

By Akira Naitou
 Artistic Director of Tokyo New City Orchestra
 Inquiries regarding free music parts: akira.naitou@nifty.com

* **There was another real newer version by Sibelius!**

"Finlandia" has been changed several times since its **premiere (1899)**, but it was still in the intermediate stage, or in other words, the score that was published was the "First Draft" (1901) and the incomplete version has been used ever since.

Sibelius made further improvements correcting flaws in the score and working on perfecting the "Symphonic poem".

However, due to various circumstances, the newest ideas and the corrected mistakes in the completed Symphonic poem did not see the light of day for a long time—but this time, the newer version has finally been awakened from a hundred-year sleep!

Changes in the Score

"First Draft/Premiere" November 4, 1899

It was first performed as the last piece of the 6-stage suite "Scènes Historiques" (all 7 pieces), based on major Finnish historic events. It includes hopes for stronger resistance against Russian oppression, and national consciousness and patriotism as Finnish people.

"Second Draft/Paris Expo Version" July 1900

In July of the following year at the Paris Expo, this music, which was the finale of the "incidental music", was performed alone as a single piece. This time, instead of the theme of the fight, which was the main theme of the coda in the first version, he used the famous 'hymn' from the intermediate part and inserted it into the finale as a brass ensemble, making a magnificent 28-bar coda.

"Third Draft/First Publishing" March 1901

In a masterpiece concert on February 10 of the following year, the "second version" (from the fact that changes in the parts have not been made) was performed for the first time using the name

Symphonic poem "Finlandia" (see below).

Then, in the wake of signing a publishing contract with the emerging Fazer & Westerlund Company (hereafter F.&W. company) on November 23 of the previous year, and after a formal title for the piece had been decided, Sibelius suddenly shortened and re-modified the coda (same as the current coda), and by the performance on February 28 (Viborg City), he had improved it to be befitting for the form and content of a "Symphonic poem". He also made the following three major modifications by March, which was the time of the first publication. The bar numbers are displayed only as numbers below, and the word "bar" is omitted.

1. The 6-bar phrase in "incidental music" **192~197** (original) has been reduced to 4 bars **192~195** (first version) by reducing the note units to halves.
2. The tempo indications for "incidental music" in various places in the original score were changed to a tempo suitable for a "Symphonic poem" and music without stage performance.
3. During its premiere as "incidental music", the tempo from the introduction until the beginning of the famous hymn was fast **Allegro moderato**, which represents the future of bright hopes. However, when it became a "Symphonic poem", in order to express the suffering and the struggle, the tempo was changed in the **"Third Version/First Edition and the current version"**, from the introduction until bar 73, to become grave **Andante sostenuto**. Some other similar places were changed to the current symbols as well (Note 3).

However, he did not have time for further improvement (see Note 4, column "Lack of time for revision work"), and as a result, when compared to the newer version later, it was discovered in March that the first edition was published in an incomplete condition and "Symphonic poem" form, and that the numerous mistakes that existed in the score from the premiere,

as well as those that had been generated afresh during score reproduction and the creation of the first edition (described below) had not been corrected at all.

Unfortunately, this first edition is the only version that has been used until now.

[Reference]

i) For one year after the first performance, as the incidental music for the finale of the play, it was the only handwritten copy written by him when he first composed the piece. Unfortunately the score was lost when it was stolen from him while he was traveling around the end of October 1900. He hurriedly wrote a letter requesting a copy of the score from a copyist (November 2nd). The copyist recovered the score necessary for performance by copying the score from each part from the first performance onto a prescribed location on one sheet of musical score. (The corresponding "Second Draft")

ii) The first edition used now is the recovered score from i) with the addition of the changes 1~3 from the above-mentioned "Third Draft".

iii) In the **Trb III** part score mentioned on Note 2, the lengthy coda of the second draft that was used in the World Exposition performance was erased by hatching, and after that the third draft of the coda (same as the current coda) was written. Then directly after that, we understand from the signature, which says "Viborg, February 28th, 1901, that after the previously mentioned famous concert on February 10th, close to the publication of the first edition at the end of February, the coda was rewritten for the second time.

iv) Various Circumstances from When the Score Was Written

At the time of the creation of the "Third Draft" currently being distributed, as mentioned previously in "i)", the score of the individual part was used as reference for the first performance, but in the journey from the first hand-written version to the creation of parts for the first performance, due to the copyist's characteristic failure to understand Sibelius's notations such as >, there were already many mistakes present in the music.

After that, when the score had been recovered using each individual part after the hand-written manuscript was lost, further mistakes were made when the 3 copies of the first edition of the score were made based on the recovered score.

As well as that, during practices under the conductors Sibelius (first performance) and Kajanus (another performance), the parts were misheard and written down by the musicians and then used as the cornerstones for the printing of the first edition score, so errors became evident in a variety of places.

An example of a particularly inexcusable mistake is bars 46 to 49 in the clarinet part. As a result of a lack of space above the lines in the full score, the dynamics and expression marks were printed one bar out (slower) compared to the original.

The musicians, who did not know the reality, could not help but play the score that even until now has been error-strewn.

The first edition that was produced like this has been used as the only score until now and has caused many problems for conductors.

On the other hand, the imperfections in the existing version of the score due to the carelessness of Sibelius himself cannot be overlooked.

Compared with the workmanship shown in the next "Fourth Draft", this version shows his unnatural use of expression marks, possibly as a result of carelessness, and in places where the music should be the same, mutually contradictory symbols have been attached inadvertently and with no meaning, and incomplete points can be seen in the score in various places.

Furthermore, the fact that he himself went traveling in Italy while producing the first version and failed to keep a close eye on the first version before it was published was an issue. Perhaps he felt he was being unwillingly made to produce the first version quickly.

