

One-Movement Form in the Chamber Music of Heino Eller, Eduard Tubin, and Eduard Oja

Aare Tool

In the present article, three chamber works written in the 1920s and 1930s will be analysed: Heino Eller's (1887–1970) First String Quartet (1925), Eduard Tubin's (1905–1982) Piano Quartet (1930), and Eduard Oja's (1905–1950) Piano Quintet (1935). In the first part of the article, I will explain, drawing on historical evidence, why these works can be considered as significant for their formal design in the Estonian context. In the second part, a comparative analysis of the works will be presented, the goal of which is to demonstrate the multitude of compositional options available within the boundaries of "one-movement form."

1. One-Movement Form and the "Tartu" School of Composers

There has been a long tradition of distinguishing two schools of composers in Estonia. Firstly, there was the "Tartu" school gathered around Heino Eller, the prominent composition teacher of the Tartu Higher Music School (the present official name of the institution being, significantly, the Heino Eller Music School of Tartu). His students from the late 1920s and early 1930s include Eduard Tubin, Eduard Oja, Alfred Karindi, Olav Roots, and Karl Leichter. In his later years, as professor of the Tallinn Conservatoire (the present-day Estonian Academy of Music and Theatre), Eller brought up, among many others, Arvo Pärt and Lepo Sumera. Secondly, there was the "Tallinn" school epitomised by Artur Kapp (1878–1952), the head of the composition faculty of the Tallinn Conservatoire in the 1920s and 1930s. Both Eller and Kapp, as typical of their generation, graduated from the St. Petersburg Conservatoire: Kapp in 1901, having studied composition with Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov, in addition to mastering the organ, and Heino

Eller in 1920 as a student of Vasily Kalafati, a former pupil of Rimsky-Korsakov.

Naturally, in comparing the "Tartu" and the "Tallinn" schools, some caution is due because the compositional practices within each are diverse enough to evade any attempt of making simple generalisations. In the critical reception of the "Tartu" school, modernist tendencies have generally been emphasised, whereas the "Tallinn" school has been associated with the more moderate trends, prevalent in the Estonian musical scene of that time. During the 1920s, Eller built his reputation of being the leading Estonian modernist – a label that in the second half of the 1930s was claimed by Eduard Tubin, especially with his Second Symphony (*Legendary*). Although the terms "modernist" and "impressionist" – another adjective widely applied to Eller by his contemporaries – had lost some of their previous pejorative connotations by the 1930s, the music of the "Tartu" school was still foil for fierce discussions.¹ In comparison to Eller (and even to Tubin), Oja was less known to the general public, and the majority of his most substantial works, including the Piano Quintet, were rediscovered and published only in the 1980s.

For their open-minded attitude towards the new ways of expression, Eller and his students formed a relatively well-defined circle of musically kindred spirits. Nevertheless, Eller, Tubin, and Oja produced few works related so explicitly in their concept as the three discussed in the present article. Eller's First String Quartet, Tubin's Piano Quartet, and Oja's Piano Quintet, all completed within a period of ten years (1925–1935), are not in the form of traditional three- or four-movement sonata cycles, but rather in one continuous movement. From the first half of the 19th

¹ According to Tubin's (2003: 138) retrospective assessments made in the 1950s and 1960s, Eller's music was considered to be ultra-modern and labelled as "French impressionism" – only because the more recent Western-European musical trends had virtually no impact on the Estonian musical scene in the 1920s, and there was little awareness that "French impressionism" had long been exceeded by Schoenberg, Hindemith, Bartók, and Stravinsky. Tubin (2003: 204) acknowledged to have been familiar with the music of Scriabin, Prokofiev, Stravinsky, Kodály, and, to a lesser degree, with Hindemith, while Schoenberg, Berg, Webern, and Shostakovich were almost unknown in Estonia in the 1930s.

century onwards, there had been an ever increasing tendency to use one-movement form in genres (piano sonata, instrumental concerto, etc.) that in the late 18th and early 19th centuries typically required a sonata cycle.

In the first half of the 19th century, two distinct routes were taken towards one-movement design: 1) in the earlier examples, such as Schubert's *Wanderer* Fantasy of 1822, an impression of continuity is created by thematically interrelating the movements, played *attacca*; 2) a further level of integration is achieved in some of Liszt's works, where the movements of the sonata cycle are incorporated into a higher-level formal paradigm, such as sonata form (or, more generally, ABA form).² Thus, the main difference between the "Schubertian" and "Lisztian" stages in the development of the one-movement cycle is the following: in the first case, the sonata cycle still functions as the highest level formal paradigm of the work, and other models (such as the sonata form) are instantiated in its movements as lower-level units. In the second case, however, ABA form (or any of its elaborated versions) is produced on the highest level, and the movements of the sonata cycle are instantiated within it as lower-level units. In both cases, the notion of "one-movement cycle," despite apparently an oxymoron, needs to be taken in the most literal sense: in those works, a greater level of integration is achieved than in the regular Viennese Classical sonata cycles, resulting in a greater continuity of musical "motion" (or "movement") throughout the piece.

Eller, Tubin, and Oja were practically the only Estonian composers to use one-movement form in their chamber music in the 1920s and 1930s.³ In instrumental concertos, however, one-movement cycles were somewhat more common. Lisztian one-movement form can be encountered in Artur Lemba's Second Piano Concerto

(1931), Artur Kapp's First Concerto for Organ and Orchestra (1934), Eller's Violin Concerto (1937, revised in 1964), and Tubin's Double Bass Concerto (1948). A similar pattern exists in the late 19th- and early 20th-century Russian music that must have had an important role in guiding Eller to the Lisztian practice. One-movement piano sonatas in the vein of Liszt's celebrated B minor Sonata were produced by Sergei Lyapunov (Op. 27) and Nikolai Medtner. Nevertheless, the majority of one-movement works represent the genre of instrumental concerto (again paying tribute to Liszt's two Concertos): Rimsky-Korsakov's Piano Concerto (1883; dedicated to the memory of Liszt in the 1886 edition); Alexander Glazunov's Violin Concerto (1904), Second Piano Concerto (1917), Cello Concerto (*Concerto Ballata*, 1931), and Alto Saxophone Concerto (1934); Prokofiev's First Piano Concerto (1912), etc. That list does not include Liszt-inspired symphonic works (overtures, symphonic poems, symphonic tableaux, etc.) in which one-movement design, either with or without cyclic implications, used to be the norm. To underline Liszt's influence on the Russian musical scene of the late 19th century, let us mention only one of the many programmatic one-movement orchestral works produced in that period: Mily Balakirev's symphonic poem *Tamara* (1883), dedicated "with the profoundest respect" to the Hungarian composer. In addition, impulses for exploring the possibilities of a one-movement design may have been given by several Finnish composers. One-movement form is used in, for example, Selim Palmgren's Second Piano Concerto *Virta* (*The River*) of 1913 (Salmenhaara 1996: 165–167), not to mention Jean Sibelius's tone poems, such as *En saga* (analysed in Wicklund 2014: 173–174).

