on-going attempt to reassert the serenity of that E major harmony. After a build-up culminating in a violent statement of the Hymn Motif in the brass, amidst relentless triplets in the woodwind and strings, E is once again established as a sustained bass note. A sense of centricity on this note remains, but the mood has entirely changed. The contrast in pitch register and a relative harmonic sparsity adds to this impression. The sonority here includes a tritone relationship (E-B♭) and seems to draw from notes found in E major and B♭ major. The duality between these two chords goes on to become a central feature at the end of the final movement of this symphony. This duality is again associated with symmetry, as these two chords are separated by a tritone. The note E is prolonged in a different manner to that of a tonic triad in functional tonal music as it emerges within a non-diatonic pitch context. Through this prolongation, transformations of modal colour form an over-arching coherence. This kind of non-functional prolongation also occurs with the note D in the Eighth Symphony.

Rautavaara draws upon and manipulates a tonal principle to communicate an oppositional, dramatic process which orientates around E as a significant centre-point. In the context of the whole symphony, E features in the closing bars, but never manages to break from the opposing B♭. The E major cluster chord in bar 59 of the second movement of Angel of Light seems to take on a certain irony, as it is immediately departed from with a harmonic shift in bar 60 – not by accident, to the tritone pole of B♭ as a new bass centre. The irony derives from Rautavaara’s denial of true E major resolution. There is a new urgency from this point and therefore any expectations of a sustained goal of an E major sonority are foiled.

---

Stasis and motion

Metaphor can be useful for understanding musical processes. Chapters 3 and 4 considered the extent to which the metaphor of motion applies to musical form in Symphonies 5 to 8. Varying rates of motion are discernible in the Eighth Symphony, for example, and these demonstrate its neo-tonal processes. This variety presents a duality between a perception of sound moving through space, as one mass, versus movement relative to, or within, that object. These multiple perceptions can co-exist. This experience is frequently created through relationships between different kinds of musical texture – those that are more static and those that are more dynamic, and how these articulate large-scale tension and relaxation. The change from one textual type into another also generates a sense of inertia, as relatively static or slow-moving textures can become zones of departure, transforming into sections of faster harmonic and melodic motion, or arrival. As discussed in Chapters 3 and 7, such sections also demonstrate harmonic significance, forming important markers within the formal process.

Further limiting aleatoricism

In controlling different orchestral textures to create varying rates of motion, Rautavaara drew on his experiences of aleatoricism, contributing to the illusion of inertia. The intention to retain control over what happens to the sound might explain why his aleatoric technique actually operates within a stringent framework. In bars 27-40 of Symphony No. 5, for example, there is an aleatoric effect, but Rautavaara here employs “time-space” notation also used by Erik Bergman. When Bergman abandoned strict serial procedures in the 1960s, tonal fields played a significant part in his output, alongside a carefully-controlled use of form. In this sense there is a musical connection between these two composers. As a notation technique, it approaches Lutosławski’s “limited aleatoricism”, but is even more “limited”.

Rautavaara was drawn to the emphasis on slowly-transforming sonority that aleatoricism brought, but ultimately wished to retain control over what happens to that sonority, its transformation, shape, and motion. His experience of aleatoric techniques influenced his integrated use of relatively static textures and he introduced a plethora of techniques relating to orchestration and dynamics to build up a sense of momentum. The

same control takes place in *Garden of Spaces* – where the “chance” elements and apparent freedom of the performers actually operate within parameters that are, in reality, limited in flexibility. The same thing also happens in the outer sections of movements 1, 2 and 3 of the Sixth Symphony, which sound far more improvisatory than is actually the case.

This idea of micro-managing a sonority that sounds freer sheds light on the control of form and content in the later symphonies. In *The Journey*, the same concern for sonority is evident, but the aleatoric element is removed entirely. Nevertheless, there is still an intention to build textures with a similar effect. The opening, shown in Ex. 8.21.1, establishes a rustling texture in the strings based on independent lines outlining the notes D-C-B flat-A-G (part of a G Aeolian collection). This creates a pitch field – a dense texture with a series of notes distributed vertically and horizontally (see Ex. 8.21.2). The overall texture is formed from the sound of all of these notes being played at the same time.

Harmonically and texturally, the opening of *The Journey* closely resembles the limited aleatoricism at the beginning of the earlier *Hommage à Zoltán Kodály* (1982), which Rautavaara states looks to the style of Lutoslawski.\(^ {32} \) In that earlier work, Rautavaara uses the technique he called “textural polyphony”\(^ {33} \) – centred on the transitioning between different textures to achieve linear orientation. His symphonic structures draw on this process to inform continuity and transitions over large-scale passages.

---

32 'Einojuhani Rautavaara ohjaa kapellimestareita’, 07:49-10:01.
33 Ibid.
Ex. 8.21: *The Journey*, mvt. 1, bb. 1-2
The opening bars in Ex. 8.21.1 are initially relatively static – a sound field – but as the introduction builds, however, this early part of the piece becomes more dynamic through a crescendo and an ascending bass line. The way this opening proceeds out of a vertical state is what creates this sense of narrative and motion as one force. The Eighth Symphony continues the idea of pacing large gestures over time, but this pace can vary at different points. There is a balance between recognisable vertical “states” and the linear processes that connect those states, resulting in a gradually transforming process.

**Journeying towards stasis**

A further example of this balance is found in the *Andante* section of the first movement, where there are textural components and clear layers to the orchestration. A relatively static texture comes from sustained horn chords and scalic runs up and down in the clarinets, violas and cellos. As discussed in Chapter 7, broad harmonies deriving from the fourth motif underpin this passage. These harmonies outline a horizontal network of third relations which collectively form one pandiatonic soundsheet. This is shown in Ex. 8.22.
This sonority demonstrates a particular dualism between motion and stasis. This moment in the first movement is a culmination, and encourages a reading of the symphony as projecting a prismatic process. There is simultaneously linearity, enacted through shifts in harmony and texture towards a goal, as well as a sense that transformations happen in space, which would be a more static musical perception. As he stated in the Preface to the Eighth Symphony, Rautavaara saw the ‘transformation of light and colour’ as a basic premise of symphonic composition.34

Like white light in a prism, the way this section splits up a larger tertian chord forms a kind of musical stratification of the modal colours and motivic shapes set up in the very beginning. However, what also characterises this Andante section of the Eighth Symphony is its unfettered melodic drive as phrases accentuate and pull towards certain notes, which are underscored by new pedals. But this melodic process also enacts slower harmonic transformation which, as the logic of the pedal notes attests, works on a broader, static plain. Similarly, the closing section incurs relative stasis through a combination of a lengthy pedal on D♯, the repeating oscillations in the lower strings, based once again on a pitch field. The fourths motif is also repeated, without development, as is the melody. All of this illustrates how the movement reaches a temporary destination and is consequently more static.

This symphony builds on the balance between motion and stasis in the Fifth Symphony and demonstrates the continued significance of harmony in the development of Rautavaara’s style. The neo-tonal processes in The Journey reinterpret the idea of large-scale tonal tensions, including notions of consonance and dissonance and the organisation of form and content. This stylistic continuity also shows the dialectical process of the symphonies. Having taken on ideas of aleatoric practice and building these textures, this process becomes ever more controlled.

**Harmonic resonance**

This chapter has explored a number of issues surrounding Rautavaara’s decision to reinforce harmony. An important conclusion to draw first is that, in doing so, he reached far beyond pitch. Some of the most significant moments in the symphonies hold harmony, texture, register, dynamics, duration and timbre in equal status to achieve effective results.

---

34 Rautavaara, Preface to Symphony No. 8.
Neo-tonal aspects that gain importance include sonority, voice leading, different manifestations of consonance and dissonance, as well as manipulations of continuity and transformation. There is also a particular emphasis on expression. A notable expressive element in the symphonies is the way that parallel harmonies emphasise linear orientation in the melody, as well as the energetic use of the semitone in horizontal melodic lines to orientate towards particular sonorities that often suggest light or metaphorical landscapes.

These works evidence Rautavaara’s reconsideration of his serialist path, reassessing how to move forward with those neo-tonal aspects that he felt needed to be there. The years between the break with serialism and its later return are especially important in this regard. Not only did Rautavaara re-assert harmony in these years, there were other important experimentations during this hiatus through the 1970s that have been channelled within this larger stylistic re-orientation. This was a pivotal direction that led to Rautavaara’s later synthesis period, where he began to see a way in which his prioritisation of sonority could integrate with a particular influence of dodecaphony.
Rautavaara’s legacy

To gain the best possible understanding of Rautavaara’s idiom and its significance, it is important to consider his legacy, as he is one of the most well-known Finnish composers outside of Finland after Sibelius. The fact that Sibelius chose Rautavaara as a recipient of a Koussevitzky scholarship in 1955 undoubtedly contributed to this reputation. International reception refers to a ‘distinctive sound’,¹ which consists of such elements as his incorporation of tonal thinking, mysticism, and a certain “Nordicness” arising from the evocations of nature in such works as Cantus Arcticus.

In order to bring focus and detail to an understanding of his legacy, this chapter will consider his direct influence on Finnish composers. By looking at examples from two generations of composers who studied with him – Paavo Heininen and Kalevi Aho as students in the 1950s/60s and Magnus Lindberg and Esa-Pekka Salonen in the 1970s/80s – it is possible to gain a picture of how Rautavaara’s influence manifests and emerges over time. His legacy takes place in different ways. Firstly, there is the direct impact of his compositional outlook on younger Finnish composers. This influence may extend to more specific musical similarities which form part of a wider incorporation of styles. But this chapter will also identify stylistic commonalities, revealing continuities of thinking and the durability of certain techniques.

An important part of Rautavaara’s legacy, therefore, is his individual contribution to larger trends that remain prevalent in Finnish orchestral music. These trends include the continuation and reinvention of tonal thinking, as well as continuity and slow transformation as symphonic form. While such characteristics exist in non-Finnish music, it is here that their clearest manifestation can be seen, and Rautavaara’s influence traced most clearly.