After that, the Breitkopf & Härtel company (hereafter B. & H. company), bought the copyright to the music in July 1905 and in December of the same year, the same company republished the first edition as it was. Presumably the B.&H. Company believed this to be the final draft.

On deciding to republish the work, they decided that a piano arrangement was also necessary and requested an arrangement from Sibelius. They then tried releasing the orchestra score together with the piano part based on it.

However, once Sibelius had agreed to the proposal, he hit upon the idea of improving the condition of the 'Symphonic poem', which had been first published in an incomplete manner, and during the arranging process he also poured his full energy into correcting the deficiencies from the full score.

Then, in accordance with these plans he accomplished the suitably great transformations mentioned below!

“Fourth Draft” 1905

It was gradually improved from the first performance in 1899, and after the first orchestra version in March 1901, it became the latest draft, improved even more by Sibelius's latest ideas. It is written as a piano score but as a matter of fact, in terms of content, it became the last draft of the Symphonic Poem “Finlandia”.

- * He corrected for the first time many of the mistakes and deficiencies left as they were since the first performance of the first edition (third draft), correcting the intervals, dynamics and phrasing above the piano score that differ from the first edition.
- * Furthermore, he added new ideas in order to transform the full “Symphonic poem”. That part is referred to below.

1. Bars 74~81 (existing version): a reduction in the number of bars

Even in the existing version, this was the part with the most mistakes.

In the existing version, no attempt had been made in this part to transform it into a “Symphonic poem”, and it had been left as ‘incidental music’ since the first performance. Because of that, in the 5 bars from 77 to 81 (20 beats), the music carries no hint of a ‘Symphonic poem’ whatsoever, and the long notes (continued notes) groan vainly with the same intervals as the bass instruments and, as a matter of fact, with almost exactly the same dynamics.

Because of that, it was a headache for most conductors whose only solutions were to endure with the non-musical monotony of those 5 bars or shorten the rhythm (number of bars) and overcome it. The musicians were of the same opinion.

At this point in the first performance of the piece, the music temporarily stopped in order to enhance the effect of the tableau play on stage, and the necessary time was taken on the stage to create tension, namely in this case using the sound effect of 5 bars of simple low notes.

This sound effect portion, which originally interrupted the flow of the music, needed to be subjected to some sort of treatment when modified to become a “Symphonic poem” as pure music minus the drama. However, there was no time to spare at the time of publication of the full score, and the publishers probably did not mind about that. After that, these problems plagued orchestras around the world, as the piece was left in a fatal condition where “despite the drama being gone, only the sound effect was left, long to resound in vain”.

In the “Fourth Draft”, Sibelius rewrote this section in the following ways.

- 1) The monotonous 5-bar phrase of bass instruments was shortened by one bar.
- 2) Depth has been given to the range and dynamics of the continuous notes in the shortened 4-bar phrase which was not previously present in the “incidental music”. The *dim.* mentioned in “a.” below, written in during practices of the parts, existed from the first version which was already being used.
 - a. A dramatic climax was aimed for with various changes. The *dim.* from the previous bar is carried on into the first bar (77), and *possibile* has been added to the *cresc.* of the slightly weakened 3 shortened bars from 78.
 - b. In this new edition, in keeping with the intent of piano score, a sound an octave higher (part) was added with the passing of each bar. To dispel the monotony owing to this, pointing towards the repeating of the conflict theme from bar 82 onwards (new version), the music builds to a bold climax, as intended by Sibelius.
- 3) In the incidental music, the continuous and tied monotonous **Fg, Tuba, Tim.** notes from bar 74 onwards carried on to the new phrase starting from bar 82 (new version, bar 81) and were tied together and showed no changes. However, by cutting the ties in the piano score, more clarity was added to the start of the new phrase from bar 81 of the new version, and an obvious shift from thin “musical drama” to clearly styled “pure music” was achieved. (More details are mentioned later, **Main Revision Points, Reference 16**).

In the existing version, some of the music from the “First Draft” composed in order to take advantage of the drama remains, and here we understand the thinly veiled attempt to show consideration for transforming the music into a “Symphonic poem” in its own right.

Regarding this, in the fourth draft, in addition to the previously mentioned changes, the transformations described below show

heavily the move from incidental music to independent symphonic poem.

2. The repeated sections of **123 (new version)** were divided into 1st and 2nd volta, and fresh ideas were added (mentioned later). Thanks to this, when the piece is repeated from the start, the links between the dynamics for the second time through have been improved. (**Main Revision Points, Reference 24**)
3. **199~ (new version)**; Following the piano score, the syncopation has been adjusted to match the rhythm of the coda section. This had not been adopted into the orchestra score until now, and until now the piece has not been performed with this rhythm, so with this revised version his final intentions are being adopted for the first time. (Note 5)
4. **201 (new version)**; as already mentioned.
 - a. At the 1900 Paris Expo, only the coda at the end was revised, and under the string ensemble with its distinctive syncopation, the main theme was reproduced wholly with a brass ensemble with a slightly faster tempo.
 - b. However, as the main tempo was too fast and also too long, in the next year, 1901, when the first version (present version) was published, by changing the standard of the notes from quarter notes to half notes under the syncopation of the same stringed instruments, the main tempo was halved (made slower), and the musical motif was shortened to 1/6.
 - c. He was obsessed with the tempo until the end, and as the tempo of the above-mentioned current version is too light, in this final version the 2/2 time signature of the first version has been returned to 4/4. In order to make this part, which has been performed as **allegro**, even slower and heavier, **pesante** has been written above bar 202 (new version). As a result, the tempo of the music in the coda has effectively become 3 or 4 times slower than when the piece was performed at the Paris Expo, and it has become a piece which is rounded out with an imposing profoundness.

(**Main Revision Points, Reference 38**)

5. **Errors in intervals** ; The **TrIII** that comes on the upbeat of the 4th beat of bar 116 in the new version.

