the original half cadence is replaced by the tonic chord of G minor. These alterations effect the transition between numbers. The D major chord at the end of no. 4 provides a stronger lead into the G minor of no. 5. Ending on the tonic in no. 5, however, means that the melody of no. 6 cannot float magically up from the final d as it does when the first version is performed as a cycle. The more traditional ending of no. 5 is considered by Rosen to lessen the effect of the opening of no. 6:

> It is … in my experience, difficult to begin [no. 6] persuasively after the revised ending. With the original half cadence, however, the sixth piece seems to arise naturally out of the sonority of the final chord. The original edition makes for a greater unity between the satirical and lyrical pieces, and more closely realises the ideals of E.T.A. Hoffmann.[10]

It seems ironic on considering Schumann's later edition that he wanted a less blatant title page but – it seems – more straightforward music. His compositional style had changed considerably since *Kreisleriana* and it is not really surprising that he should have formed different ideas about the strengths of his earlier works; a preference for the more eccentric versions is no doubt influenced by a modernist appreciation of their progressive elements, which was not Schumann's concern by 1850. Yet the pertinent point here, whether or not we agree with Rosen's assessment, is the validity of accepting the 1850 edition of *Kreisleriana* as the basis for an Urtext.

A brief survey suggests that performers have chosen freely from first and second editions of *Kreisleriana*. Maurizio Pollini, for example, prefers the first edition in his 2002 *Deutsche Gramophon* recording but takes some of the Whistling edition's repeats. Wilhelm Kempff used Clara's edition, using the revised endings in his 1973 recording for *Deutsche Gramophon* as does Imogen Cooper's live BBC recording (1995). Pianists will probably turn to Henle's Urtext edition in search of a portable and reliable edition: those who read the footnotes will find further secret messages from Schumann that may be better decoded by the forthcoming New Complete Edition published by Schott.

Laura Tunbridge
University of Manchester

Jean Sibelius: Symphony no. 2 in D major op. 43, Study Score ed. Kari Kilpeläinen. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 2004. Partitur-Bibliothek 5376, 214 pp. €112.

Among Sibelius's large-scale orchestral works, the Second Symphony is perhaps the best known. It is also, however, one of the most difficult to understand. Its gestures are brutally direct, nowhere more so than in the precipitous brass and string exchanges in the second movement and the searingly affirmative chorale of the final bars. In a poor performance, the symphony can seem too diffuse, its discourse too fragmented to carry genuine symphonic conviction or support a sustained critical response (by comparison with the telegrammatic standards of Sibelius's later symphonies). Yet in reality, the symphony invites a wide range of hermeneutic accounts. It is Sibelius's 'Italian' Symphony, conceived and sketched

10 Ibid., 678.

on vacation at Rapallo in 1901. As Kari Kilpeläinen notes in the Afterword to this new study score from the complete edition (other recent volumes previously reviewed in this journal, see Vol. 2, Iss. 2, pp. 242–5), Sibelius had originally planned to write a series of four tone poems for orchestra inspired by such Latin subjects as the Divine Comedy and the legend of Don Juan. Elements of this early conception can still be found in the finished work: the opening movement can be heard as a Claudian pastoral, an arcadian spring hymn or dithyramb sung perhaps on arrival in the south from the cold gloom of a Nordic winter. Similarly, the extended opening passage of the second movement could depict a solemn pilgrim's procession, much like the corresponding movement in Mendelssohn's Italian Symphony (likewise in D minor). The violent contrasting material might represent the conflict and struggles of a Don-Juan-like hero, whose amorous adventures are consummated with almost cinematic candour in the languorous trio of the following Scherzo. Following this imaginative train of thought, the outer sections of the third movement become a whirling saltarello, whereas the finale represents the hero's ultimate victory and apotheosis in the brilliant light of a southern sun. Other programmatic accounts are also possible. For many commentators from Robert Kajanus onwards, the dark mood of the Andante, and the spirit of redemption and release through adversity of the symphony's finale suggested an obvious contemporary political metaphor, a fervent call for Finnish independence from the tyranny of Russian rule and occupation. Such conflict–liberation trajectories suggested darker political ideologies to many later critics such as Theodor W. Adorno. Yet it is equally possible to understand the work as an abstract essay on the nature of symphonic discourse, particularly the structural implications of the process of 'crystallization of thought from chaos' that Sibelius later explored in the Third Symphony. Heard from this perspective, the symphony is concerned above all with a process of teleological genesis, the articulation of a complete structural cadence in the tonic major attained only in the work's very final bars.