Rautavaara as a teacher

As a teacher of composition, and Professor of Composition at the Sibelius Academy from 1976-1991, Rautavaara held an influential position. Above all, he is remembered for

---

encouraging students to focus on realising their own vision. Reflecting on his own eclectic range of composition teachers, and Vincent Persichetti in particular, Rautavaara states:

A student must know all of the techniques as well as possible, but Persichetti never said: ‘this is how we do it today’, as Stockhausen said. I also did not want to be a guru who states how things must be done. Finding oneself – that’s one thing I tried to teach my pupils if anything.2

Kalevi Aho confirmed this pedagogical approach, recalling how Rautavaara encouraged each student to compose in his or her own style, not saying what was right or wrong, but wanting his students to find their own starting points.3 In his obituary of Rautavaara, Aho further states how he impressed that there should be a vision behind every work, rather than a ‘mechanical resolution to abstract musical problems.’4 Discussions would also branch out beyond music, for example to literature. Rautavaara also passed on his view that musical ideas to some extent have a will of their own. In an interview with Duffy, he describes how he taught his students to never force the direction of the music, but to believe in where it wants to go.5 This organic approach stems directly from his experience.

Technique and method were also present in Rautavaara’s teaching, however. Aho states how they practised modern techniques such as Persichetti’s ideas on harmony, as well as dodecaphony and total serialism.6 He implemented Persichetti’s Twentieth Century Harmony at the Sibelius Academy7 – ideas from which had been tested on him and other students during his time in America while Persichetti was writing the book.8

This approach differs from that of Paavo Heininen, an early pupil of Rautavaara’s and his successor as Professor of Music at the Sibelius Academy (1993-2001). According to Ilkka Oramo, Heininen’s teaching ‘is known for its stress on strict methods while encouraging broad perspectives’.9 While Heininen seems to have advocated mastery of method with a view to finding independence, Rautavaara worked on the basis that prior visions for the music could then lead to the channelling of technique.

3 Interview with Kalevi Aho, April 2018.
4 Aho, ‘Rautavaara’s Death’.
5 Duffy and Rautavaara, ‘Composer Einojuhani Rautavaara’.
6 Interview with Kalevi Aho, April 2018.
7 Rautavaara, Omakuva, 51.
8 This fact was confirmed in interview with Paavo Heininen (April 2018). Eila Tarasti also gives details about Rautavaara’s notes from Persichetti’s lectures in ‘Music: The art of light and shadow’: 270.
Rautavaara’s balance of these perspectives may also have differed from that of Erik Bergman, his predecessor in the role of Professor of Composition from 1963-1976. While Bergman also seems to have condoned finding an original style, according to Heininen, his thinking was orientated towards modernism and new music, often to the active exclusion of tradition, especially Romantic music.\(^{10}\) There was a certain emphasis on gaining a full knowledge of technique in order to achieve originality:

> I have always preached that you must be fully equipped technically and a master of your craft. Anyone who falls under the spell of the new musical methods, a vast field, must know precisely what he is doing.\(^ {11}\)

Rautavaara’s individually-orientated approach meant he got his students to challenge themselves through experimentation in order to express their own preferences to the best of their ability. Finnish pianist, conductor and composer Olli Mustonen recalls how he was challenged to experiment with new forms, rather than relying on one that has worked in the past.\(^ {12}\) According to Olli Kortekangus, another former pupil, and a founding member of Korvat Auki!, 1950s serialism was ‘glossed over’ as part of the ‘essential theory’.\(^ {13}\) He also comments on the relative avoidance of teaching compositional methods:

> I would become thoroughly confused when listening of an evening to my friends’ descriptions of the strict regimes enforced by their own teachers. Rautavaara certainly didn’t appear to have anything in that department. To be fair, I did sometimes feel a bit like a non-swimmer down at the deep end of the pool. Perhaps that was the method: I just about managed to stay afloat, and after flailing around with my arms for a while, I got to grips with matters of style and technique.\(^ {14}\)

Rautavaara’s teaching style reflected his own perspective and experience as a composer, in particular his broad, independent outlook on style and technique. As Kortekangas’s account suggests, however, this approach could be challenging for composers in the early stages, possibly before they had established their stylistic independence.

---

\(^ {10}\) Interview with Paavo Heininen, April 2018.


\(^ {12}\) *Gift of Dreams*, 37:03-38:01.


\(^ {14}\) Ibid.: 12.
Paavo Heininen (b. 1938)

Reflecting on recent Finnish music today, it is easy to view Rautavaara and Paavo Heininen as being the antithesis of each other. However, the reality of the relationship between these two influential figure-heads is more complicated. When Heininen was taught by Rautavaara he found it to be an important and productive time in his student days, and in interview he described how Rautavaara radiated a positive influence. Their relationship started in the mid-50s before Heininen enrolled at the Sibelius academy. As a pianist, he was significantly drawn to Rautavaara’s early piano works, especially Icons and Seven Preludes. Heininen states that he was the unofficial first performer of the preludes and Rautavaara’s advice for this performance was an early positive experience of their relationship.

An age gap of 10 years meant that when Heininen started out, he described it as huge age difference. Rautavaara was the older, more established composer at this point, although they both began teaching at the Sibelius Academy in 1966. But there was also a large overlap in their music over many years, where the stylistic differences became more pronounced, as their reactions to modernism differed. In the early stages, Heininen was encountering Rautavaara’s music at a time when the latter was on the cusp of new modernist experimentations to which, by the end of the 1960s, he had reacted critically. Heininen, meanwhile, began with serialism and embraced this technique more consistently.

Heininen was a figurehead for the modernist cause around the time of the third wave of Finnish modernism, as can be seen from his early devotion to dodecaphony and serialism and advocacy of new compositional techniques, including electronics. His teaching inspired a culture that contributed to the formation of the Korvat Auki! group. Although he does not define modernism in specific terms, it is not surprising that certain younger generations of composers, including Magnus Lindberg, Kaija Saariaho, Eero Hämeenniemi and Jouni Kaipainen gravitated towards him. Rautavaara’s more individually-centred approach, which aligned much less clearly to such a zeitgeist, could hardly have inspired the same kind of tribal following.

15 Interview with Paavo Heininen, April 2018.
16 Ibid.
17 Mikko Heiniö, ‘Rautavaara, Einojuhani’ and Oramo, ‘Heininen, Paavo’. 
Dialectical processes

The fact that there are differing points of view concerning modernism is an important hallmark of Finnish music and elsewhere. To some extent, the directions of Rautavaara and Heininen are indicative of such dialogue. For Heininen, Rautavaara’s rejection of tonality in the late-50s with highly chromatic works such as the Seven Preludes and an orientation towards dodecaphony and full-blown serialism was an exciting step forward. But this was eventually followed by Rautavaara’s rejection of strict serialism when he felt it to be too constraining. But in an interview with Duffy, he details how he sees this balancing of opposites as a natural process, stating:

Certainly there will be changes all the time. Western music is typically "Western" in that it is Faustian. It changes all the time, and it is dialectic so that the opposites come after each other.¹⁸

Heininen recalls discussions in composition seminars led by him and Rautavaara whilst Erik Bergman was Professor of Composition. According to Heininen, the roles were clear: Rautavaara, who had become somewhat sceptical of the avant-garde by that time (this was around the time that he felt he had reached a dead-end with serialism), took this stance in the classroom, while Heininen assumed the role of the defendant of modernism.¹⁹ Whilst it is difficult to determine the exact nature of these important discussions at the Sibelius Academy, they suggest Rautavaara’s uncertainty concerning particular directions of the avant-garde, but not necessarily the motivation of progress behind them.

Such discussions were indicative of a larger broadening out from modernist techniques in Finnish music around this time – a period that Heininen describes as the “opening of the fan”.²⁰ Despite musical differences between these two figures, Heininen emphasises the on-going respect that remained between him and Rautavaara. Their different solutions have also impacted Finnish music to the extent that figures such as Magnus Lindberg have ultimately benefitted from both perspectives.

Kalevi Aho (b. 1949)

Kalevi Aho holds his former teacher and friend in extremely high regard. He has played a significant part in introducing and promoting Rautavaara’s music, especially the symphonies, having written a book on Symphonies 1 to 5, whilst also advocating for

¹⁸ Duffy and Rautavaara, ‘Composer Einojuhani Rautavaara’.
¹⁹ Interview with Paavo Heininen, April 2018.
²⁰ Ibid.
recording the entire cycle under the direction of Max Pommer. Rautavaara undoubtedly influenced Aho’s own direction but, in spite of their close relationship, and Aho’s detailed knowledge of Rautavaara’s music, there is little stylistic influence. His early symphonic writing shows more affinity with such composers as Shostakovich. In contrast to Rautavaara, his music features frequent juxtaposition of opposing stylistic elements, including past styles, such as the Baroque reference in his Symphony No. 9. But these elements nevertheless form one holistic work, demonstrating his continued questioning of how the content and form of a symphony should relate to modern life. In discussing his Seventh Symphony, Aho says the six movements are all stylistically different, but it is a whole based on contrasts.

For Aho personally, Rautavaara’s legacy is found in larger philosophies and approaches to composition: as an important figurehead in realising a musical personality. Aho experienced first-hand Rautavaara’s ambition to help students judge their progress against their own preferences, and his own inclination was towards large-scale music from the beginning – a preference that has endured. To date, he has written 17 symphonies, 33 concertos and five operas.

A prolific symphonist

Aho is one of the most active symphonists in Finland. He is comfortable with the label of “Symphony” and, like Kokkonen, Rautavaara and Sallinen, he has persistently challenged conceptions that this is an anachronistic medium. His continued experimentation stems from his student work, Symphony No. 1. Under Rautavaara’s tutelage, Aho pursued his own kind of symphonism. His teacher helped his First Symphony come into being and was influential in getting it performed.