(**Main Revision Points, Reference 23**)

6. It is printed as is in the existing version. As well as mistakes from the time of the first performance owing to Sibelius's own carelessness, there are also errors in phrasing and dynamics owing to mistakes by the copyist, as well as the previously mentioned failure to distinguish between the **>** and **dim** symbol. In the various places in the existing version where marks representing nuances in the music are incorrect and where problems with integrity of the bars exist, corrections have been made to this completed piano score.

Namely in this piano score, the arrangements are not merely designed to be orchestral pieces played on the piano, important new musical additions have been made to each place, and furthermore it has been completed beautifully through countless small and large modifications. We can truly say that this is a revised, newly published Symphonic poem “Finlandia” quite different to the existing version.

Through these changes, from the point of view of this piano score, the Symphonic poem “Finlandia” speaks both as an orchestra piece and a piano piece, and shows the composers latest and final intentions.

Existing State

Similar to that mentioned above, this final version summarized Sibelius's feelings, but the B.&H. Company did not understand his intentions. As it kept being published as a piano score, the real meaning of this latest version has not been especially acknowledged by people since, and the version used up until now became the final orchestra version of the Symphonic poem “Finlandia”—the final version did not see the light of day.

In this way, even if it is a historically important piece of music and even if the composer requests it, due to various circumstances, it is difficult to modify a piece that has already been published during the composer's lifetime. At the time, the composer could not help but give his approval to the published score itself.

And even in the case of these new critical editions, which fortunately have been published with the errors corrected, it has often taken more than a century or even longer to reach this point.

Let alone in the case of this piece, even though the revised version showed a high degree of attention to the composer's last intentions, it started with the orchestra score being published in the form of a piano score, and Sibelius, like the composers of other famous pieces mentioned above, could only content himself with one printed version of his first version. I'll introduce an anecdote that demonstrates this.

When the B.&H. Company decided to newly publish a small-scale score in 1930, even though he was already a famous composer he

was told nothing about this and the B.&H. Company moved forward with things at their own pace.

When this information reached him in December of the same year, he wrote a letter to the B.&H. Company asking them to at least add M.M.=104 to the part of the music which was continually being med too slow. Unfortunately, however, two months before in October of the same year, the first edition had already been printed as it was.

This fact tells us vividly the difficulty in getting the improved version of the music published, even if the request came from a famous composer.

Exactly the same circumstances can also be seen with Rossini. He also lived a long life, but in the second half of it his musical output was of little note, so they have a lot in common. Both were sufficiently prominent composers, yet due to inadequacies in the musical scores they left behind and despite differences to their own intentions being present in many places in their music, they both found that their publishers were reluctant to correct these errors.

In the late 20th century, a century after the death of Rossini, the composer Albert Zedda finally noticed a myriad of important errors in Rossini's work. Initially, publishers were squarely opposed to his suggestions, but after recognizing the importance of the matter, they were led to issue a corrected version of his many works.

This feat happened precisely because Zedda was a composer rather than a scholar. Now, after nearly half a century has passed, the famous opera houses of the world are currently starting to revise some of the errors which have been present for more than a century.

To the younger Sibelius, the chance may now finally have come in similar circumstances. But various obstacles must still be confronted and overcome. This new edition is an opportunity due to a number of conductors who know the current situation, and these devoted conductors are expected to make their own contributions.

The Guiding Principles of the Revision

Through the objectives below, the present revised edition reflects the earnest feelings of Sibelius that were not incorporated into the first edition of the score.

1. Regarding the many mistakes from the existing version which are thought to have been a result of carelessness, corrections have been made in the appropriate places on the score, based on this final corrected hand-written piano score.
2. By understanding Sibelius's writing habits, many of the mistakes that are common to his work due to sight errors by the copyist can be corrected, such as the distinction between \gt and **dim.** and also the places where \gt is used.
3. In order to transform the piece from "incidental music" to "Symphonic poem", important modifications entrusted by the piano score (reference: transition of "Fourth Draft" score) were newly added to the appropriate places on the score.

Thanks to this, it has been possible to release to the world the final version of the "Symphonic poem" that was completely removed from the 'incidental music', but is now available for the first time in its original form for orchestras. This is the main aim of this revised version. (Note 1).

It should be noted that in the text, where descriptions go into very specific details, information is written elsewhere as endnotes (notes), or in the text in somewhat small font.

When I reflect on finding out about this finished version, it becomes apparent to everyone that the version that has been played until now was just an intermediate draft. Up until this point, for both composer and musicians there was a large gap between this version and musical perfection.

Before reading about each revision

- 1) (A) describes Sibelius's hand-written final version made for the publication of the single-piano version in 1905.
(B) describes the existing version of the score based on the B.&H. Company's version currently in circulation.
(C) describes individual parts from the first performance that form the basis of the first version and that were used since the time of the first performance of the "incidental music" to the time of the publication of the first version (=B), including the musicians' individual hand-written notes from that time.
- 2) The marks surrounded by brackets in the score represent one of the following:
 1. It is not written in the parts from the first performance, but it is necessary in order to increase the actual effect of the performance. I have added them believing them to be in line with Sibelius's original intentions.
 2. Things written in (B) or (C) of which the significance is noted, but are not written in (A).
- 3) As this new version removes bar 77 (B) copied from (A), the following number of bars is shortened by one bar each. Because of this, the following number of bars is indicated by the word 'New' followed by the bar number in the form 'New**'.

- 4) The use of \gt is a mistake that is common to all editions.

* In notes with tied syncopation that straddles bars, where a \gt is attached to the first note and then an attempt is made to play the music, in many cases Sibelius attaches the \gt symbol to the next note rather than the first note where it should be. When the tied notes start with halved notes, he starts writing the notation from the right end of those notes or in extreme cases, more than one note later. He also has a tendency to write horizontally elongated \gt symbols (which resembles **dim.** symbol) about one or two beats into the next bar when the notes are tied together. This is the root of many misunderstandings. (Reference 15)

* Sibelius's \gt was, as mentioned above, exceptionally long and looks similar to the **dim.** symbol. Even when short, their horizontal length was more than 1cm, and it is not rare to see some \gt symbols that were longer than the bar itself. It is not too much to say that there were no \gt symbols written normally.