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, one-movement form was used mainly in those genres in which Liszt himself had set the example, and

² One-movement cycles of both types have precursors in the second half of the 18th century. For example, in C. P. E. Bach's Symphony in E flat major Wq. 183 (*Allegro di molto – Larghetto – Allegretto*), the first two movements are performed *attacca*. Sonata form has been enhanced with cyclic implications in Mozart's Symphony (*Ouverture*) in G major KV 318; the development section is followed by an interpolated *Andante*, only after which a (partial) recapitulation is given. Thus, the emergence of one-movement cycles involved a reintroduction of the early-Classical procedures that had been excluded from the compositional vernacular by the early 19th century.

³ Eller's First String Quartet was preceded by his First Sonata for Violin and Piano in A minor (1922), a one-movement work in sonata form. In the critical reception of its first performance, the Sonata was likened to the first movement of a sonata cycle, and as the piece was found to be a "significant one," it was suggested that the "remaining" movements should be added in the future – an utterance that indicates how unexpected was the one-movement design as an alternative to the traditional sonata cycle (Humal 1987a: 166).

there are significantly few instances of it in string quartets and other works for chamber ensembles. This might have been, at least in part, due to the social function chamber music had in the 19th century. Because of its greater degree of integration, one-movement design often (but not always) results in a shorter duration of the work than traditional three- or four-movement sonata cycles (for example, the length of Tubin's Piano Quartet and Oja's Piano Quintet is a bit more than 15 minutes each – that is as much as only the first movement of César Franck's Piano Quintet). In the 19th century, when chamber music was performed in private and players gathered on an ad hoc basis for a special occasion, a shorter duration was not necessarily an advantage (Talbot 2001: 156). In the 1920s, the tendency to introduce concertante elements into chamber ensembles gave rise to numerous "chamber concertos." Those works, however, typically represent the neo-Baroque trends (Hindemith) and have much less, if anything at all, to do with the Lisztian one-movement paradigm (Mäkelä 1990: 76–78).

In the 1920s and 1930s, chamber music became one of the main vehicles for the most radical new musical developments. For its elaborate contrapuntal technique (analysed in Humal 1987b: 104–107), the First String Quartet is one of Eller's most boldly experimental works. Nevertheless, Eller rejected the idea of his Quartet being atonal: "It has very much to do with a central tone, which I occasionally leave and return to, but it is only at the end of the work that I really tackle it" (Humal 1987a: 101). When asked what aspects he paid most attention to in his chamber music, Eller responded: "form as such and a total independence of voices (linearity)" (Humal 1987a: 107). In few of his other works, if any, has the preoccupation with linear voice-leading been taken to such measures as in the First String Quartet. It is interesting to note that Eller never returned to the one-movement design in his later chamber music; all of his four subsequent string quartets (1931, 1945, 1953, and 1959) are composed as traditional multi-movement cycles. Therefore, the First String Quartet holds a rather unique place in his oeuvre.

In Oja's output, the Piano Quintet is equally unparalleled – his only large-scale work of chamber music and arguably one of his most representative pieces in general. Oja was the first in Estonia to extensively use the octatonic scale, a hallmark of Rimsky-Korsakov (Taruskin 2011: 174), early Stravinsky, Scriabin, Bartók, and several other composers of the early 20th century (Jurkowski 2005: 71–72; about the origin of that term in Berger 2002: 186–187). The Piano Quintet is one of his three octatonic works, the other two being the piano cycle *Vaikivad meeleolud* (*Silent Moods*) and a suite for cello and piano entitled *Ajatriilooja* (*Trilogy of Time*), all written in the first half of the 1930s.⁴ Thus, it can be considered as an eloquent example of how the use of one-movement form is in correlation with the other features innovative in the local musical scene.

Tubin's Piano Quartet came to being in 1928–1930 as a graduation work. Subsequently, his priorities were shifted in favour of other genres (symphony, instrumental concerto, and, in the late 1960s, opera), and in the relatively limited number of works for chamber ensembles produced in his later years, traditional sonata cycle was favoured (however, one-movement design was revisited in Tubin's Tenth Symphony of 1973). In the chamber music of the "Tartu" school, the preoccupation with one-movement form was a markedly period-specific phenomenon, and, considering its rarity, Eller was very likely the one responsible for ushering Tubin and Oja towards it.

2. Analytical Perspectives

The notion of one-movement form (or one-movement cycle) is informative mainly in speaking of works in which, due to their indicator of genre (sonata, quartet, quintet, concerto, etc.), a three- or four-movement sonata cycle would be expected by analogy with the Viennese Classical tradition, but a more integrated type of design is used instead. For the aforementioned "Lisztian" one-movement model, other terms have been proposed, one of the most recent ones being "two-dimensional form" introduced by Steven

⁴ The first piece (*Lento, con moto*) from *Silent Moods*, which is based on the pitches of only one transposition of the octatonic scale and contains no other tones, is particularly significant as an example of Oja's octatonic practice.

Vande Moortele (2009).⁵ Compared to “two-dimensional form,” one-movement form is a considerably wider term. It encompasses, in addition to the “two-dimensional” design, sonata cycles following the examples of Schubert’s *Wanderer* Fantasy and Schumann’s Fourth Symphony – which, according to Moortele (2009: 29, 37), come close to being “two-dimensional” – and single-movement works in sonata form, regardless of the explicitness (or implicitness) of the sonata cycle. The term “one-movement form” stands for a rhetorical function of deviating from the classical sonata cycle towards a greater degree of integration, and does not specify (apart from the exclusion of separated movements) how that goal is to be achieved.