There is also an important Finnish context to consider: it is no coincidence that one of the most active symphonists working today is a Finn. As David Fanning observes, Finland continues to enjoy a cultural society, where considerable funding is put into the arts and the commissioning of new works. There is also to this day a long-standing Finnish pride in the idea of the symphony, and Sibelius left a permanent mark on Finnish

22 Korhonen, ‘New Music of Finland’, 207.
23 Interview with Kalevi Aho, April 2018.
24 Aho, ‘Rautavaara’s death’.
culture in this respect. This cultural consciousness of music and symphonies means there is more demand for these large-scale works, which feeds state-funded grant systems that allow composers to write them. In a country that is regarded as one of the world-leading exponents of new music, Aho has personally played a pivotal role as an activist and promoter of contemporary Finnish music. The musical world in Helsinki is also a small one – Aho is known by all of the orchestras in Finland and knows exactly who he is writing for, resulting in certain clarity from a compositional point of view. He is therefore ideally placed to continue to explore symphonic writing as a way of thinking. The fact that he receives regular commissions for these large-scale works is indicative of the way symphonies are still wanted in Finland. Rautavaara was therefore influential in helping Aho crystallise his predilection for symphonic writing, and these two composers have much in common in experimenting with the genre, while the wider Finnish context is also an important factor.

In approaching symphonies, the question of influence between Rautavaara and Aho might have worked both ways. They each have written symphonies that draw on material that they originally wrote for operas. Symphonies and operas are two prominent genres in the hands of some Finnish composers who have drawn on the relationships between them. Aulis Sallinen also wrote in both genres and Mikko Heiniö points out that, with the opera Ratsumies (1975), Sallinen also ‘tried to create a piece built out of ‘symphonic frescoes’, his motivic technique ensuring a uniformity that spans at least one scene at a time.’ Aho states how his Insect Symphony (1988), which is based on his opera Hyönteiselämää (1985-87) allowed him to find a new relationship with the symphony. Much the same process happened with Rautavaara’s Sixth Symphony, which draws on Vincent. Aho believes he may have in fact influenced Rautavaara in this case, stating that he had heard the piece. Aho later returned to this technique of blurring the lines between symphonies and opera with his Thirteenth Symphony, Symphonic Character Studies, which is based on the opera Salaisuksien kirja (The Book of Secrets, 1998). The idea of a reciprocal dialogue – rather than a one-sided inheritance – between these

27 Korhonen, ‘New Music of Finland’, 280.
31 Interview with Kalevi Aho, April 2018.
two composers therefore emerges, as they share a common aim to renew pre-existing genres by testing the boundaries between them. Such commonalities indicate the relatively focused environment of Finnish music, especially between those composers whose stylistic ambitions overlapped in looking to modern and traditional forms as sources of inspiration.

This inter-genre experimentation by Aho and Rautavaara is different in each case – an additional factor here might be that Aho was active in the symphonic genre when Rautavaara had broken away from it. Rautavaara’s Vincentiana explores narrative and inner coherence, whereas the seven movements in Aho’s Seventh Symphony are different, but a sense of unity derives from their being drawn from the same opera. For both composers, the symphonic and the operatic can work alongside each other, and the dramatic, imaginative and emotional side of the latter can assist in personalising the former. Indeed, opera holds a prominent place in Finland’s musical history, and Aho states that his compulsion to write opera derives from the fact that it is ‘an art form with a unique fascination that stimulates the imagination and fires up the emotions’.33

**Aho and modernism**

An emphasis on independence can also be found in Aho’s own balance between tradition and the avant-garde. His music retains strong ties with tradition but, like Rautavaara, he has both engaged with modernism and developed a critical relationship with it. Aho is somewhat separate from the avant-garde and may not have been seen as a clear proponent of new techniques. Traditional elements and deliberate references to previous styles appear in his music. However, Aho did orientate gradually towards Finnish modernism, before continuing on an independent path. The Sixth Symphony marks a significant point, as he felt he had gone as far as he could down a particular modernist line.34 The larger context at the time was the “second wave” of Finnish modernism, and Aho in these works drew upon those avant-garde techniques brought to Finland by such composers as Erkki Salmenhaara and featured in the “Nursery Chamber Concerts”.35 These new techniques included aleatoric approaches, a prioritisation of texture and the use of complex textures, experiments with timbre, extended techniques and dense orchestral clusters. Aho’s
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33 Aho, ‘Is it all over for opera?’, 16.
35 Korhonen, ‘New Music of Finland’, 155
Seventh Symphony therefore follows the end of a particular line of thought, culminating in the modernism of the Fifth and Sixth Symphonies.

Aho’s own perspective on modernism is clear. In recent years he has found the label unhelpful and, in an interview with Juha Torvinen, he identifies modernism as an approach where a composition does not express anything other than itself:

The purebred aesthetics of Modernism has led to a situation where any meaning other than musical is prohibited. Everything has to be pure and absolute. In this shape, Modernism has become so firmly institutionalised that the entire genre of concert music has been marginalised. It is illustrative of this idealisation of complete objectivity that an Austrian critic once considered my works well crafted and expressive but crucially flawed in that they were not dehumanised enough (‘Nicht entmenschlicht genug’).  

Although this definition could be debated, it is a tenet that has nevertheless reasserted for Aho the importance of honing a personal vision or philosophy that builds on various musical elements, rather than adhering to technique alone. This independence was the essence of Rautavaara’s teaching approach.

Aho has pursued his own philosophy that music must communicate, believing that it should have an application to human lives. He believes that, by experiencing a search for resolution to the conflicts and drama in the musical scenarios he creates, listeners should search for solutions in real life.  

Aho is able to do this, having explored and participated in modern techniques. Indeed, in describing his Fifth Symphony – his most complex and experimental symphony up to that point – he emphasises the difficulty in writing it, but that, afterwards, he felt he was able to write anything, ‘symphonies, operas, concertos’. The Fifth and Sixth Symphonies were a kind of watershed and something that, as well as producing two new symphonies in a new experimental style, he needed to work through for the development of his own path.

Although critics have identified certain gimmicks in his concertos relating to his instrumental combinations and his ambition to compose a concerto for every orchestral

---


Aho’s music has nevertheless consistently found favour due to its personality of expression, its engagement and the rigour that helps bring quality.

**Continued vitality**

Reflecting on Aho’s symphonies to date, some trends are discernible but the overriding impression is one of experimentation and using the symphony to achieve a variety of expression, thereby adding to the vitality of this genre. His symphonies have ranged between one to seven movements, while contrast and juxtaposition are consistent. The First Symphony establishes a Neo-Classical approach with a clear emphasis on polyphony, fugal writing and counterpoint that distances this youthful work away from the Sibelian style. His Symphony No. 12 experiments with location, written to be performed at the foot of Mount Luisto in Lapland. The later symphonies continue to portray an ‘abstract plot’, where the psychological characters are established and departed from but each address this communication in a different way.

**Magnus Lindberg (b. 1958)**

Certain members of the generation of Finnish composers who started out in the late-1970s had a complicated relationship with Rautavaara. As Professor of Composition at this time, he undoubtedly had a certain status, but he was not seen by this generation as a champion of new modernist directions. However, some composers who studied with him have come to recognise the value of his outlook as a teacher and a composer. As a key player in the third generation of Finnish modernists, and a pupil of both Rautavaara and Heininen, Magnus Lindberg forms an important case study in this discussion.

Olli Kortekangus was aware of Rautavaara’s reputation as a relatively unfashionable choice of teacher at this time, but alludes to his ability to look past trends towards renewability:

> If we use as a yardstick the modernist trend that emerged amongst my particular generation, then I suppose I could be said to have enjoyed an “old-fashioned” musical education (something my fellow students regularly enjoyed pointing out to me!).

---

Nowadays, Rautavaara’s visions of the seminal moments in 20th century music seem almost prophetic.  

As Lindberg’s first composition tutor, Rautavaara’s influence enters into a complex nexus of stylistic input – local and international – that Lindberg has assimilated into his own musical personality. It is easy, however, for Rautavaara’s influence to be obscured given that Lindberg has been drawn to many composers. While reference has been made to the tangible influence of Sibelius, Berio and Stravinsky, Rautavaara is usually acknowledged in biographical accounts as a teacher, but not in any detail, while in one of Korhonen’s overviews he is not mentioned at all, although Heininen is. One reason to reconsider this issue is that similarities between Lindberg and Rautavaara – in terms of outlook and musical style – are a relatively recent development. While Lindberg’s philosophy in the 1980s was that ‘Only the extreme is interesting – striving for a balanced totality is nowadays an impossibility’, he has moved towards the notion of balance. Rautavaara’s influence has become more significant following this stylistic transformation.

The relative historic emphasis on Heininen is due to his influence on the new avant-garde in the 1980s, and Korhonen states that the first signs of this modernist wave ‘became apparent towards the end of the 1970s when Paavo Heininen replaced Einojuhani Rautavaara as the most sought after teacher of composition.’ Many of the best-known young modernists of the 1980s studied with him at the Sibelius Academy. Rautavaara’s more moderate position in relation to modernism as a teacher, focusing less on current trends and consequently being seen as more traditional, might also explain this shift in preferences. Nevertheless, Lindberg himself has discussed in recent interviews the importance of both Rautavaara and Heininen as composition tutors. The fact that Lindberg has only discussed this issue recently suggests that this realisation is an emergent property of his stylistic growth.