Because of this, difficulty in judging the differences between **dim.** and \gt is a familiarity of his writing habit. Thorough musical examination of an individual sense must be made. (Unfortunately, the \gt symbols that appear in his symphonies are also hard to distinguish, and many have ended up being left as **dim.** symbol instead. It is still a basis for incorrect performances today.)

Furthermore, these mistakes in judgment from the published piano score based on the handwritten piano score from 1905 were one of the major points for revision.

For the publication of this new version, we owe much to the Finland researchers Timo Virtanen, Masaru Kanbe and Ken Inoue. I thank them from the bottom of my heart.

Main Revision Points

Following are just the major examples of the numerous corrections.

- 1) 1-4; at (C), **Trb III** has the same tone as the Tuba. However, it was omitted by mistake when the score was created from the parts of the premiere score and it is a blank. During the publication, this blank was filled with a rest by the revisionist, who did not know the circumstances.
- 2) 5-8 ; **ff**→**f**
The contrast is clearly written, and the first 9 bars of (A) are **f**, and then it is **ff** until bar 21. **fz** (C) is written for the **Tim** in 8.
- 3) Between bars 8 and 9; in (B), the **tr** of **Tim** end, and in bar 9 it is written to start again. However, this is just a notation mistake because in (A) and (C) the **tr** is not broken. Also, in bar 9 there is a **dim.** symbol (A).
- 4) Between bars 9 and 10; **Tim.** starts with **dim.** from the beginning of bar 9 and cuts once before the music enters the following bar (in (A), there is a clear fermata between bars 9 and 10), and then all parts begin a new phrase in **ff** (A). The fermata written in bar 9 of (B) and (C) is not written in (A), therefore it is marked with parentheses.
- 5) 17-21; In (B), all parts have \gt in 21 only, but in (C), it is not written at all, except for in some of the parts.
However, in (A), \gt is used on all notes in these 5 bars, so we followed this. Also, in (C), bar 17 in the score of **Hr III** has been rewritten from **G**→**Bb**, so the conductor's instructions are followed when considering the balance between parts during rehearsals.
- 6) 23; In (A) all parts have whole notes, so we followed this.
- 7) 29; In (A) the woodwind instruments have half notes + half rests. The **Tim** has a **dim.** symbol for the whole bar. The **p** written in (B) is missing here.
- 8) 30-37; There is a **cresc.** symbol for the string instruments between 30 and 35 and \gt in (B) and (C), but they are missing in (A) and all \gt are in parentheses. Also, there was no \gt in any of the parts in bar 36, but (\gt) was added. Its adoption is left to the conductor. The **dim.** symbol written to **Vn** and **Vc** in bar 35 of (B) is mistaken as \gt in (C).
The **meno f** in 37 is due to (A).
- 9) 35; In (C), there are copied parentheses and an \gt on the 1st beat of the **Fg**, **Hr** and string instruments, so we adopted them. In (B), the **cresc.** symbol in **Hr III** just happened to be a mistake when it was copied from (C), so it was erased.
- 10) 39, 41, 43; The **f** in **Vc**, which is written in (B) and (C) is missing in (A), so we removed it because it is not necessary.
- 11) 40-43; All \gt in the scores are in (A), and they are adopted because there is no problem with consistency with other parts. The **dim.** symbol in bar 40, which was written in (B) is actually the incorrectly read \gt , which was written in (C).
- 12) 44-46; The \gt for strings comes from (C), and the **ten.** comes from (A). The **dim.** symbol in **Hr** and strings in bars 44 and 46 of (B) is a mistaken reading of \gt .
- 52-53; The **ten.** in the brass and the **f** on each beat are not in conflict with (A) and are written in (B) and (C) as well, so they were adopted.

The **ten.** in the strings in bar **54** of **(B)** is missing in **(A)** and **(C)**, therefore it was a mistake and it was erased.

Note that in the entire piece, when the wavy lines on the **tr** in **Tim** are broken, it means an attack on the next beat (bar).

13} 46–57; In this new edition, we adopted the dynamics and **espr.** symbols in **(C)**. That is because unlike the existing version **(B)**, we understood Sibelius's intention at the time of the premiere.

Considering **(C)**, we believe that the intention of the **cresc.** symbols in bars **46** and **54** in the **Cl** and **54** in the **Ob** in the original is to focus on the new phrase in the **Ob** and **Cl** and to swap the previous phrase while the other parts complete it by **dim.**, and to replay it **espr.** from the following bar.

Also, the expression marks in **46–49** and **54–57** look the same, but the position of the symbol for **dim.**, **espr.** and the way the phrasing slur is placed are different. It depends on the conductor whether to use the final version **(A)**, which does not include detailed instructions, or **(C)**, which includes more detailed instructions, to express such subtle differences.

14} 55–61; In **(C)** and **(B)**, symbols for **cresc.**, **dim.**, **cresc.**, **dim.**, and again **cresc.** are clearly marked in each bar after **55**. Indeed, it was performed like that at the time of the first version. However, in the final version **(A)**, all those dynamics were removed and naturally, it was changed to one large phrase.

Regardless that the changes in dynamics written in **(C)** and **(B)** can be expressed well when using the piano score **(A)**, the meaning of removing them from the final score **(A)** to configure a large phrase is significant.

15} 62–73; *Correction of errors in the score We have given these examples several times:

1. > is read as the **dim.** symbol by mistake
2. Unaware of the way Sibelius wrote > (he often wrote > to the right of the actual notes) > was placed on different notes. (See the examples in the hand-written score written at the bottom of the page with the color chronological table).