The study score is a direct reproduction of the musical text previously printed in the Complete Edition,[1] in a format more suited to practical performance than scholarly use. Though the new score reproduces Kilpeläinen's illuminating account of the work's compositional genesis and reception from the earlier volume, it does not include the full critical commentary or a detailed description of the sources. This is a potentially significant loss, because Sibelius's own autograph, used for the first performance but since badly damaged by fire, contains numerous differences from the printed edition. Sibelius made significant alterations to the instrumentation in the first movement (the relevant pages from the autograph are reproduced in the earlier edition, plates III–V), for instance, and wrote 12 bars of the F♯ major string theme in the second movement (between bars 97 and 98) which he later excised (plates VI–VIII). Whether these changes are substantial enough to justify the preparation and recording of an official 'first version' of the symphony – as has recently been the case with other works such as the Fifth Symphony, 'Lemminkäinen and the Maidens of the Island' from the *Four Legends* op. 22, and the Violin Concerto – is unclear from Kilpeläinen's summary. But tracing such processes of revision undoubtedly assists our understanding of Sibelius's compositional development. In the earlier volume, Kilpeläinen notes that the autograph score appears to have been written in considerable haste:

[1] Kari Kilpeläinen, ed., *Sibelius: Works for Orchestra*. *Jean Sibelius Works* I/3 (Wiesbaden, 2000).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479409800000525 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> He thus created many difficulties for understanding his intentions, especially with regard to dynamics. There are numerous passages where the crescendo and dimuendo signs … are so haphazardly written that it is impossible to know exactly what their real length should be or where to place them. An additional problem is when to interpret the diminuendo hairpin as an accent, since Sibelius's handwriting often makes little or no distinction between the two marks.[2]

Similar concerns could be raised about the placement and significance of slurring, articulation marks and dynamics. It is not always clear, for example, whether Sibelius's *fp* marking constitutes an accented attack or a sudden terraced reduction in volume. Such problems reinforce the potential dangers of fetishizing a composer's handwriting as an intentional source. The detailed critical commentary in the earlier volume clearly describes where Kilpeläinen has relied on Sibelius's autograph as a primary source, and where he has allowed practical considerations to dictate editorial changes and emendations in the light of later copies and printed versions. In the new study score format, however, such finer details are inevitably lost, and, as a result, the reprinted edition gains a seemingly authoritative status that the work's complex source material cannot unequivocally support.

To all other intents and purposes, however, the edition is to be warmly welcomed in its new format. As long as conductors persist in ignoring many of the score's subtle nuances (the way in which there is a slight dynamic drop in the brass in the very final bars from *fff* to *ff*, for example, so that the concluding cadence sounds more optimistic than triumphalist), there is clearly a need for a reliable, accessible edition to support practical performance. And through such enlightened interpretation, the symphony's complex and contradictory layers of meaning can be further deconstructed. As Kilpeläinen suggests in the study score, 'it almost seems that the Second Symphony was the beginning of the search for something novel, not the initiation of a new stylistic period' (p. 212). If the edition accordingly continues to provoke an awareness of the work's novelty, it will have served its purpose admirably.

Daniel Grimley
University of Nottingham

2 Ibid., 216.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479409800000525 Published online by Cambridge University Press