40 Kortekangas, ‘Rautavaara gave support’, 12.
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I came to study with Rautavaara, and I always regret that I did it in that order, because Rautavaara was a big artist and he has his own vision of music, wrote a lot of operas and symphonies, and he was always like an idol for us. At that time I wanted to have a more method-oriented approach, a teacher that would be critical, precise, and focusing on the method in composition, and Heininen was the perfect teacher in this regard. In Sibelius Academy I made some kind of scandal by asking to be downgraded from being a student of a professor to that of an ordinary teacher – that was not a good thing to do, I should have done it the other way round, of course (laughs).47

This interview from 2019 gives another perspective to Kortekangas’s account of Rautavaara’s teaching style. The relative lack of method as a starting point under his guidance must have been a disconcerting prospect. The fact that Lindberg says, albeit with a smile, that he should have studied with Heininen and Rautavaara in the reverse order is significant considering that he is currently negotiating very similar issues around neo-tonality. Lindberg’s comment, for example, that he is ‘trying to find a way to move between these tonal and atonal elements within the same language so that they blend together’48 bears a striking resemblance to Rautavaara who, when discussing 12-tone technique, stated that his solution was to ‘seek a synthesis of this modernism and tonal harmony’.49 Such parallels between Rautavaara and Lindberg make it worth observing their stylistic similarities as Lindberg moves towards his later style.

Lindberg and modernism

As a fore-runner of the third wave of Finnish modernism, Lindberg’s style has gradually transformed and he has recently viewed modernist techniques as part of a context in time. Enforcing standards or taboos on compositional practice in the present is problematic when the passing of time has brought increased knowledge and experience. Aho also observes how the “taboo” of tonality at the Sibelius Academy in the 80s has since broken down.50 Lindberg is aware of the potential danger of a specific idea of modernism simply replacing previous dogmas, becoming a set framework that has the potential to obstruct a more renewable spirit of progress. In an interview with Joshua Cody and Kirk Noreen in 2000, he said:

48 Savikovskaya and Lindberg, ‘Magnus Lindberg’.
49 Duffy and Rautavaara, ‘Composer Einojuhani Rautavaara’.
50 Interview with Kalevi Aho, April 2018.
What is extreme today, anyway? From a certain angle, the determination and standardisation of modernism is itself contradictory, since modernism is supposed to be based on change and progress. If the modern spirit is kept alive, then it will not necessarily continue to push parameters to their extremes, for ultimately that would become retrogressive. And conversely, rediscovering balance might be a force of renewal.\(^{51}\)

This view on the potential pitfalls of a pre-supposed modernist idea strongly resonates with Rautavaara’s assertion that when a composer tries to be a modernist, they are already behind the times.\(^{52}\) The development of this independent, critical outlook demonstrates perhaps their strongest overall affiliation. Additionally, the inclination towards synthesis in Lindberg’s more recent music, fusing old and new to achieve progress, is a shared ideal that might account for more specific common techniques.

One of Lindberg’s most recent orchestral works, the five-movement *Tempus Fugit* (2016-17), is an example of his renewal of tonal thinking in a contemporary idiom. He draws on sonorous intervals of octaves and fifths and uses extended tertian harmonies.\(^{53}\) Both composers have come to terms with modernist approaches to pitch, but have arrived there from different directions. While Rautavaara emerged from serialism by approaching pitch using an over-arching 12-tone vocabulary, Lindberg approaches harmony here in a way that is informed by spectralist thinking – another modernist technique, influenced by French music, that was an important part of his development, having studied with Gérard Grisey.\(^{54}\) Julian Anderson believes that Lindberg is an example of a composer ‘who benefitted from the liberating influence of spectral thinking, without hampering his personal style or becoming part of any “sect”’.\(^{55}\) Evidence of this relative independence in this later piece suggests that it also helped him with tonal renewal.

Lindberg has been open about his tonal sound world, having to negotiate suggestions of traditional writing and explain the necessity to go back to tonal ideas. In an interview about *Tempus Fugit*, he discusses what he sees as a problem of much modern music, and how he seeks to renew the ‘logic and rhetorical power of functional harmony

\(^{52}\) Aho, ‘Rautavaara’s Death’.
to shape music, mirroring that enjoyed in the tonal classical era.\textsuperscript{56} Moments of relative triadic and diatonic stillness are balanced against a familiar energetic drive established at the beginning of his career. A large number of influences from home and away coalesce in this piece, no doubt explained by the fact that it was written to commemorate the centenary of Finnish independence.\textsuperscript{57} Lindberg sees this assimilation as a natural consequence of composing today and again refers to the importance of both Rautavaara and Heininen in Finland.

Today, everything seems to be a mash-up, partly due to the total access to all available music. It is hard now to appreciate back then in Helsinki how important composition teachers were as guides – in my case Rautavaara and Heininen – and the crucial role of libraries in providing source material for study. […] To sum up, of course I have the tradition of Finnish music in my work, but now, in the age of iTunes and Spotify, so could any composer from any country.\textsuperscript{58}

This cosmopolitan standpoint and assimilation of diverse elements allows him to reference his own past, especially the sound world of \textit{Kraft} (1985) towards the end of the fourth movement, which is fully synthesised into its surroundings. This is not collage or a pastiche of past styles. Gestures recalling Rautavaara also enter naturally into this process. All of these elements are channelled into a process that reconciles large-scale formal processes and new tonal thinking in a personal way.

\textit{Symphonic inheritance}

Lindberg has not written a “symphony” – for him, that label carries irrevocable associations of tradition\textsuperscript{59} – but many of his orchestral works are \textit{symphonic}. Large-scale development has been a hallmark of Lindberg’s music since \textit{Aura} (1994), and he continues to explore the balance between form and content. To Howell, Lindberg has spoken of ‘cultivating’ his material, letting it grow, and exploring the balance between natural development and shaping, recalling Sibelius’s comments about being a slave to his themes.\textsuperscript{60} But this mentality of allowing the composition to be somehow shaped by the

\textsuperscript{57} Allenby and Lindberg, “Lindberg’s TEMPUS FUGIT”.
\textsuperscript{58} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{59} Howell, \textit{After Sibelius}, 237.
\textsuperscript{60} Howell, ‘Narratives of Time and Space’: 360.
material is also in Rautavaara’s music, where he talks of ‘helping’ the works into being.\textsuperscript{61} In this way, these three composers form parts of a continued practice of deep, formal processes that exude from Sibelius’s influence. Lindberg operates within a wider context where questions of what constitutes a symphony still arise, and Rautavaara, along with other symphonists like Joonas Kokkonen and Aulis Sallinen, forms an important layer in the history of the Finnish symphony.

Consequently, this in-between generation cannot be ignored, especially as pursuing Sibelian models is a matter of preference – a choice from an increasingly wide range of options – that can reveal overlaps between certain composers. While Lindberg writes symphonic music, but not symphonies, that are often influenced by Sibelian practice, Kalevi Aho, who does write symphonies, has not been as stylistically influenced by him, especially in notions of form and continuity.\textsuperscript{62} Lindberg has inherited this Finnish notion of form as process.

Lindberg’s music features motivic development, subjecting a select amount of material to processes of developing variation, further indicating his admiration for works like Sibelius’s Seventh Symphony.\textsuperscript{63} Orchestral works from \textit{Aura} onwards demonstrate goal-orientation. This influence of directionality and form as a process is evident in such works as \textit{Sculpture} (2005) and \textit{Era} (2012), where form and content are inextricably connected and stages of arrival happen as large orchestral motions and transformations. While this temporal combination of the linear and the circular looks to Sibelius, more modern harmonic and melodic materials align more closely with Rautavaara’s language. Quartal harmonies, sustained, non-triadic cluster chords over pedal points – often forming a closing harmony – as well as the use of Mode 2 and Mode 6 all indicate that Lindberg builds on practice by both Sibelius and Rautavaara, whilst subsuming these into his own, highly recognisable language.

\textit{Tempus Fugit} aligns with processes in works such as Sibelius’s Symphony No. 7 in C major (1924) and Rautavaara’s Symphony No. 3. Although there are five broad sections, the music unfolds continuously, making it deliberately difficult to maintain awareness of the beginning and end of individual sections. The combination of recurring and new material replicates the passing of time, where there is linear development, circular repetition, and allusions to past events. Lindberg assimilates musical events to

\textsuperscript{61} Aho, ‘Rautavaara’s death’.
\textsuperscript{62} Interview with Kalevi Aho, April 2018.
enhance this piece as part of a process that freely departs from and returns to motivic events established in the first and second sections. The gradual, circular orientation towards a short motif in the third movement recalls the large, expressive gestures in Rautavaara’s Third Symphony that transform focused motivic material. This similarity is shown in Ex. 9.1. As this symphony looks to a Brucknerian model, there seems to be a broader inclination towards large waves of orchestral material.

Ex. 9.1.1: Lindberg, *Tempus Fugit*, Part 3, bb. 281-284

Ex. 9.1.2: Rautavaara, Symphony No. 3, mvt. 1, bb. 24-27
Stylistic similarities

A number of specific stylistic similarities between Lindberg’s more recent orchestral music and that of Rautavaara further suggest an increased awareness of the compositional thinking of his first composition tutor. Such stylistic incorporation has also been highlighted in some reception, suggesting there is an instinctive public awareness of some musical influence. Discussing Lindberg’s orchestral music, an article outlines the ‘fluent and confident modernism characterised by solid structuring, pulsating energy […] and a luxuriant density reminiscent of his early studies with Rautavaara at the Sibelius Academy’.64 Meanwhile, Jeff Dunn has identified the string ‘whooshes’ in Lindberg’s recent orchestral work EXPO (2009) as reminiscent of both Sibelius and Rautavaara.65

There is more musical evidence to suggest that Rautavaara becomes one of the many voices that Lindberg has channelled into his style. This affinity comes from a collection of shared stylistic elements that become more prominent and frequent in his recent music. Lindberg has also described himself as a “Romantic”,66 suggesting a comfort with the past. These occasions must, however, be considered within a larger context of the wide range of styles that Lindberg assimilates.