2.1. Setting the Trend: Eller’s First String Quartet

Eller’s First String Quartet can be divided into two relatively independent but interrelated parts of approximately equal duration (10 minutes), played *attacca*, the first one (*Allegro assai*) encompassing bars 1–275 and the second one (*Presto scherzando*) bars 276–748 (Scheme 3a). The *Allegro assai* (in 3/4 time) is written in sonata form and accommodates an extensive *Andante sostenuto* interpolation (4/4), preceding the recapitulation. The *Presto scherzando* (6/8) is in ternary form, leading to a restatement of the primary theme of the first part (*Adagio molto espressivo*, 3/2), followed by a *Prestissimo* coda (2/4). Therefore, the aforementioned “Schubertian” and “Lisztian” models are combined in that work. The procedure of inserting a slow-movement episode within a developmental space of the sonata form was well known in the 18th century and subsequently became increasingly common as a means for enhancing the cyclic properties of a one-movement work (Hepokoski, Darcy 2006: 221). The *Allegro assai* is governed by the “Lisztian” paradigm, combining sonata form with the sonata cycle. In the work as a whole, the “Schubertian” paradigm, characterised by relatively self-contained (but interrelated)

movements and the absence of an overarching ABA form, comes to the fore.⁶

In the *Allegro assai*, the primary- and secondary-theme zones (bars 1–41 and 42–70) are not significantly differentiated in terms of character, the “secondary” function of the latter being only slightly underlined by the *poco sostenuto* and *dolce* indications. Furthermore, they are strongly interrelated, and the secondary theme results from a gradual thematic transformation. The main phrase (Scheme 1a) features descending triplets {B}, A}, G} and an appoggiatura figure {E, F}, resulting in an incomplete neighbouring tone figure {G, E, F} – a motivic cell that plays an important role in the forthcoming thematic material. In bars 14–15, an inversion of the main phrase occurs in the cello part (1b), extended in bars 22–26 by means of an {D, E}, C, B} figure. The thematic material of the secondary theme zone (1c) is produced by combining these figures.

The qualities of sonata form, obscured in the exposition (due to the lack of clearly differentiated primary- and secondary-theme zones), are further blurred in the developmental space by means of an extensive *Andante sostenuto* interpolation (bars 120–198), which is linked to the primary theme by the triplets-and-appoggiatura-figure (Scheme 1d). At first hearing, it would not be unthinkable to assume that the *Andante sostenuto* (rather than the *poco sostenuto* of bar 42) functions as the secondary-theme zone of the sonata exposition. Its status as a self-sufficient slow movement, undermined by the seamlessness with which it outgrows from the preceding music, is not obvious enough to exclude such an interpretation. This would allow for a somewhat more differentiated primary-secondary theme relationship in terms of character (*Allegro assai* versus *Andante sostenuto*). The recapitulation (bars 199–275), however, provides little justification to that reading, because it clearly follows the musical events of bars 1–70, with the *poco sostenuto* secondary theme being transposed by a fifth lower than in the exposition.

⁵ Speaking of the emergence of one-movement form in the early 19th century, Lev Mazel (1960: 184–185) used the term “new one-movement form” (*новая одночастная форма*). According to Mazel, Lisztian one-movement form was anticipated by Chopin in, for example, the Fantasy in F minor Op. 49 and the Polonaise-Fantasy Op. 61.

⁶ According to Hugo Riemann (1889: 95–97), ABA (*Hauptgedanke–Nebengedanke–Hauptgedanke*) is the archetype of all classical formal paradigms and one of the most general musical concepts (see also Rehding 2011: 220). Therefore, it is interesting to observe if that model, typically evaded on the highest formal level in the traditional sonata cycles, is instantiated in the one-movement works of Eller, Tubin, and Oja.

Thus, the recapitulation fulfils one of the essential criteria of the sonata form, according to which – to put it in the most general terms – the tonal relationship between the primary and secondary themes in the recapitulation has to be different than in the exposition.

There is sufficient ground to speak of the presence of the sonata cycle only if the work contains sections resembling a slow movement and a scherzo. Eller's Quartet meets that criterion, with the *Andante sostenuto* as a slow movement and the *Presto scherzando* as, obviously, a scherzo. The *Presto scherzando* (Scheme 1e) sets a mood completely different from that of the *Allegro assai*. For its certain rhythmic gestures, such as the iambic phrase ending, standing in contrast to the appoggiaturas of the *Allegro assai*, and the multitude of pedal tones (such as the drone of open fifths played by the cello in bar 227), the *Presto scherzando* seems to fall into the category of Eller's "rustic" style, not uncommon in his orchestral works written in the latter half of the 1920s, including *Varjus ja päikesepaistel* (*In the Shade and in the Sunshine*) and *Sümfooniline burlesk* (*Symphonic Burlesque*). Thematically it is not unlinked to the preceding material, as demonstrated by an incomplete neighbouring tone figure {D#, E, C} derived from the *poco sostenuto* phrase (Scheme 1c), although the connections are not as obvious as had been within the *Allegro assai*. In the coda, the *Presto scherzando* theme, or rather the first bar of it, is transformed into 2/4 time, its every statement instantly echoed by an inverted version, as if to point out one of the most characteristic contrapuntal procedures of the Quartet in a nutshell (Scheme 1g).