Most of these mistakes occurred when the copyists were copying the part scores for the premiere **(C)** and then they were taken over to **(B)**. As a result, dynamics symbols which were quite different from what Sibelius intended remained in the score until today.

There are > on the second beat of **63** and **67** in **(B)** and **(C)**, but they are just a typical example of misreading.

Usually, when long notes are linked with a tie across the bar and the first note is performed with >, the > is placed above (or below) the first note.

However, as in this example and for the same purpose, Sibelius had a habit of placing long and narrow > on the very right side of the note where it was supposed to be placed originally, or a long > similar to **dim.** on the **first ~ second beat** of the following bar. This was his unique style of writing > at the beginning of the first long note.

However, in many cases it has been misunderstood and the copyists placed > 1 or 2 beats after the original place, or the **dim.** symbol.

*Idea for the performance, in order to express Sibelius's intentions.

In the new edition, all placements of the > have been corrected, but some new ideas may be needed in order to accurately represent Sibelius' intentions during performance.

Following Sibelius's true intentions, this time we have shown the difference between the clear dynamics that Sibelius intended by the new > on the half notes at the beginning of the ties in bars **62** and **66**, and on the contrary, the > which until now were placed on the half notes of the following bar by mistake have been erased for the first time.

The idea is that usually, the half notes at the beginning of the ties are played with a down-bow, and the half notes in the following bar, whose > were erased, are played softly with up-bow.

However, with this bowing, if you try to play softly, the note on the following beat is played again strongly with a down-bow, the bow has to be returned with up-bow in one stroke from the tip to the frog. Therefore, these half notes become strong, and the dynamics may reverse.

The only way to prevent this is to play the half notes with > at the beginning of the ties in bars **62** and **66** strongly with a down-bow, and to continue playing the next half notes with a down-bow from the position of the bow which you have finished playing (i.e. the tip of the bow) without returning the bow.

With this method, the half notes will become soft and clear and a clear dynamic contrast will be obtained. We do not see another way to properly represent the differences between the dynamics intended by Sibelius.

In order to indicate this method in the score, the symbol for down-bow and punta d'arco (on the tip of bow) are enclosed in

parentheses on the second beat of bars **63** and **67**, and another dotted tie indicating that the bow should not be returned to the frog was added in parentheses. This is the desperate idea of a conductor struggling in this field.

In addition, the dynamics symbols on the **second beat** of bar **62**, which were placed inconsistently for each string instrument in **(C)**, were copied from **(A)** and became **f** and >. Similarly, **più f** and > on the **second beat** of bar **66**, and **ffz** and > on the second beat of bar **70** were copied from **(A)** to all parts. Also, in order to convey Sibelius's intention without misunderstanding, **f**, which had been omitted, was added to all parts in bars **64** and **65**, and **piu** was added in parentheses to the **f** in bars **68** and **69**, just in case.

16} 74–81 (Existing version); Among all modified places in the new version, this place has especially great significance.

The process and changes in the newest version of the "Symphonic poem", which Sibelius showed in **(A)**, are already described in detail in paragraph 1 in the "Fourth Draft". In addition to those, here we are giving additional descriptions of the corrected sections based on other evidence.

Initially, in these 8 bars, the low instruments played **f**. There were instructions added during practice and the **cresc.** symbol was written for 4 bars from the fifth bar by each player. Also, there was a **dim.** symbol from the third or fourth bar toward the fifth bar, and **mf** in the fifth bar to decrease the dynamics.

The proof of the fact that they were made during rehearsals are the different handwritings present in each part, the presence or absence of symbols for **dim.**, bars where they begin vary, and the difference in the written contents due to each player's understanding, etc.

The **cresc.** should start after a gradual attenuating of the dynamics in order to increase the performance effect of the second half.

Writing these dynamics is highly effective for enhancing the performance effect and they were adopted in this new version because they also reflect Sibelius's will. From the new **78**, the following two points, i.e. "spread the range width rapidly in octaves which begin from extremely low bass" and "play with maximum **cresc.** effect", were indicated for the first time in **(A)** as innovative efforts and important means in order to modify the "Symphonic poem".

1. In **78**, the **Cb** only takes the low tones that the **Vc** cannot play.
2. In order to further increase the timbre and sound intensity, 2 bars after that I added **Va**, which did not exist in either **(B)** nor **(C)** by my judgment.

This significantly increased the range width and I believe the effect in **(A)** has been expressed as Sibelius intended.

Adoption of this means is left to the conductor's discretion after full understanding of the author's intention. (For conductors who prefer the version with bracketed notes, they are also included as small bracketed notes in each part.)

As incidental music **(C)**, may be in relationship with the play, the music between the new bars **80** and **81** was performed without break. In **(A)**, the pedal at the end of the new bar **80** is off so that the sound may break once, and this is one of the highlights in the innovation of the "Symphonic poem". In order to employ this effect in performance, (') is added between the new bars **80** and **81** in the new version.

With this treatment, the new bar **81**, which was not important in the "incidental music", became the beginning of a new phrase (introduction phrase), using the one from the premiere as "incidental music" before the revision in a lively **Allegro moderato**, and with this tempo the new phrase began effectively. In **(C)**, on the last ♯ of bar **74** of **Tim.** there is **fz**.

In bar **78**, considering the balance with **Cb**, I chose (**mp**) for **Fg, Tuba, Tim.**

17} New 81–93; Presence and position of slurs, symbols for **cresc.**, erasure of **piu** in **piuf**, and presence of **fz** and **ten.** were corrected in accordance with **(A)**.

Also, due to a mistake in the number of bars when copying the **Tim.** part for the premiere, in the current edition **(B)**, the new bar **88** (rehearsal number **E**) in the **Tim.** part has only been shifted forward by 1 bar.