Like Rautavaara, Lindberg uses tertian harmonies based on systematic organisations of stacked thirds and fourths. As well as forming part of his harmonic continuity – a consistently important trait in his music – these tertian harmonies result in a broad orchestral sound. In the more recent orchestral works, Lindberg often treats these harmonies homophonically, achieving a dense linear movement. EXPO, for example, makes use of chorale-like, homophonic and tertian chords, recalling such passages as the opening movement of Rautavaara’s Manhattan Trilogy – see Ex. 9.2.

---
Symmetry is also a highly important part of Lindberg’s harmonic technique. Ed Martin points out that, when using the “Class-6” harmonic technique, Lindberg arranges this symmetrically. While Martin points to an influence of Lutosławski here, it should also be noted that tertian and “mirror” harmonies in works such as Tempus Fugit recall Rautavaara and Heininen’s teaching, which was influenced by their time studying with Persichetti.

There is a similar, reasonably specific harmonic technique, as both use interval cycles to achieve harmonic and melodic motion. A melodic step on the horizontal level can be underscored by a different tertian harmony operating independently of diatonicism. Therefore, although the language is tonal-sounding, this system allows him to approach harmonic change as an extension of how he has always approached harmony, including his spectral techniques, as a series of vertical states that transform over the form of the piece through time.

The orchestral work Arena (1995) can be seen as a testing ground for reconciling atonality and an emphasis on tertian harmony. The close of this piece uses a full 12-tone

---

set but this is arranged in thirds. In later works such as *EXPO* and *Tempus Fugit*, Lindberg makes these third-based harmonies more prominent and more concentrated. In another interview, he observes the relative consistency running through his harmonic thinking that has recently admitted tonal allusions:

> Over the years I’ve been coming very much toward a tonal world. […] Yet I don’t consider myself a tonal composer, because what I try to do is integrate the harmony such that I could work with anything: with the most atonal, constructional things and the most sonorous objects.  

Such synthesis, integration and re-shaping of tonality in his own way shows how Lindberg has approached a similar issue in reconciling tonal harmony with their previous styles, believing that one can enhance the other.

In *Tempus Fugit*, Lindberg returned to his method of organising harmonic continuity that he used in the 1980s. Re-vitalising the LISP software, he ‘defined rules for the algorithms to create hierarchical charts of related chords, and this harmonic pool provided him with a rich range of musical materials for the new composition.’  

He therefore essentially uses the same system in *Tempus Fugit* as earlier pieces but expands his vocabulary, meaning many different harmonic organisations are accessible within one work. Tertian organisations interact with related harmonies as part of a larger process of harmonic transformation, exploring consonance and dissonance in a contemporary setting.

Another moment of similarity happens in the opening of the fourth movement of *Tempus Fugit*, where harmonic continuity is based on tertian segments, which essentially derive from the circle of fifths. Not only is the same technique used in such a piece as Rautavaara’s *Autumn Gardens* (1999), the admittance of a serene atmosphere also invites comparison – see Ex. 9.3.

---

68 Quoted in Smith, ‘Embracing the Orchestra as Alive’.
69 Allenby and Lindberg, ‘Lindberg’s TEMPUS FUGIT’.
A recurring chorale in Tempus Fugit also strongly recalls Rautavaara’s music, especially “Daydreams” from the Manhattan Trilogy. A comparison of the stacked, tertian harmonies used by both composers in Ex. 9.4 shows a similar broadness of sound that this harmonic approach creates.
Ex. 9.4.1: Lindberg, *Tempus Fugit*, Part 4, bb. 460-465
Any stylistic influences of Rautavaara become more significant when considering the context for which *Tempus Fugit* was written. Commissioned for a concert commemorating the centenary of Finland’s independence in 2017, the piece addresses issues of reflection and time passing. The title translates as “Time flies”, as a reflection on the progress of Finland in the last 100 years, or “Time in flight”. Lindberg also recalls Bernd Alois Zimmermann’s concept of time as spherical, where the past, present and future are all accessible. Within this reflective atmosphere, it is striking that *Tempus Fugit* was written so close to Rautavaara’s death, a time when a re-evaluation of his music was taking place. Kalevi Aho’s obituary, with the epithet that Rautavaara ‘dared to be himself’ and follow his own creative path, must also have reached a wide audience in Finland. Considering this context, it is possible that passages recalling Rautavaara in *Tempus Fugit* were either subconsciously incorporated, or they deliberately occur, as a quiet acknowledgment of Lindberg’s first composition teacher.

Another audible similarity is the combination of relatively static textures and scalar configurations. In terms of atmosphere, a comparison of the opening of *Arena*, and Rautavaara’s *Angels and Visitations* in Ex. 9.5 is illuminating.

---

Ex. 9.4.2: Rautavaara, *Manhattan Trilogy*, “Daydreams”, bb. 46-49
Ex. 9.5.1: Lindberg, *Arena*, bb. 1-5

Ex. 9.5.2: Rautavaara, *Angels and Visitations*, b. 1

---

Given the striking similarity, it is unlikely that Lindberg had not been familiar with *Angels and Visitations*. It is, however, equally important to emphasise that *Arena* as a whole is totally different, and this opening therefore forms a note-worthy moment of affinity that leads the music into a new direction, much like the reference to Sibelius’s Symphony No. 4 at the beginning of *Era* (2012) – a deliberate reference by Lindberg. Howell also notes that Schoenberg, Stravinsky, Mahler, Debussy and Strauss are all referred to musically. However, the repeating cell in both cases provides a point of departure and return. It is through the limited, static nature of this cell that it is possible to perceive the transformations that take place around it.

**Saying different things in the same way**

Drawing on Paavo Heininen’s view of variation form, Lindberg regards his output as ‘saying very different things in the same way.’ This ‘consistency of method’, especially the fascination with large-scale pieces, rhythmic energy and, perhaps especially, sonority has helped generate his characteristic language. As his style has evolved, he has drawn on a wider range of elements to explore continually what this method is capable of. This self-assurance means that Lindberg is able to call himself a “Romantic”, and the Finnish conductor Hannu Lintu also uses this term, as one direction among others in his output.

**Esa-Pekka Salonen (b. 1958)**

An exact contemporary with Magnus Lindberg, Esa-Pekka Salonen also studied with Rautavaara, as well as Franco Donatoni in Sienna and Niccolò Castiglioni in Milan. Like Lindberg, the evidence of Rautavaara’s influence can be heard but similarly forms part of a personal style that embraces a number of diverse influences. Rautavaara’s influence as a teacher and his philosophy towards composing has proved significant to Salonen’s personal progress and ambition to reach a diverse audience.

---

74 Ibid.
75 Cody and Noreen, ‘Moving between extremes’: 33.
76 Clements, ‘New Romantic’. 
Conductor or composer?

Esa-Pekka Salonen holds a unique position in Finnish music, as he has principally known as a conductor who also composes. Whilst studying at the Sibelius Academy, he took classes in both composition and conducting and at one time saw himself more as a composer than as a conductor. The importance of composing to Salonen, as well as his original style and craftsmanship, is somewhat overshadowed by his conducting career, which was thrown into motion by his last-minute replacement of Michael Tilson-Thomas for a performance of Mahler’s Third Symphony with the London Philharmonia Orchestra.

However, the composing side of Salonen’s persona has been asserted more in recent years, especially since 2000 when he took a sabbatical from conducting to concentrate exclusively on composition. His experience and close interaction with orchestras has shaped his composition, giving him a particular insight into issues of performance compared to composers who have been less active as conductors. The fact that he has lived and worked abroad has also led to a particular balance between his notion of “Finnishness” and international influences in his music.

Salonen and modernism

As a young conductor, Salonen conducted the premiere of Rautavaara’s Symphony No. 5 in 1986. He remembers the occasion, stating: ‘I felt as if my grandfather had spotted me buying a porn magazine. It was an outrageous thing to conduct a new piece that started in C major.’ It is important to remember the anecdotal nature of this comment, and Salonen seems to be aware of its over-simplicity (as argued in Chapter 8, the Fifth Symphony is not in C major). Nevertheless, this quotation further indicates how Salonen’s generation perceived Rautavaara as a traditionalist, especially during the 1980s, and possibly how this perception was based on those elements on the surface, such as triads. As his first composition teacher, Salonen has spoken of having felt frustrated at times by Rautavaara.

---


79 Korhonen, ‘New Music of Finland’, 249.


not being a ‘rabid modernist’. He reflects on the way he, and others of his age, wanted to ‘destroy everything’ at this time and establish his own order, but that things did not happen in this way. Having recognised the need for a tribal identity as a young composer, Salonen has come to appreciate Rautavaara’s influence, especially the idea that following individual preference is needed in order to progress as a composer, going on to say:

As the years went by, the things Rautavaara told me that I didn’t understand at the time become more and more important to me. He was trying to help me be myself, and not to worry about fashion.

As one of the founders of Korvat Auki!, along with Lindberg, Saariaho, Kaipainen, Kortekangas, and Hämeenniemi, Salonen was at the forefront of 1980s Finnish modernism. His early compositions demonstrate the experimentalism and the use of modern techniques of the time. His return to composition after conducting for many years, however, brought an important sense of balance. As a composer, Salonen believes in cultivating performing skill, preferring to take players to the edge of their training, rather than ask them to break with it altogether – something he regards as wasteful. This awareness derives largely from his role as a conductor.

Salonen has also discussed how he found European modernism constraining and framed around negatives, such as the avoidance of melody, harmony and rhythmic pulse, and that the environment in Los Angeles facilitated creativity. This positive influence of moving to America might derive from the way it came at a different time to the young Rautavaara, whose studies in New York left him somewhat unfulfilled, wanting to explore the European avant-garde fully. Nevertheless, Rautavaara’s experience contributed significantly to his stylistic development and musical techniques established during his time there can be heard in his later music. For Salonen, the move to Los Angeles followed on from his experiences of the modernist vernacular, so he therefore had a clearer idea of what modernism could offer him when in his new surroundings.