There are not many pieces that could be considered as a likely model for the rather unusual form of Eller's First String Quartet. Nevertheless, some similarities with Alexander Glazunov's celebrated Violin Concerto in A minor (1904) may be worth exploring. Glazunov's Concerto consists of two movements (*Moderato* and *Allegro*) connected by a solo cadenza, the first movement being in sonata form with an *Andante* interpolation. Thus, Eller's and Glazunov's works are both one-movement cycles composed of two relatively self-sufficient parts, and the first part of each contains a slow-movement interpolation: in Glazunov's case, before, and in Eller's case, after the outset of the developmental space. In Eller's work, the

thematic connections between the two parts are more explicit and, unlike in Glazunov, the primary theme of the first part recurs before the coda. There are some similarities in how the two parts relate to each other in terms of their character. In Glazunov's Concerto, the contrast between the passionate *Moderato* and the "hunting calls" finale (*Allegro*) is as stark as that between the *Allegro assai* and the "rustic" *Presto scherzando* in Eller's Quartet. Moreover, in both works, the second part is in 6/8 time and the theme even begins with a similar rhythmic figure (♪ | ♪♪ ♪♪). Glazunov's *Allegro* is a rondo, whereas Eller's *Presto scherzando* is written in ternary form. However, both follow the Beethovenian practice according to which the finale of a minor-key work is signalled by a tonal shift to the parallel major. At the beginning of Eller's *Presto scherzando*, the C minor key signature of the preceding *Allegro assai* is omitted to give way to C major, and, analogously, A minor is followed by A major at the outset of the "hunting-calls" finale of Glazunov's Concerto.

Although the two works are, apart from the aforementioned common features, markedly dissimilar, the possibility of a link between them should not be ruled out. In his early years, Eller had been an aspiring violinist and was undoubtedly well familiar with the violin repertory. It is worth knowing that in 1907 Eller had originally entered the St. Petersburg Conservatoire to study the violin, and it was only later, after his prospects as a violin virtuoso had been shattered, that he enrolled at the composition class. In January 1922, Glazunov, the long-time director of the St. Petersburg Conservatoire, paid a visit to Tallinn and Tartu to attend (and conduct) the performances of a number of his works, including the Violin Concerto, giving Eller the opportunity to renew his acquaintance with both the author and his music. It says much for Glazunov's reputation in Estonia that in 1935 the title of "honorary professor" was bestowed upon him by the Tallinn Conservatoire.

2.2. Eller and Beyond

It is open to debate whether Glazunov's Violin Concerto could have served as a model for Eller's First String Quartet. However, it is almost certain that the one-movement form exemplified in Eller's oeuvre had considerable impact on Eduard Tubin's Piano Quartet in C sharp minor. That is not to say that the two works are similar in terms of

Scheme 1. Intra- and intertextual connections between Eller's First String Quartet (a to g) and Tubin's Piano Quartet (h to m).

The image displays seven musical excerpts, labeled a) through g), illustrating connections between Heino Eller's First String Quartet and Eduard Tubin's Piano Quartet. Each excerpt includes a measure number, tempo/mood marking, and dynamic marking.

- a)** Measure 1, *Allegro assai*, *f*. Treble clef, 3/4 time. Features a triplet of eighth notes.
- b)** Measure 14, *f*. Bass clef, 3/4 time. Features a triplet of eighth notes, enclosed in a box with an arrow pointing to the right.
- c)** Measure 43, *poco sost.*, *dolce*, *p*. Treble clef, 3/4 time. Features a triplet of eighth notes, enclosed in a box.
- d)** Measure 120, *Andante sostenuto*, *p*. Treble clef, 4/4 time. Features a triplet of eighth notes.
- e)** Measure 280, *Presto scherzando*, *mp*. Bass clef, 6/8 time. Features a triplet of eighth notes, enclosed in a box. A later measure in this excerpt features a tremolo and a *f* dynamic, also enclosed in a box.
- f)** Measure 580, *Adagio molto espressivo*, *ff*. Treble clef, 3/2 time. Features a triplet of eighth notes.
- g)** Measure 602, *Prestissimo*, *p*. Treble clef, 2/4 time. Features a triplet of eighth notes.

Diagrammatic elements include a large arrow pointing from the boxed triplet in (b) to the right, and a curved line connecting the boxed triplet in (c) to the boxed triplet in (e).

their formal design. Tubin's Piano Quartet is written in sonata form (Scheme 3b), with a slow introduction and an extensive coda, the slow introduction (*Lento, grave*) returning before the outset of the recapitulation (*Andante, grave*, bars 178–200). The primary- and secondary-theme zones – bars 20–72 and 73–119 in the exposition; bars 201–234

and 235–266 in the recapitulation – are considerably differentiated in terms of character (*Allegro energico* versus *Un poco andante*, or *Andante sostenuto e molto espressivo*, as in the recapitulation). In the exposition, the secondary-theme zone begins in E minor (or D mixolydian), transposed into B flat minor (or A flat mixolydian) in the recapitulation.

traditional three- or four-movement sonata cycle; on the other hand, as appropriate for a student work, he chose a relatively well-defined formal principle, rather than a more adventurous “two-dimensional” (Moortele) solution. Nevertheless, as not uncommon for late-Romantic sonata form, the Quartet has some elements of the sonata cycle, not least because of the scherzo-like *Capriccioso* episode of the development section and the restatement of the slow introduction before the recapitulation.

Given all the differences, is there any reason at all to assume that Tubin might have been familiar with Eller’s First String Quartet while working on his Piano Quartet (note that the first performance of Eller’s work took place only after the Piano Quartet had already been premiered)? After all, Eller’s First Sonata for Violin and Piano (1922), a one-movement work in sonata form, could be considered as another likely source of influence. However, despite of all the counter-arguments, there are still some similarities in Tubin’s Piano Quartet and Eller’s First String Quartet that might urge to provide a positive answer to the previous question. Scheme 1 demonstrates thematic links within each work as well as intertextual connections. The staves to be compared (b and i; c and j; e and k; f and l) are aligned and the similar motivic units of each pair highlighted by means of a rectangular shape. Firstly, let us compare Eller’s *Allegro assai* phrase (Scheme 1a) and the main phrase (*Allegro energico*) of Tubin’s work (1i). Their similarity is best revealed if one observes the *Allegro assai* phrase in its inverted form, as played by the cello in bars 14–15 (1b). Both contain a figure of ascending triplets (on the last beat of the first bar) that concludes with an incomplete neighbouring tone figure: {D, F, E} and {F \sharp , A, G \sharp }, respectively, a similar figure appearing in the slow introduction of Tubin’s work. The time signature is in both cases 3/4. Therefore, Tubin’s *Allegro energico* phrase seems to be derived from Eller’s *Allegro assai*. Secondly, both Eller’s *poco sostenuto* phrase (1c) and Tubin’s *Un poco andante* (1j) contain a specific grace note figure that coincides both in terms of melodic contour and rhythm. Thirdly, both Eller’s *Presto scherzando* phrase (1e) and Tubin’s *Allegro*

vivace assai phrase (1k) consist of four bars, begin with an $\hat{1}$ - $\hat{5}$ upbeat (followed by $\sharp\hat{4}$), and conclude with an accentuated drone-like long note ($\hat{5}$) that contributes to their “rustic” character.

Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, in both works, the primary phrase (*Allegro assai* and *Allegro energico*, respectively) is eventually restated (as *Adagio molto espressivo* and *Maestoso*) to enhance the sense of conclusion (Schemes 1f and 1l): in Eller’s case, the restatement precedes the *Prestissimo* coda, and, in Tubin’s work, separates the two coda-like episodes (*Allegro vivace assai* and *Presto*). In both cases it is given an apotheosis-like character, played fortissimo and in augmented rhythmic values (in 3/2 time).⁷ In Eller’s work, the *Adagio molto espressivo* is anticipated in bars 543–552 (that is within the *Presto scherzando* and in 6/8 time) by a statement of the primary phrase, which, due to being thematically transformed and off the original C minor, resembles an deceptive recapitulation and thus underlines the function of the subsequent *Adagio molto espressivo* as the “proper” recapitulation – a role that the latter, however, fails to fill convincingly, because the material of the *Presto scherzando* returns shortly in the guise of a *Prestissimo* coda (2/4), leading the works to a conclusion in C major.

The extensive coda functions as an “additional” recapitulation, with the *Allegro vivace assai* being based on the primary theme (*Allegro energico*) and the *Presto* derived from the four-note figure {A, E, C, D} of the secondary theme (*Un poco andante*). The Beethovenian practice of concluding a minor-key work in the parallel major, observed by Eller, can also be witnessed in Tubin’s Quartet, where the *Maestoso* restatement of the primary theme begins in D flat (= C sharp) major, and C sharp major is the key in which the work is drawn to an end. The aforementioned subtle thematic links, as well as the practice of recalling the main theme in an apotheosis-like fashion, seem to suggest that Tubin might have drawn inspiration from Eller’s First String Quartet, even though the two works are anything but similar in other aspects.

Eduard Oja’s Piano Quintet falls into a somewhat different category than the quartets of Eller and Tubin in more than one sense. Of the three,

⁷ A similar procedure is used in Eller’s First Sonata for Violin and Piano, where the coda (*Presto*) is “interrupted” by a fortissimo restatement (*Largo e molto espressivo*) of the brief *Adagio* introduction of the work, after which *Prestissimo* is resumed.

it comes the closest to resembling a traditional sonata cycle (Scheme 3c), with a clearly defined first movement (*Allegro moderato*), slow movement (*Andante con moto*), scherzo (*Allegro scherzando*), finale (*Allegro moderato*) and coda (*Presto*). Remarkably, large portions of the first and second movements are literally reproduced in the finale in order to provide the work with a thematic frame. Literal repetitions of substantial formal units (to produce the recapitulation) are one of the hallmark features of Oja's treatment of form in general and can also be encountered in, for example, his symphonic poems *Müsteeriumid* (*Mysteries*) and *Mere laul* (*Song of the Sea*), written in the early 1940s. In the first movement, the material of bars 13–49 is repeated (transposed and expanded) in bars 50–79 and 80–153, the beginning of each unit being marked by a four-bar "motto" (Scheme 2b) that lends the music an ever-recurring (rotational) character. The extensive repetitions and the lack of thematic differentiation contradict assumptions about sonata form, and the first movement can rather be perceived as a *Fortspinnung* of the main phrase (2a).

The second movement (*Andante con moto*), initiated as a canon, leads to a *Largamente* culmination area (2e), later reproduced in the finale. That procedure of "reproduction" is not dissimilar to the practice mentioned in connection with the quartets of Eller and Tubin, where the preceding material is restated in the concluding part of the work in an apotheosis-like fashion to amplify the impression of a finale. However, there are some considerable differences in the realisation of that model. In Oja's case, it is not the beginning of the work, but rather the second movement that is being recalled, and, unlike in Eller and Tubin, that procedure does not involve any transformations in terms of character. *Largamente*, the culmination area of the *Andante con moto*, is restated in the finale, seamlessly combined with the preceding material extracted from the first movement (*Allegro moderato*). Oja draws together material not originally combined in order to "synthesise" a recapitulation (finale). What makes that treatment exceptional, is the fact that the two segments are played with virtually no changes (adornments, textural modifications, transpositions, etc.). The two rather extensive thematic blocks have been extracted from their original context and placed adjacently to produce the finale – a procedure sig-

nificantly at odds with the aesthetics of Lisztian thematic transformation or Schoenberg's concept of "developing variation" (Frisch 1982: 215–216), at the very heart of which lies the idea that recurring themes need to be given a new appearance.

If the multitude of literal restatements in Oja's Piano Quintet seems puzzling, it is only because one is tempted to consider that work against the backdrop of the 19th-century (Lisztian) practices. However, that technique is much less surprising in view of the overall ostinato-like repetitiveness of the thematic material, especially in the *Allegro moderato* (Scheme 2b) and the scherzo – a characteristic that distinguishes the Quintet clearly from the late-Romantic moods of Tubin's Piano Quartet. Let us consider the beginning of the *Allegro scherzando*, reproduced in Example 1: the *secco* textures in the piano part, the written-out trill figures (Violin I), and the somewhat ironic effect underlined by the subsequent glissandi and the octatonic context, are just a few of the several stylistic devices that liken the scherzo (as well as the whole work) to Stravinskian neoclassicism, rather than to the realm of late-Romantic gestures.

On the one hand, Oja's Piano Quintet follows, at least apparently, the Lisztian tradition of one-movement form, with motivic transformation as its precondition. On the other hand, that formal principle has been transferred into a harmonic context very different from anything written by Liszt, Eller, or Tubin. In the Piano Quintet, Oja has combined one-movement form with a harmonic idiom characterised by a combination of octatonic, hexatonic, and diatonic procedures. This gives rise the question: how is the principle of thematic transformation to be realised in a harmonic context as strictly defined as octatonicism? One part of Oja's solution is to minimize the role of motivic transformation and, instead of that, provide the work with a fitting degree of thematic unity by recalling rather substantial sections. The other part of the solution was to devise the main thematic material in a way that facilitates combining octatonic with hexatonic, major, and minor scales.