Naturally, the score reproduced from the **Tim.** part has also been shifted. It became a good score, which makes sense, after the corrections in the new bars **88, 89, 92, 93**, as well as in dynamics directions.

18} New 94–97; The **Tim.** which are playing alone until the first beat of **New 93–94** have been made **dim.** and on the first beat of **94** play **p**. Also, all parts starting from the **second beat** start in **p**. In **(A)**, there is > instead of **fz** on the **second beat** of the new **94**. However, it is quite difficult to make an effective **cresc. molto** during 4 bars, as requested in the score, when they begin with > or (**fz**) in **p**. Therefore, I shifted the beginning of **cresc.** one bar to the right.

M.M=104, which was written in the new **94**, is a mistake of the new **131**.

- 19) **New 98~105, 110**; The **third** and **fourth** beats in **Vn, Va** in bars **98, 102, and 110** were corrected based on **(A)**. All unifications and changes related to the presence of other slurs, dynamics changes, > and **ten.**, as well as the **third** beat of the **Fl** in **99** were done following the theoretical consistence of **(A)**.
- 20) **New 106~119**; In the new **106** in **(A)**, there is a handwritten **marcattissimo**. In **(A)**, all other symbols for **cresc.** and dynamics changes are present consistently, so the **Vc** and **Cb** in the new **109** follow the ideas of **(A)**. Notes, etc. were added and major changes were made following (A), in order to unify the phrasing of **Vn** from the **third** beat in the new **110** to the **first** beat of **111** and the phrasing of **Vn, Va, Vc, and Fl** from the new **111** to **113**. There are big differences between it and (B) and (C), but priority was given to the 'final decision' of Sibelius.
- 21) **New 107**; The note played by **Cb** in this bar is undoubtedly **C**. Some conductors instruct them to play **H**, which is the same as **Vc**, because **C** conflicts with **H** and it is a mistake. However, in **(A)**, **C** and **H** are written together on the left hand many times, and now it is **C** in all materials.
- 22) **New 114~119**; > is added on the first weak beat of the syncopation in **Vn, Va, Tr** in **(A)**.
- 23) **New 116**; The pitch of the last ♯ in **Tr III**, the note **As (B) and (C)** is incorrect. **G (A)** is correct.
- 24) **New 123**; The intention shown in **(A)** was selected (the first time uses **cresc.** from the **third** beat and returns to the new **98**, and when going to new **124** after the repetition, uses **dim.** from the **third** beat). Therefore, following **(A)**, it was divided into 1st and 2nd Volta.
- 25) **New 126**; In **(C)**, **Tr, Trb** start from this bar in **p** and have **cresc.** It is written that the strings and other parts that continue **cresc.** from the previous bar must have already reached **f** at that time and should continue the **cresc.** However, in **(A)**, the dynamic until the previous bar is **molto cresc.** and once it has reached the peak **fz**, it drops immediately to **meno f** and escalates to a maximum **cresc.**
In this new edition, which synthesizes them, the former starts in **p** as written in **(C)**, and the latter is tailored to the dynamics of **(A)**.
- 26) **New 128**; **fff** was adopted in accordance with **(A)** and **meno moderato** was adopted in accordance with **(C)**.
- 27) **New 131~177**; In 1930, in a letter to B.&H., Sibelius sent a request to add **M.M.=104** in the margin on 131 of the score, so that the hymn does not get too slow. As I already mentioned in the field regarding the current state, as a result, it was not adopted at the time. Yet, in the edition on the market today it has been written by mistake in 94.
Also, in accordance with **(A)**, **131 mf⇒p**, new **140⇒mf**, new **148⇒f**, new **152⇒f**, and other staccato, tenuto, slurs, symbols for **cresc.** and **dim.**, are present and as a result of following Sibelius's final intention **(A)** we have a very consistent tune. **Poco Allegro** follows **(C)**.
- 28) **New 155~**; The second phrase in the strings and **Cl, Fg** in **(A)** is **forte assai**, and compared to the first phrase, which is performed beautifully and cantabile, it transcends the changes in the poor dynamics. To show a contrast along with the accompaniment, it has been changed to powerful **forte**, which appeals to the freedom and patriotism of Finnish people. As a result, in **(C)**, **pp** in the big drum was changed to **mp**.
In this version, however, taking into account the effect of the orchestra, it is marked as **mf**.
As for the choral, it is advisable to determine whether the dynamics in 1st and 2nd volta should be the same, as well as the dynamics of the strings.
In the new **154**, in order to increase the performance effect, **cresc.**, like in the **Cb**, was added to **Vn II** and **Va (C)**.
This is not Sibelius's instruction, but please note that the slur for bowing in **Vn I** and **Vc** from the new **155 (B)**, has significant meaning for the performers and music, so it was left in parentheses.
- 29) **New 146 - Woodwinds, New 170 - Vn I and Vc**; There are **dim.** symbols written in **(A)**, and **cresc.** symbols written in **(B) and (C)** (instructions by the conductor during rehearsals). Neither of them can be ignored, so two conflicting symbols are placed as they are deliberately, and the final decision is in the hands of the conductor when building the phrase.
- 30) **New 173**; The quarter note **G** on the **fourth** beat in **Va** is actually an eighth note on the **fourth** weak beat, the same as **165 (A)**.
- 31) **New 178~181**; Dynamics changes every **2 bars** basically follow the idea of **(C)**, and the other parts also are analogous thereto. In other words, I have placed **piùf** in **180**. In **(A)**, the other parts that begin from **181** have **f**, and in **(C)** they have **ff**. This meaning is scarce, so in order to have consistency, I changed it to **piùf**.
Also, the **Ob, Cl, Vn I** parts in the new **178** are changed following **(A)**. A whole note is added as a final note and > is added, the same as in **177**. The whole note in **Vn II** is divided into 1/16 notes the same as in the previous bar, and > is added similarly to the other parts. Following **(C)**, I added **ten.** to the **Fg** and **Tuba**.
- 32) **New 181, 182**; The rhythm and tune changes in the **Fl, Ob, Cl** are based on **(A)**.
- 33) **New 182~185**; The strings here and the brass after new **183** are corrected in the same manner as new **110~114 (A)**. However, after the **ff** in **183** comes **f**, not **mf**.
- 34) **186~**; Dynamics at the beginning of new **186** is **mf**, and after that all parts have **cresc. (A)**. The > in new **186~** in **Vn, Va** and in all parts in new **191, 192** and the **dim.** in the **Tim.** in new **188** is based on **(A)**.
- 35) **New 196~198**; The rhythm changes in **Fl, Ob, Cl, Vn, Va** are based on **(A)**. The **fourth** beats in **Tr** and **Trb** are **ffz**.
- 36) **New 199, 200**; There is a significant correction based on (A). See (Note 5)
- 37) **New 201**; According to **(C)**, initially, the half notes in the wind instruments in this bars were in **ff**. But during rehearsals, in order to make the syncopation in the strings more conspicuous, **dim.** symbol and **p** were added after that **ff**.
Originally, these corrections must have been utilized properly in the first edition **(B)**, because it was created by copying the parts. However, for some reason, there is neither **ff** nor **dim.** on the first beat. There is only **p (B)**.
From various materials, it is obvious that this was not Sibelius's intention.
Also, in the piano version **(A)**, the whole notes are in **ff**, which seems to be the best from a musical point of view, but considering the corrections in the balance between the strings in the orchestra version **(C)**, this version was adopted because it demonstrates Sibelius's real intention.
- 38) **New 202~**; As was already mentioned in section 4 of the "Fourth Draft", as a result of changing the tempo to **Pesante**, the music in the coda has become 3 or 4 times slower and heavier than the Paris Expo version, and it has become a hymn which is rounded out with an imposing profoundness.
Although he made the tempo of the hymn twice slower (quarter notes→half notes) when he revised the 2nd draft to make the 3rd draft (current edition), he could not throw away the syncopation, which the stringed instruments play continuously, and performed it with 'the same sound, pitch, and tempo' as it was.
However, in the "Fourth Draft", when the music is played in **Pesante**, his favored distinctive syncopated accompaniment inevitably gets slower and heavier, and the flavor of the accompaniment is lost completely.
So, in order to achieve his new hope to 'perform the theme of the hymn with imposing profoundness in **Pesante**' as well as to present his adherence to 'continuous syncopated accompaniment, which is full of unique tension' that he carried from the very beginning, he "halved the note units (1/4 notes→1/8 notes, 1/8 notes→1/16 notes)."
Through this, despite the basic tempo which has become heavier and slower, the accompaniment tempo is similar or has become somewhat faster than before, and as a result, the feeling of tension is higher. With this imposing and dignified tempo, it concludes with a loud voice celebrating independent Finland.
On the other hand, significant differences may occur between the syncopation before the bar with **Pesante** (new 201) and after the basic tempo becomes slow by **Pesante**, as well as between the tempo and the syncopation after reducing the length of the above-mentioned notes to half. Also, it depends a lot on the tempo which the conductor chooses for **Pesante**, so infinite varieties of possible tempos may be expected.
Therefore, if you have performed it with the former score, on the first beat of the new 202 (**Pesante**), an unexpected collision in the syncopation is inevitable due to the two different tempos. In order to avoid this moment of unnatural and unmusical tempo fall, the first and second beat in the strings in this bars is changed to tremolo, as in the piano version, to serve as a metrical buffer for this change.
The tempo fall is absorbed during the tremolo and from the third beat of this bar, the new syncopation takes over the advantages of accompaniment of the second and third draft as they are, making it possible to seamlessly enter into the new tempo **Pesante**.
Depending on the conductor, following the instructions of **Pesante**, it is very likely the tempo of the hymn will become twice as slow, similar to the revisions from the second to the third draft. In that case, it may be a good idea to change the unit of note syncopation from the first beat rather than the above-mentioned third beat. Therefore, I wrote 2 versions in the score and parts, which the conductor can choose from as **ossia** (or).
In addition, in order to produce an imposing theme effect even in a slow tempo, cymbals were added to the backbeat of the music in