83 da Fonseca-Wollheim, ‘Einojuhani Rautavaara’.
84 Salonen, ‘Barbican Meets’.
The audible influence of Finnish music is also evident in his orchestral works, however. In these pieces, there is an emphasis on renewal over revolution, again reflecting a desire to draw out particular elements of modernism. Incorporating aspects from different genres, including Contemporary Classical, Folk music, Rock, and aspects of American minimalism, has helped him advance his own style, whilst also potentially attracting greater audience diversity. Working alongside this stylistic preference is a larger mission to make classical and contemporary classical music reach wider audiences. This outreach perhaps reached a pinnacle with his presence on Apple iPad advertisements, where he discusses the act of composing and which feature sections of his Violin Concerto (2009). Additionally, he has launched an interactive application called ‘The Orchestra’ which features the same concerto alongside other orchestral pieces from the Classical repertory.

The issue of accessibility is also directly pursued in his pieces. In LA Variations (1996) – one of the first orchestral works written after his return to composition – he explores a balance between the serial and the non-serial through the treatment of two hexachords that together form an overall 12-note collection. This balance resonates with Rautavaara’s practice as both composers uphold 12-tone thinking, whilst approaching this with some degree of freedom and asserting their own harmonic approach.

‘Deep’ formal processes

Large-scale form is where Salonen demonstrates the closest affinity to Finnish music, especially the emphasis on motivic development over large stretches that show an inheritance from Sibelius – an aesthetic that was continued through Rautavaara. In an interview, Salonen identifies the ‘deep processes underneath the music’ as being of great significance to many Finnish composers. This identification also suggests that Salonen looks to Finnish models when it comes to large-scale musical form, and this is borne out by the way his orchestral pieces approach form as a process. The fact that Salonen often gradually transforms a small amount of material evidences the combination of musical economy and temporal development, which looks to Finnish practice.

In *Helix* (2005), Salonen experiments with the idea of continuous form itself. Composed as an orchestral overture, this nine-minute work creates the illusion of subjecting the same material, which is limited to just two phrases, to a continuous accelerando, “pushing” the phrases into what Salonen describes as a descending spiral or coil.\(^90\) As shown in Ex. 9.6 regularly-spaced tempo changes outline a block-like structure, but the emphasis is on a continuous process of accelerated motion. Pedal points related by thirds provide a bass-level organising harmonic principle for this process – a technique that also features in Rautavaara’s music.

This sense of acceleration is an illusion, however, as, although the tempo and surface rhythmic energy increase, Salonen describes how ‘the note values of the phrases become correspondingly longer.’\(^91\) Also, the number of bars separating each tempo shift gradually increases, resulting in the clock-time being roughly equivalent for each section.\(^92\) Whether or not this process is a helix or a spiral is therefore an additional source of tension in the piece. As Ex. 9.5 shows, the *experience* is a descending spiral, while the *process* is closer to a helix.

---


\(^91\) Salonen, ‘Helix’.

\(^92\) Approximate timings in Ex. 9.6 are taken from Salonen, Esa-Pekka., Yefim Bronfman and Los Angeles Philharmonic. *Helix*. Deutsche Grammophon, 2008, CD.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tempo</td>
<td>( \uparrow \uparrow = 84 )</td>
<td>( \downarrow \downarrow = 60 )</td>
<td>( \uparrow \uparrow = 72 )</td>
<td>( \downarrow \downarrow = 84 )</td>
<td>( \downarrow \downarrow = 100 )</td>
<td>( \uparrow \uparrow = 66 )</td>
<td>( \downarrow \downarrow = 160 )</td>
<td>( \downarrow \downarrow = 88-96 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars</td>
<td>1-33</td>
<td>34-51</td>
<td>52-70</td>
<td>71-92</td>
<td>93-117</td>
<td>118-156</td>
<td>157-205</td>
<td>206-299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of bars</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. time (mins.)</td>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>1:07</td>
<td>1:02</td>
<td>1:01</td>
<td>0:58</td>
<td>1:04</td>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>0:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedal points</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C-E(_{5})</td>
<td>E(<em>{5})-G(</em>{7})-E(<em>{5})-F(</em>{7})-G(<em>{7})-E(</em>{5})</td>
<td>C(<em>{5})-E (</em>{5})</td>
<td>C-E(<em>{5})-F-D(</em>{7})</td>
<td>A-E(_{5})-F-C</td>
<td>C-A-D(<em>{7})-B(</em>{7})-A-B-D-F-E(_{7})</td>
<td>C(<em>{5})-E(</em>{5})-G-B(<em>{7})-D(</em>{7})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics</td>
<td>( p )</td>
<td>( \ll ) ( m</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>)</td>
<td>( \ll ) ( m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>)</td>
<td>( f )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex. 9.6: Formal summary of *Helix*
This process in *Helix* brings to mind Aho’s analysis of Rautavaara’s Fifth Symphony as a ‘widening spiral’, most evident through the shared experience of slow, continuous transformation which is simultaneously underscored by eight carefully-paced, block-like sections. As Salonen conducted the premiere of this piece, it may have contributed to the mentality behind *Helix*. Using *accelerandi* to build momentum into new sections is also a common device in these two pieces. In looking to manipulate the shifting perceptions of musical time, it is clear he pursues the same kind of thinking as Rautavaara in creating a musical experience, with focused material, that phases between different musical atmospheres along the way. He builds on an impulse to allow a compelling process that captures the composer’s imagination to shape the content, therefore continuing processes of large-scale continuity while being unrestrained by any previous formal shape. The same idea in reverse is seen in Lindberg’s *Al Largo* (2009-10). Underneath this systematic process in *Helix* are freely selected materials, extended melodies and expressive orchestral gestures, most evident in the dense closing bars, as the process reaches its overloaded culmination. A similar interest in circular designs is evident in *Giro* (1982).

Salonen also follows a Finnish trend, evident in the thematic approaches of Sibelius, Rautavaara and Lindberg, in his relationship to musical ideas. He continues the principle that content can drive the form based on an economy of material. In the programme note to his most recent orchestral piece, *Pollux* (2018), Salonen discusses how the basis of the material has two strands that wanted to grow in opposite directions, stating that these ‘very different musical identities (I had referred to them as brothers in my sketches) would not fit into a single piece. They simply couldn’t co-exist.’ This is a similar compositional challenge to that in Rautavaara’s music, where his use of self-quotation stems largely from the pull of the same musical material to go in two different directions or realisations. Indeed, Salonen has also re-used material from his piano work *Dichotomie* (2000) in his orchestral work, *Foreign Bodies* (2001), demonstrating a similar intention to re-develop musical content and place it in a more large-scale orchestral context. This notion indicates a continuity that is perhaps a trait of prioritising large-scale formal processes and continuity.

---

Salonen has drawn on visual elements to inspire his composition. This is particularly evident in the orchestral work, *Nyx* (2011). This 20-minute piece is essentially a contemporary tone poem that depicts the illusive Greek goddess of the night. The capricious and volatile character of Nyx also informs the dramatic, orchestral outbursts that happen and Salonen describes how, rather than using the ‘principle of continuous variation of material’, the themes in this piece essentially keep their properties while the environment around them changes.\(^9^4\) Salonen finds renewability in a late-Romantic source of inspiration through the flexible form of a single-movement tone poem – a genre that has also featured as an important part of Finnish musical history, alongside the symphony, in Sibelius’s hands. Although this genre carries a weight of tradition, and their relatively intense flourishing is likely explained by the rejection of Romantic ideals with the onset of modernism in the early-twentieth century,\(^9^5\) they offer fertile ground for musical imagination and communication.

Rautavaara is one of the few Finnish composers after Sibelius who wrote a tone poem, aligning naturally with his synthesis of modernism expressed through Neo-Romantic lexicon. This affinity is most evident in Rautavaara’s *Anadyomene – Adoration of Aphrodite* that also alludes to Greek mythology. Also, visual and colouristic evocations appear in his “Angel” works. The notion of light expressed in music is also important to Salonen, and he discusses this notion in the programme note to his *Violin Concerto*. However, while Salonen may have drawn upon Rautavaara’s preoccupation with light in conjunction with other more tangible features, this general trait is common to many Finnish composers.

There is also continuity here, audible in *Nyx* and *Anadyomene* that can be traced back to Sibelius, notably the tone poem *The Oceanides* (1913-14). There are similarities in extra-musical subject matter, as well as the harmonic language and atmospheric sound worlds. The influence of Debussy, which features to an extent in *The Oceanides*, has a part to play in *Nyx*, where the sound world of *La Mer* (1905) is evoked in places – a work that


Salonen holds in extremely high regard. He also sees the music of Debussy, Ravel and Stravinsky as being more influential for recent contemporary music than that of the Second Viennese School. In this respect, Finland illustrates the highly diverse landscape of contemporary music that includes the influence of French composers. As well as there being traces of Debussy and Ravel in his music, Salonen was also influenced by Messiaen. That Messiaen was also highly influential on Rautavaara illustrates the significance that these alternative strands had on certain Finnish composers.

In pursuing this line of thinking with the tone poem, Salonen builds on individual preferences and finds inspiration in visual ideas, rather than being concerned about the implied weight of tradition that a tone poem might bring. Descriptive music does not align with certain perceptions of modernism, but its ability to inspire new music forces a questioning of the value of definitions of modernism that centre on musical processes alone. Salonen therefore demonstrates openness to multiple possibilities and outside influences.

Finally, there are audible similarities between Rautavaara and Salonen. In “Adieu”, the final movement of the Violin Concerto, this commonality is seen in the particular use of a collection of features including synthetic scalar configurations in rapid semiquavers, harmony, texture and pace. This connection can be observed in a comparison of bars (49-56) from the Violin Concerto with bars (91-94) from Rautavaara’s Anadyomene – see Ex. 9.7. Such commonalities might demonstrate a musical influence of Rautavaara on Salonen and, at the very least, illustrate a common influence of Messiaen.