The main phrase, played by the violins in bars 3–5 (Scheme 2a), is based on octatonic collection {C, D, E_b, F, F_{##}, G_{##}, A, B}, with F as a pedal tone in the piano part; there is also an extra-octatonic tone {B_b}. Its most remarkable feature is the four-note opening figure {F_{##}, E_b, D, B}, stated in bars 20–21 by the cello in its inverted form (2c) and thereafter

Example 1. The beginning of the *Allegro scherzando* from Oja's Piano Quintet.

Allegro scherzando

The musical score is arranged in two systems. The first system contains five staves: four for the string quartet (Violin I, Violin II, Viola, Cello/Double Bass) and one for the piano. The second system also contains five staves: four for the string quartet and one for the piano. The tempo is marked *Allegro scherzando*. Dynamics include *pp* (pianissimo), *cresc.* (crescendo), *mf* (mezzo-forte), and *conped.* (con pedale). Fingerings and articulation marks are present throughout.

Scheme 2. Thematic connections within Oja's Piano Quintet.

3
Allegro moderato
 a)  + pedal tone F [0,3,4,7] OCT {C, D, Eb, F, F#, G#, A, B}

13
 b) 

20
 c)  [0,3,4,7] dolce  [0,3,4,7]

37 (347)
 d)  [0,3,4,7]

Andante con moto (Largamente)
 204 (436)
 e)  [0,3,4,7] *fff* *ff*

Allegro scherzando
 258  [0,3,4,7] 266  [0,3,4,7]

OCT {C, D, Eb, F, F#, G#, A, B}

forming the basis for a sixteenth-note accompanimental figure. When played by the cello, however, the octatonic qualities of the phrase are not defined as clearly as previously, because the four-note opening figure {E; G, A_b, B}, combined with the subsequent tone {E_b}, produces rather a five-note subset of hexatonic collection {E, G, A_b, B, C, E_b}. Now it is evident that there was a very specific reason why Oja chose to initiate the main phrase with that particular four-note figure of pitch-class set [0,3,4,7]: it is the only type of tetrachord that can be produced both in the octatonic and hexatonic scales and, therefore, being harmonically ambiguous, perfectly sets the scene for combining material based on those two scales. A similar degree of harmonic ambiguity is displayed by the incomplete neighbouring tone figure of bar 37 (2d), to be later recalled in the *Allegro scherzando* from bar 266 onwards (2f), and by the opening figure of the *Andante con moto* phrase (2e). They enable to combine octatonic and diatonic material as seamlessly as the four-note figures of pitch-class set [0,3,4,7] enable to combine octatonicism and hexatonicism; the four-note collection {F, F_♯, A_b, A} can be produced both in the octatonic and harmonic minor scales, and {G, A, B_b, C} leaves the door open for octatonic, major, and minor implications.

The finale grows seamlessly from the *Allegro scherzando*. It is only gradually that one, not aware of the subtle switch from 3/8 to 6/8 time indicated in the score, can recognise that the scherzo has already been brought to an end and the finale is in progress. Notably, this transition is realised much more seamlessly than the previous ones: the first movement (*Allegro moderato*) was rounded off by a solo passage played by the cello (*calando*), and the transition from the *Andante con moto* into the *Allegro scherzando* was marked by a fermata and a *morendo* indication. Therefore, at first glance, Oja's practice is not dissimilar to that of Beethoven's Fifth and Sibelius's Second Symphonies, in which the first movements are detached but the third movement and the finale are performed *attacca*, although in Oja's case, unlike in Beethoven and Sibelius, that procedure totally lacks the quality of a symbolic gesture. Of the many questions rising in connection with one-movement form, that concerning the finale is definitely one of the most complicated. In the 19th-century symphonic tradition, the finale often assumed the role of

the most substantial and significant movement, providing the clue for interpreting the work as a whole. In one-movement works with an overarching ABA structure, the "finale problem" is uniquely troublesome. On the one hand, in order to be perceived as "meaningful," the finale needs to be clearly differentiated from the preceding material in terms of character (a criterion that the finale of Oja's Piano Quintet hardly meets); on the other hand, a contrast too overwhelming might undermine the impression of a recapitulation.

Conclusions

The three chamber works of Heino Eller, Eduard Tubin, and Eduard Oja are similar in their formal concept, and yet so different. Eller's First String Quartet (1925) is composed of two interrelated parts (*Allegro assai* and *Presto scherzando*), the first one being in sonata form and including an extensive *Andante sostenuto* interpolation – an example of how traditional three- or four-movement sonata cycle has been replaced by a one-movement design that, however, does not lack the qualities of the sonata cycle. Considering the rarity of one-movement works (sonatas, quartets, quintets, concertos, etc.) in the local musical scene, it is most likely that the subsequent chamber works of Tubin and Oja grew out of their fascination with Eller's oeuvre. Tubin's Piano Quartet (1930) is in sonata form, with some cyclic implications, whereas Oja's Piano Quintet (1935) takes the four-movement sonata cycle as its point of departure, combining it with an overarching ABA form.

Those three works were produced in an age when Lisztian one-movement form, as several other Romantic procedures, were falling into disfavour, not least because of burgeoning neo-classical trends. In the 1920s and 1930s, one-movement design, once not uncommon in, for example, instrumental concertos, was losing ground in Western Europe, and there was rather a tendency to return to the 18th-century practice of self-contained and separated movements. It was an age when Lisztian one-movement form started to seem obsolete as another invention of the Hungarian composer, the genre of symphonic poem. However, the situation was quite different in those European regions, like Estonia, where the first Conservatoire-trained composers had entered the musical scene only in the early

Scheme 3. One-movement form in Eller (**a**), Tubin (**b**), and Oja (**c**).

a)

1–275 *Allegro assai* (3/4)

1–70 Exposition:

1–41 Primary-theme zone

42–70 Secondary-theme zone (*poco sostenuto*)

71–119 Development (*a tempo*)

120–198 *Andante sostenuto* (4/4): SLOW MOVEMENT interpolation

199–275 Recapitulation (3/4):