some places, and the rhythm section, which provides more dynamism, was added to the backbeat of the woodwind instruments based on the piano score. In addition, from this point until the second beat of the new **207**, > and tenuto were added to all notes except for those with slurs.

39) Third beat of the new 204 to the second beat of 205: The partial changes in the syncopation in the strings were made by referring to his final handwritten piano score.

40) New 210-: According to (A), Sibelius strongly hoped the bass parts in the last 4 bars would end up lowering **As** → **Es** → **As**. In order to show his intention, he wrote (**fff**) in **Trb II and III**. Its adoption is left to the conductor.

Note 1) As incidental music, the parts that have been composed as sound effects in order to support the stage became meaningless when the play became a "Symphonic poem". Similarly, the tempo indications set to match the stage movements did not make sense without a stage. Therefore, these changes were essential in order to become entirely independent and distinguished from the incidental music.

Note 2) That the reorganization is made just before the Expo is evident from the following facts.

If you see the existing **Trb III** part from the premiere, the player has signed the date and his name at the end of the coda of the 1st draft as a record of the public performance on April 2, 1900.

If the long coda of the 2nd draft had been created by that day, the signature must have been after that coda, and it is unthinkable that the player would have signed the 1st draft after the coda had been erased with slashes.

Here are explained the parts used those days, which will play an important role in future verification. Including the Expo, the parts created as "incidental music" were used frequently until the new parts were published the following year.