---
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Ex. 9.7.1: Salonen, Violin Concerto, “Adieu”, bb. 49-56
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Rautavaara’s influence on Salonen forms part of a broader stylistic assimilation, through which an independent stylistic voice has been honed. But this larger significance is also where Rautavaara’s influence comes through the strongest. Salonen’s musical expression embraces an eclectic range of international, twenty-first-century styles. He explores new musical experiences and continues to experiment and question ideas and forms, meaning that individual pieces often have widely different creative impetuses. Salonen’s position as a conductor and his move to America might have provided him with the distance required to arrive at his independent view of composition as something that can embrace a range of influences and is suited to the international modernity and vast musical accessibility of the twenty-first century.

Renewable revolutionaries

The composers discussed in this chapter have all been influenced by Rautavaara to some extent, pedagogically, musically or philosophically. Such a legacy takes its place as part of
a broader, complex picture of Finnish orchestral music, which balances outside influences alongside a sense of inheritance from a Finnish music tradition. For the younger composers discussed here (Kortekangas, Lindberg and Salonen), the relative importance of Rautavaara has become apparent in recent years. These composers have embraced modernism but faced the challenge of renewability in its wake. Rautavaara’s legacy in Finland is considerable in this regard, as he achieved a longevity that largely derives from his independence and the steady cultivation of his own stylistic world that draws on his prior experiences. His self-belief in working outside of modernist trends, using neo-tonality, and writing music that forms part of genres such as symphonies and operas, has commanded a certain respect. Rautavaara achieved this recognition before he died, but his independence has been forcefully communicated since his death in 2016.

This success also has a lot to do with a national awareness of Rautavaara’s music as a marketable product. While visionary aspects such as nature, angels and orthodox religion can be viewed as a departure from modernist ways of thinking, looking beneath the surface reveals a negotiation with issues of renewability faced by contemporary composers. The wide reach of Rautavaara’s music makes him something of an anomaly in his home country, and therefore a point of reference. His symbiosis of tonal and 12-tone thinking and his novel continuation of past genres invite comparison to recent attempts at such synthesis and might explain why similar elements of his language emerge in music by later Finnish composers.
Conclusions

By employing analytical perspectives of musical form, thematic development and pitch organisation, this thesis has identified how Rautavaara’s symphonic output demonstrates a particular modernist mentality centred on a consistent stylistic evolution. An awareness of this continuity must co-exist with acknowledging the stylistic variety that has, rightly, been identified in previous studies and criticism. The revelation of this consistency of intent provides greater detail and clarity for understanding the often contradictory perspectives regarding this composer. The individuality arising from his synthetic approach has also informed his reputation and leaves a significant model for future composers.

To draw the intervening discussion back to the idea of a “late” manifestation of moderate modernism, there is a common, progressive spirit that, in individual cases, reaches across the twentieth century. This understanding of modernism is one that responds to the need to write music of its time – by building on previous experiences and creating new compositional solutions – while remaining critical of any single narrative of avant-garde development. Additionally, as with the earlier “peripheral” modernists discussed in Chapter 1, Rautavaara’s continuance of traditional characteristics (symphonic composition, linear forms, motivic development and triadic harmony) was entirely compatible with this progressive compositional purpose.

At the heart of Rautavaara’s modernism is his prolonged ambition to find a ‘reliable technique’.1 His early hope that serialism would provide the answer to this problem means that, at one point, he himself believed in embracing this new language without looking back. However, as can be seen across the eight symphonies, looking back became pivotal to moving forwards. The various stylistic accumulations that can be traced over the symphonies contributed to this on-going ambition. While Rautavaara could not predict the ultimate impact of new techniques on this end goal, without this early drive many of the original aspects of his style outlined above would not have been. As part of his reappraisal of modernism, his identification of those elements that were to be most renewable reveals one cautiously-modernist perspective behind them. These elements

1 This term is used by Rautavaara in the context of his crisis following his studies in America. For a full quotation, see Sivuoja-Gunaratnam, Narrating with Twelve Tones, 34.
include a belief in the democracy and symmetry of the 12-tone vocabulary, whether using rows or a freer, tertian language. There is also an enduring prioritisation of harmony and texture, the visual and metaphorical alignment with light and colour, and a fascination with the self-generating potential of musical material based on prior structures and organisations. Rautavaara’s *modernity* – that is, music written in recent times – continued to be defined by earlier explorations and future applications of *modernism*.

**An original composer**

When reviewing the reception of a composer who has recently passed away, the word ‘original’ should be approached cautiously, as a posthumous, retrospective interest in their music might selectively emphasise their achievements or legacy. On *Twitter*, Esa-Pekka Salonen, responding immediately to his passing, says: ‘Devastated by the passing of Einojuhani Rautavaara, great original voice in Finnish music. Also my first composition teacher and friend.’ The thread of comments in reaction to this post makes several uses of the word ‘original’. Likewise, Kalevi Aho’s obituary refers to Rautavaara’s ‘original style’ as a basis for a reminder to ‘dare to be yourself’ as a composer. In Finland, Rautavaara is recognised as a somewhat moderate, independent voice that does not fit within the usual categories of Finnish modernism. But his belief in following a personal compositional path, which is reflected both in his music and in his teaching, is a significant and accurate part of his legacy at home that should also be recognised abroad.

This investigation has shown that Rautavaara was indeed an original composer. His innovation extends beyond an exoticised, new-age idea of “Nordicness”, “holy” music or tonal, Romantic traditionalism. Kimberly J. Scott states that Rautavaara ‘has not and did not set out to discover a new method of musical expression as did Schönberg or John Cage’, but that he ‘simply set out to discover what his new method of expression would be’. While individual radicalism on Cage’s level is clearly absent, there was nothing simple about Rautavaara’s acquisition of his new method of expression, which became a significant contribution to late-twentieth-century music, albeit as one distinctive voice among many others. Drawing on a wide range of techniques, and sometimes grappling between them, explains why Rautavaara does not fit into one category. Furthermore, this
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3 Aho, ‘Rautavaara’s Death’.
4 Scott, ‘Unity and Pluralism’, 36.
orientation towards individual preference results in a style that did not exist before and is, therefore, original.

Rautavaara commented that ‘A Romantic has no coordinates. In time, he is yesterday or tomorrow, never today. In space, he is over there or over yonder, never here’.\(^5\) The delayed and compressed waves of modernism in Finland contributed to this perspective. But, from the late-1960s, when a sense of belonging to a group of avant-garde serialists dissolved, and there was a resurged interest in free tonality and opera in Finland, Rautavaara could progress slowly. He reassessed the path of modernism, reflected on the viability of, and compatibility between, stylistic elements for himself, and wrote music reflective of the wave-like developments of his time. Within a moderately modernist approach, being original is not the same as being revolutionary. Dahlhaus’s view of the modernist, musical concept of “breakthrough” around the beginning of the twentieth century\(^6\) was concerned with a decisive departure from established techniques and musical language at the end of the nineteenth century. For Rautavaara, operating at the end of the twentieth century, it is the other way around: his breakthrough was finding a unified, original style out of both modernism and the stylistic pluralism of the time. The challenge to renew – to break through – was still there, however, and Rautavaara embodies the splintering of musical progress into more individual strands.

Rautavaara’s musical language has a particular flavour which also builds on the early-twentieth-century new tonalities of Stravinsky, Bartók, Messiaen, Hindemith, Shostakovich and Prokofiev. In his own context, Rautavaara renewed tonality from within through steady experimentation with modernism, testing boundaries and commonalities. In this sense, he aligns with what Harper-Scott identifies as a feature of “reactive modernism” in relation to the emancipation of dissonance. Harper-Scott says that if ‘faithful modernism can be said to adhere closely to the moment after the radical disjunction, reactive modernism can be said to return again and again to the moment of the disjunction itself.’\(^7\) Rautavaara manifestly challenged the idea that tonal reference was to be outlawed with the continuation of serialism through the Long Twentieth Century. This music demonstrates comfort with the past alongside an assurance of reinvention, and such newness is made impactful by its resemblance to tonality as well as its total independence from it.

\(^7\) Harper-Scott, ‘Reactive Modernism’, 171.
Belief in symphonic writing

Much of this thesis has dealt with issues of durability and renewal. In his symphonies, Rautavaara actively contributed to the continuation and re-establishment of a way of thinking that has a special place in Finland, believing this old form to be entirely compatible with an on-going modernist project. Each of the symphonies comprises a different solution to reconciling modern and traditional stylistic elements that, in his hands, continually orientate towards large-scale expression and unity. Part of this renewal is experimenting with the overlapping common ground between symphonies, operas and concerti, which all look at journeys, duality and motivic development in different ways. It is therefore possible to observe an on-going experimentation with the symphonic form across all these works.

There is a personal journey in the symphonies, where a more absolute musical genre confronts music that he has written in the past, channelling and fusing it to realise, in that moment, a new expression of those ideas. This introspective approach makes sense in light of Rautavaara’s comment that ‘I should be content if the symphony includes the whole of myself’. But these musical experiences also embrace much broader narratives and dramatic ambitions. No doubt this experimentation made it easier for him to call these works “Symphony”. In continuing, rather than rejecting, the symphonic form, he controlled its direction to fulfil his own intentions.

Rautavaara’s commitment to the symphonic genre after a significant hiatus before Symphony No. 5 reveals a shift in the mid-1980s towards reasserting large-scale symphonic principles through contact with the most useful modern techniques. This conscious return to the genre is reinforced by characteristics that are used consistently from the Fifth Symphony onwards, including the synthesis of pitch collections, the carefully-paced use of textural counterpoint and an inherent sense of drama.

Modernist or postmodernist?