199–246 Primary-theme zone (*Allegro assai*)

247–275 Secondary-theme zone (*poco sostenuto*)

276–748 *Presto scherzando* (6/8): SCHERZO MOVEMENT

276–350 A¹

351–405 *Meno mosso* B

406–579 *Tempo I* A²

580–601 *Adagio molto espressivo* (3/2): restatement of the *Allegro assai*

602–748 *Prestissimo*: coda based on the *Presto scherzando* (2/4)

b)

1–19 *Lento, grave*: introduction (6/4)

20–119 Exposition (3/4)

20–72 Primary-theme zone (*Allegro energico*)

73–119 Secondary-theme zone (*Un poco andante*)

120–177 Development

120–135 *Allegro non troppo, ma energico*

136–154 *Un poco più mosso, capriccioso*: SCHERZO MOVEMENT?

culmination area: 155–177 *Appassionato*: based on the secondary theme

178–200 *Andante, grave*: restatement of the introduction (6/4)

201–266 Recapitulation (3/4)

201–234 Primary-theme zone (*a tempo, ma part ritenuto*)

235–266 Secondary-theme zone (*Andante sostenuto e molto espressivo*)

267–417 Coda

267–326 *Allegro vivace assai*: based on the primary theme

327–336 *Maestoso*: restatement of the primary theme (3/2)

337–417 *Presto*: based on the secondary theme (3/4)

c)

A¹ 1–153 *Allegro moderato* (6/8)

B 154–223 *Andante con moto* (4/4): SLOW MOVEMENT

culmination area: 204–223 *Largamente*

C 224–346 *Allegro scherzando* (3/8): SCHERZO MOVEMENT

A² (A¹ + B) 347–455 *Allegro moderato* (6/8)

347–435 ≈ 37–124

436–455 = 204–223 *Largamente* (4/4)

Coda 456–487 *Presto*

20th century, trying to catch up with the 19th-century genres and models still unprecedented in their homeland. In Estonia, the symphonic poem was a genre that epitomised, with Eller as its main proponent, the progressive, rather than the “obsolete” practices. Analogously, it is telling that most of the one-movement chamber works written in the 1920s and 1930s (Eller’s First String

Quartet and Oja’s Piano Quintet in particular) also stand out for their innovative harmonic idiom. As an alternative to the traditional sonata cycle, one-movement design could still be considered as a novelty in the local musical scene and was therefore, not surprisingly, embraced by the composers of the “Tartu” school as a means for their modernist aspirations.

References

- Berger**, Arthur 2002. *Reflections of an American Composer*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Frisch**, Walter 1982. Brahms, Developing Variation, and the Schoenberg Critical Tradition. – *19th-Century Music* 5/3 (Spring), pp. 215–232.
- Hepokoski**, James, Warren Darcy 2006. *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late Eighteenth-Century Sonata*. Oxford [et al.]: Oxford University Press.
- Humal**, Mart (koost.) 1987a. *Heino Eller oma aja peeglis*. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.
- Humal**, Mart 1987b. Heino Elleri kahe esimese kvarteti kompositsioonist. – *Muusikalisi lehekülgi IV*. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, lk. 100–113.
- Jurkowski**, Edward 2005. Alexander Scriabin’s and Igor Stravinsky’s Influence upon Early Twentieth-Century Finnish Music: The Octatonic Collection in the Music of Uuno Klami, Aarre Merikanto and Väinö Raitio. – *Intersections* 25/1–2, pp. 67–85.
- Mazel**, Lev 1960. ekotorye cherty kompozicij v svobodnyh formah Shopena (About Some Composing Features in Chopin’s Free Forms). – *Friderik Shopen: stat’i i issledovanija sovetских muzykovedov (Frédéric Chopin: Articles and Studies by Soviet Musicologists)*. Moscow: State Publisher Muzyka). [Мазель, Лев 1960. Некоторые черты композиций в свободных формах Шопена. – Фридерик Шопен: статьи и исследования советских музыковедов. Москва: Государственное музыкальное издательство, с. 182–231.]
- Moortele**, Steven Vande 2009. *Two-Dimensional Sonata Form. Form and Cycle in Single-Movement Instrumental Works by Liszt, Strauss, Schoenberg, and Zemlinsky*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Mäkelä**, Tomi 1990. *Konsertoiva kamarimusiikki 1920-luvun alun Euroopassa. Historiallinen ja interaktionalistinen näkökulmatyytilajin muotoihin ekspressionismin ja uusbarokin piirissä*. Studia musicologica Universitatis Helsingiensis 1, Helsinki: Helsingin yliopiston musiikkitieteen laitos.
- Rehding**, Alexander 2011. Dualistic Forms. – *The Oxford Handbook of Neo-Riemannian Music Theories*. Eds. Edward Gollin and Alexander Rehding, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 218–245.
- Riemann**, Hugo 1889. *Katechismus der Kompositionslehre. I. Teil. Musikalische Formenlehre*. Leipzig: Max Hesse.
- Salmenhaara**, Erkki 1996. *Kansallisromantiikan valtavirta 1885–1918*. Suomen musiikin historia 2, Porvoo: Söderström.
- Talbot**, Michael 2001. *The Finale in Western Instrumental Music*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taruskin**, Richard 2011. Catching Up with Rimsky-Korsakov. – *Music Theory Spectrum* 33/2 (Fall), pp. 169–185.
- Tubin**, Eduard 2003. *Rändavate vete ääres*. Koost. Vardo Rumessen, Eesti mõttelugu 49, Tartu: Ilmamaa.
- Wicklund**, Tuija 2014. *Jean Sibelius’s En saga and Its Two Versions: Genesis, Reception, Edition, and Form*. Studia Musica 57, Helsinki: University of the Arts / Sibelius-Academy.