The situation becomes clear by verifying the existing parts from those days. In other words, the coda that was changed twice due to certain circumstances (see next section), the first change was for the Expo, and the second was just before publication the following year (end of February 1901). Both of them were erased with slashes (surface erasure, so the original score could be read) and the newly written music was added after the erased coda in additional staves.

Note 3) Specific examples of tempo symbol changes:

For the Finnish people, who were suffering from Russian domination, in order to show the bright future of Finland through this "incidental music", the figure of the steam engine recently-introduced to Finland, which was one of the symbols of hope at that time, has been depicted at the beginning of the finale (now Finlandia).

Here, the sound of the powerful departure of a steam engine ("Choo Choo...") is expressed with the finest sound and tempo (**Allegro moderato**).

However, in March 1901, some parts were changed and the first edition of the score was published as an independent "Symphonic poem". The score was the same, but in order to change the sense the music gave, the tempo of 'the theme of people who suffer from Russian oppression' was changed to the appropriately-dignified for that theme **Andante sostenuto** (in the public performance on February 28, this change had not been made yet).

This oppressive part continues until **73**, and from **74** the scene changes and it returns to fast **Allegro moderato** as in the first draft expressing the hope and the fight for it, which was the original idea. It enters the new **81** and for the first time after becoming a "Symphonic poem", the theme of the steam engine departure appears in the tempo from the premiere (**Allegro moderato**) and along with the theme of "appeal to a fight" in the brass instruments, it brings the first half to a climax.

Based on (A), in this revised edition from **74**, **Allegro moderato** is changed into a slightly faster **Allegro assai**. In other words, the "steam engine departure" in the introduction of the "incidental music" during the premiere had been performed powerfully at the tempo of the current new **81**. In addition, the introduction in the 1905 piano edition is in **Andante** and there are also a few other differences from the first draft (1899) as well as in the tempo directions.

Note 4) Lack of time for revision work

Sibelius went on a long journey with his family from fall 1900, and in February – March 1901, just before the publishing of the first edition, he was in Italy concentrating on preparations for composing Symphony No. 2.

As a result, he could not spare sufficient time for revision work on the "Symphonic poem". In addition, the publisher was in distant Finland and he was unable to check the draft before it was first published, so he had to publish it in an incomplete state.

Note 5) The results of this revision are significant, but it is not a new idea in particular. It has already been used repeatedly in other parts, and I returned it to the rhythm with the original syncopation, which is a feature of this music. The reason why this syncopation has not been used in this bar until now is as follows.

In other words, syncopation has not been used at all in the coda of the first draft, and all parts had a simple movement of whole notes and half notes. Therefore, Sibelius must have thought that in order to enter smoothly into this simple rhythm, for the two transition bars, all parts, except for the **Cymb.**, should play a simple uniform rhythm, rather than syncopation.

The rhythm in the coda after the "Second Draft" returned to the conventional syncopation, so the rhythm in these 2 bars should have been returned to syncopation as was done in the other parts.

After publishing the first edition, he noticed that fact, and then for the first time he returned it to the original syncopation in the piano version.

Note 6) Dahlström's catalog of Sibelius's works

Not limited to Finlandia, this catalog plays a very important encyclopedia role in the study of Sibelius's works, and it is a must-read book for all researchers. However, as always in these kinds of books, it is difficult to say that all the facts above are correct, and their identification is also an essential requirement for the researchers.

Note 7) The 1900 edition of the piano score for "Finlandia" does not exist, while there is only one version of the 1905 latest version in existence.

In the above-mentioned catalog, the piano score was first published by the F.&W. Company in fall 1900 (November?). The publishing rights were then bought by the B.&H. Company in 1905, and in the same year it was republished by the same company and has been until now.

Even amongst the researchers, who approach this catalog with full confidence, this cornerstone theory is still widely believed.

However, this theory was completely mistaken. Furthermore, the erroneous theory had also become a major factor preventing the emergence of a new critical edition.

[The basis for error in the above-mentioned Dahlström catalog]

On page 114 of Dr. Dahlström's catalog, there is mention of the piano score being published in November 1900. However, there is no unique number attached to the work as is normal, and in the date column only the vague 'fall 1900' is written in brackets. In other words, the evidence is not clear.

Furthermore, according to that catalog, a handwritten version of the newly-published piano score was in existence and the music's reference number was 0843.

However, if we assume that to be correct, the contents of the music 0843 must be the same as that published in fall 1900, namely the same as that played at the piece's premiere, minus the coda mentioned above.

Even so, that content is far from that of fall 1900, and after that the contents of the first edition were revised and published in March 1901 and the new content was fully added, the piano score published in 1905 is, in other words, according to my classification, the latest draft ("Fourth Draft"). 0843 is also the number attached to the handwritten "Fourth Draft", and is not unique to the 1900 version.

Also in this catalog, the expression mark written over the opening 6 bars of the piano score published in 1900 is **Andante**, but just as this symbol is published on the opening page [Flow in the Development of Finlandia], at the time of fall 1900, it was **Allegro moderato**. By looking at this table, everything becomes clear.

Even this catalog, which could be called the bible for Sibelius researchers, must in this sense take a large part of the blame in regards to the description of this section.

Note 8) This piano score is still published by the B.&H. Company, but during the production process, quite a few differences arose between the handwritten piano score and the published version.

- * The fermata written between bars **9~10** is not present.
- * Due to a lack of understanding of Sibelius's writing habits, between bars **62~70** there is some confusion between the > and **dim.** symbols and their locations.
- * Over the **2 and a half bars** from bar **77**, the meaningfully long-written **cresc. possibile** is shown, but it is written in the normal way ending just with bar **77**.
- * The **fz** on the **fourth beat** of bar New **83** has become **f**.
- * The > on the second beat in bar New **94** is missing.
- * In bars New **131~134** and the four bars after that, the slurring and staccato etc., must be equal.
- * Errors in the phrasing (slurs) in bar New **207**.