The lack of any clear ending point for the influence of modernism on Rautavaara’s symphonies makes the idea of postmodernism rather less helpful than previous researchers have found it to be. This thesis has sought to trace the consistent attitude that has formed Rautavaara’s idiom and does not seek to pigeonhole him into a compositional category.
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This finding relates to Guldbrandsen and Johnson’s notion that postmodernism reflects the contradictory nature of modernism (see Chapter 1). While it might be tempting to regard Rautavaara’s later neo-tonality and his outwardly traditional symphonic structures as a conscious, postmodern shirking of modern techniques, the evidence shows that this is not the case. Whether it is new methods of organising the 12 tones, form or texture, he quietly builds on modern techniques and re-orientates them into his own direction in an integrated way. The removal of dogmatic constructivism, admitting neo-tonal harmonic colour, lyricism, organicism, narratives and visions into the mix, results in a new lease of life for both modernism and traditionalism. It is not easy, however, to reject the notion of postmodernism completely when considering the way Rautavaara verbally challenged what he felt to be dogmatic modernist views:

I never understood the fanaticism of those modernists of the fifties and sixties who said: ‘Now we should never look backwards, we should never be anchored to tradition.’ For me tradition has been extremely important, and I am happy if I can be considered to be a part of the tradition. That I should only use the techniques of today, those invented after 1940—I think that’s senseless, that’s idiotic nowadays. I am talking against this quite a lot these days because that was the idea at Darmstadt when I was there too. But we are talking about the flogging of dead horses—I had to get these things clear for myself!

But this intention to ‘get these things clear’ for himself is a reminder that his relationship with modernism was based on personal experimentation. “Postmodernism” here could usefully refer to a period of reflection on how best to apply modern techniques, following Rautavaara’s introduction to them. Studies on Postmodernism by both Kramer and Heiniö argue for the possibility that a continuation or development of modernism is one possible characteristic. However, these are not the criteria with which certain writers and critics usually classify Rautavaara as a postmodernist. The emphasis is typically placed on stylistic pluralism, which places him in the context of collage-like combinations of styles.

The postmodernist ideal of breaking down “grand narratives” is also problematic. While he departs from the modernist “mainstream”, he clearly does not reject progress in his own music and was, overall, positively impacted by newer compositional techniques.
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10 Anderson and Rautavaara, ‘Einojuhani Rautavaara, Symphonist’.
12 The cantata True and False Unicorn (1971) stands out within Rautavaara’s output in the way it exhibits this fragmented and collage-like character within one piece, rather than emphasising musical unity.
Musical quotation, or intertextuality, has also been associated with the postmodernist idea of challenging imposed hierarchies but, as can be determined from Chapter 6, Rautavaara’s self-quotations are part of the dialectical progression of his own modernist narrative, even if he looks back to his own past. Tiikkaja also identifies the modernist tenet of ‘progress’ in Rautavaara’s self-quotations, even if that progression happens slowly and somewhat introspectively. The intention to write “new” or “original” music here preserves something of the modernist emphasis on the singular work of art. The word “innovation”, which David Metzer describes as being crucial to modernism, is in this context concerned with the reinvention, rather than the rejection, of both newer and older musical styles and techniques. It is the methodology of progress that separates Rautavaara from the likes of Boulez, not the principle of building on new ideas. The emphasis on unity and renewal in these symphonies reveals that he actively processes traditional styles, rather than simply recalling and combining them.

Rautavaara’s path therefore moves between modernism and postmodernism but is ultimately independent of them. Indeed, he said that he wished to be seen as a ‘stylistic anomaly’. This perspective allowed him to focus on those visionary aspects that also define his music, allowing him to get the most out of his material. This thesis does submit, however, that Rautavaara’s novelty was made possible by pushing into the grey areas – finding the connecting space between different stylistic spheres – and that this fact is ultimately more significant than acknowledging eclecticism. The consistency of approach in arriving at a controlled idiom through curiosity and experimentation does not present an image of a composer who rejects modernism, as an aesthetic, a belief in progress, or as a pool of technical resources.

Rautavaara not only synthesises old and new, but also respective modernist techniques, illustrating how his modernism takes on different musical guises. Experiments with serialism have informed the later, inclusive harmonic practice, symmetrical harmonies and sense of structure. Thematic development in some form is a fundamentally renewable feature of all the symphonies, even when it results in different stylistic
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14 Tiikkaja, ‘Postmodern Intertextualist’

15 David Metzer, Musical Modernism at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 3

16 Länsiö, ‘Einojuhani Rautavaara’.
outcomes. Finally, his experimentation with sonority and extended techniques has informed his retention of harmonic resonance and gradual transformations in harmonic colour which co-exist with passages containing free tonality.

The continuous sense of perfection and order that circularity and symmetry bring – a source of unity and continuity in all musical environments – helped Rautavaara perfect his style. Paavo Heininen abides by the idea that modernism is an ‘ethic’ and ‘ideology’ and not ‘just one flavour out of five hundred’.\footnote{Länsiö, ‘Paavo Heininen’.} He goes on to say: ‘The modernist is a free individual, thoroughly alone (= sans authorities) before the material he knows and understands. Modernism is the same as the classical art-ethos’.\footnote{Ibid.} This ideological view of modernism links in a particular, and perhaps surprising, way with Rautavaara having a modernist outlook. The emphasis on perfection, balance, proportion and brevity that symmetry brings, coupled with his taking complete ownership over his material, resonates with a particular modernist aesthetic. This ethos is combined with the more practical integration of recent techniques. Rautavaara continued to draw on the aesthetic order of symmetry to help advance his own style. This principle motivated his most extreme serialist experimentations but it also rings throughout his various stylistic turning points, making modern techniques another avenue through which to apply this notion.

The detailed uses of symmetry outlined here relate to larger issues of balance highlighted by Howell,\footnote{Howell, After Sibelius, 141.} as well as the importance of duality. A reflection on Rautavaara’s music could focus either on its consistency or variety – a mirror image of his own view that ‘synthesis, yin and yang, polarities, dialectics have always been the most interesting phenomena in the arts.’\footnote{Länsiö, ‘Einojuhani Rautavaara’.} It is clear that he did not regard such potentially opposing perspectives to be mutually exclusive, but a consequence of a process that brings together old and new.

**Saturation point**

Reflecting on the lyrical atmosphere of much of Rautavaara’s late music, it might be assumed that he reverted to traditional music when the pressure to be a modernist was removed, hence Scott’s view that Rautavaara “legitimised” his music by incorporating modernist (here meaning serialist) elements.\footnote{Scott, ‘Unity versus pluralism’, 20.} But such a view would obscure the fact
that, firstly, Rautavaara wanted to embrace modernist elements in his early music and, secondly, that his later music is the result of all his previous experiences. At the same time, however, Rautavaara crystallised his style to such an extent that many of the later works often sound similar. A more concentrated consistency of style finally caught up with the consistency of intent that ran throughout his output.

The explanation for this saturation point is that he reached a new level of control of, and perspective on, his material. In conversation, Kalevi Aho discussed how Rautavaara had mentioned that, by the 2000s, he had already created his musical “universum”. This meant that he created new pieces from the musical organisations and stylistic assemblage that he had. The extensive use of self-quotation during these years fitted naturally into this process. Meanwhile, as he established his musical universe, the control over his resources, which by now were semi-autonomous, became ever more cogent – a continuous, symmetrical and economical force of order that allows accessible, familiar and similar features. Rautavaara was basically able to forget about technique and focus on helping the music come into being. Arriving at this point, however, was only possible through all of his prior experimentation. In short, he had found his ‘reliable technique.’

Part of this acquisition of a musical language is a balance between control and freedom. Even in those pieces that are more freely organised, there is always a structure or guiding framework. The role of the piano is significant here, especially as the inclination towards tertian harmonies can be explained by the way these sit naturally in the player’s hands. Larger governing principles of symmetry and the harmonic availability of all 12 tones accommodates these triadic harmonies and they therefore work outside of previous tonal models, even if these can be evoked.

Overall, Rautavaara’s symphonic journey therefore forms a complete spiral, one that culminates, aptly, in *The Journey*. His fascination with the “infinite” and his increased self-reflection is shown in the idea that nothing in composition can be entirely new, but its applications have a potentially infinite reinvention. Within these step-by-step modifications and dialogues can be seen the ways in which Rautavaara upheld a modernist mentality.
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22 Interview with Kalevi Aho, April 2018.
Some suggestions for future research

As stated at the outset, the focus of this investigation has been the music of Einojuhani Rautavaara and his personal relationship with modernism. To continue in this vein, future research could extend beyond the symphonies to investigate how modernism has impacted other significant genres within his output, such as the concertos or the operas, with which the eight symphonies share some common material. Another avenue would be to investigate the impact of the more radical experimentations (including extended techniques and graphic notations) that are found in his music from the 1970s – a decade when he did not write any symphonies – and how this might offer further detail concerning the impact of modernism on his output as a whole.

Future work might also look outside the context of this composer. The approaches taken here (combining existing modernist research frameworks with musical analysis and contextual research) might inform studies into other late-twentieth-century composers who have demonstrated a similarly independent response to the avant-garde. Possible composers include (but are by no means limited to) Alan Hovhaness, Roy Harris, Jón Leifs, Henryk Górecki and Krzysztof Penderecki. Equally, such an examination might also contribute to on-going research into the nature of musical modernism itself – an area that falls beyond the scope of this study.

Another potential expansion would be to shift the research focus towards the variety and enduring significance of the symphonic idea in Finland. Future researchers may therefore wish to situate those aspects of Rautavaara’s symphonic contribution discussed here (especially his approaches to large-scale form and thematic development) within this larger context. Similarly, the analysis undertaken into Rautavaara’s solutions to tonal renewal through contact with modernism might be useful to those who wish to research other cases of neo-tonality that are not limited to diatonic collections and draw on the larger reservoir of the twelve tones. Such an approach might continue to explore the intersections between modernism, tonality and modality in the music of other individuals, either in Finland or elsewhere.
List of primary sources

Scores

The first date given is the date of composition. The publication date is given after the
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