Üheosaline vorm Heino Elleri, Eduard Tubina ja Eduard Oja kammermuusikas

Aare Tool

Heino Elleri (1887–1970) esimene keelpillikvartett (1925), Eduard Tubina (1905–1982) klaverikvartett (1930) ja Eduard Oja (1905–1950) klaverikvintett (1935) moodustavad mõttelise teosegrupi. Neid ühendab võrdlemisi eripärane vormilahendus, üheosaline vorm (*one-movement form*), mille puhul puudub traditsiooniline kolme- või neljaosaline sonaaditsükkel ja selle asemel kulgeb teos sidusa tervikuna. Selle võrdlemisi laia mõiste alla mahuvad kõik teosed, mis nimetuse poolest (sonaat, kvartett, kvintett, kontsert jne.) võiksid koosneda eraldiseisvatest osadest, nagu on tavaline Viini klassikutele ja suuremas osas hilisemas muusikas, kuid selle asemel on osi omavahel sidudes teos tugevamini integreeritud.

19. sajandil püüeldi sonaaditsükli integreerituse poole kahel viisil. Esimene neist seostub Franz Schuberti loominguga ja eriti tema klaverifantaasiaga „Rändur“, kus sonaaditsükli osad on temaatiliselt läbi põimunud ja esitatakse *attacca*. Teist lähenemisviisi esindab näiteks Ferenc Liszti klaverisonaat h-moll, kus omavahel põimuvad (kõrgeima vormitasandi) sonaadivorm ja sonaaditsükkel. Lisztiliku mudeli puhul on teos tervikuna sonaadivormis (või üldistatumalt ABA vormis), kuid selles leidub sonaaditsükli osadega (aeglane osa ja skertso) sarnanevaid rohkem või vähem iseseisvaid lõike.

Kuigi 20. sajandi alguses ei olnud üheosalised kammeransamblid sugugi pretseedenditud, võib siiski väita, et kammeransambrites oli see vormipõhimõtte märksa vähem levinud kui näiteks instrumentaalkontsertides. Üheosalised on Artur Lemba teine klaverikontsert (1931), Artur Kapi esimene kontsert orele ja orkestrile (1934), Heino Elleri viulikontsert (1937/1964) ja Eduard Tubina kontrabassikontsert (1948). Kuivõrd Eller (nagu teisedki sama põlvkonna heliloojad) oli Peterburi Konservatooriumi kasvandik, siis väärib mainimist, et üheosaline vorm oli seal teatud perioodil vägagi soositud – nii näiteks on üheosaline Nikolai Rimski-Korsakovi klaverikontsert (1883), Aleksandr Glazunovi viulikontsert (1904), teine klaverikontsert (1917), tšellokontsert (1931) ja saksafonikontsert (1934) ning Sergei Prokofjevi esimene klaverikontsert (1912).

Elleri esimese keelpillikvarteti ja Glazunovi viulikontserdi ülesehituses võib täheldada mõningaid sarnasusi. Elleri teos koosneb kahest suhteliselt iseseisvast, kuid *attacca* mängitavast osast (*Allegro assai – Presto scherzando*), kusjuures esimene on sonaadivormis ja sisaldab sonaaditsükli aeglase osaga sarnanevat *Andante sostenuto* lõiku; kaheosaline on ka Glazunovi teos (*Moderato – Allegro*) ning sonaadivormis esimene osa sisaldab *Andante* episoodi. Esimene keelpillikvartett on Elleri kammermuusikas erandlik, sest tema hilisemad neli kvartetti on ehitatud üles traditsioonilise, eraldatud osadega sonaaditsükliina.

Kuigi Tubina klaverikvarteti ja Oja klaverikvinteti on üheosalist vormi käsitletud sootuks erinevalt kui Elleri teoses, võib siiski oletada, et Elleri oli Tartu Kõrgema Muusikakooli kompositsiooniõppejõuna otsustav roll nende suunamisel selle vormipõhimõtte juurde. Tubina klaverikvartett on ulatusliku koodaga sonaadivormis, kuid selles ei puudu ka mõningad sonaaditsükli tunnused. Elleri ja Tubina teose temaatilises materjalis on tunda sugulust. Skeem 1 demonstreerib nii kummagi teose sisemisi (intra-tekstuaalseid) motiiviseid kui ka omavahelisi (intertekstuaalseid) kokkupuutepunkte. Siit nähtub, et Tubina teose peateema (*Allegro energico*) langeb suuresti kokku Elleri *Allegro assai* teema peegelkujuga ja teatav analoogia on ka Elleri *Presto scherzando*'l ja Tubina *Allegro vivace assai*'l.

Oja klaverikvinteti lähtepunkt on neljaosaline sonaaditsükkel, kus eristuvad selgelt esimene osa (*Allegro moderato*), aeglane osa (*Andante con moto*), skertso (*Allegro scherzando*), finaali (*Allegro moderato*) ja kooda (*Presto*); finaali on kombineeritud esimese ja teise osa materjalist, moodustades seetõttu teose temaatilise raami (ABCA¹). Klaverikvintett on klaveritsükli „Vaikivad meeleolud“ ja „Ajatrilooja“ (tšellole ja klaverile) kõrval üks neid Oja teoseid, milles on ulatuslikult kasutatud oktaatoonilist helirida. Oktatoonikat leidub Igor Stravinski, Maurice Raveli, Aleksandr Skrjabini, Béla Bartóki ja teiste 20. sajandi alguse heliloojate muusikas, kuid Eestis võib Oja pidada selle esmaesitlejaks.

Elleri, Tubina ja Oja üheosalised kammerteosed valmisid ajal, mil Liszti eeskuju järgiv üheosalisus (nagu paljud teisedki 19. sajandi kompositsioonipõhimõtted) oli Lääne-Euroopas varasemat populaarsust minetamas ja Stravinski neoklassitsismi tuules püüti pöörduda tagasi 18. sajandi eraldatud osadega

sonaaditsükli juurde. Üheosaline vorm (ja eriti selle liztlik versioon) mõjus nüüd samavõrd vanamoodsana nagu ungari helilooja üks teine leiutis, sümfooniline poeem. Olukord oli aga paljuski erinev neis Euroopa paigus, kus konservatooriumiharidusega heliloojad (ja koos nendega 19. sajandil kujunenud žanrid ja vormipõhimõtted) ilmusid areenile alles 20. sajandi alguses. Nagu Heino Eller rakendas sümfoonilise poemi tollase Eesti kontekstis uuendusmeelse väljenduslaadi teenistusse, nii on ka esimene keelpillikvartett, olgugi „vanamoodsas“ üheosalises vormis, harmooniakeelelt üks tema uuenduslikumaid teoseid.