

Stephen Hinton, Editor-in-Chief

BEETHOVEN

José Bowen & Richard Will, Reviews Editors

FORUM

VOLUME
NUMBER I

11

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS PRESS: URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Editors

Mark Evan Bonds

José Bowen

Michelle Fillion

Stephen Hinton

(Editor-in-Chief)

Christopher Reynolds

Elaine Sisman

Richard Will

Editorial Advisory Board

William E. Caplin

William Drabkin

William Kinderman

Richard Kramer

Lewis Lockwood

Nicholas Marston

William Meredith

Maynard Solomon

Glenn Stanley

James Webster

Assistant Editor

Christina Acosta

Contents

iv	Notes to Contributors
v	Abbreviations
	KATARINA MARKOVIC-STOKES
i	To Interpret or to Follow? Mahler's Beethoven <i>Retuschen</i> and the Romantic Critical Tradition
	RAYMOND KNAPP
41	On the Inner Dimension of Heroic Struggle in Beethoven's <i>Eroica</i> : A Mahlerian Perspective (and What That Might Tell Us)
<hr/>	
	REVIEWS
	WILLIAM KINDERMAN
90	Charles Rosen, <i>Beethoven's Piano Sonatas: A Short Companion</i>
	ALEXANDER REHDING
100	Berthold Hoeckner, <i>Programming the Absolute: Nineteenth-Century German Music and the Hermeneutics of the Moment</i>
	JANE R. STEVENS
110	Hartmut Hein, <i>Beethovens Klavierkonzerte: Gattungsnorm und individuelle Konzeption</i>
	MELANIE LOWE
116	A. Peter Brown, <i>The First Golden Age of the Viennese Symphony: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Schubert</i>
<hr/>	
125	Contributors
<hr/>	

NOTES TO CONTRIBUTORS

Beethoven Forum, a journal devoted to the work, life, and milieu of Ludwig van Beethoven, is published semiannually by the University of Illinois Press.

For matters of style, contributors should refer to this volume of *Beethoven Forum*. Submissions should be double-spaced, with notes following the text, and they should incorporate the abbreviations given at the beginning of this volume. Musical examples require captions that provide titles, measure numbers (in the case of published works), and complete references to the source of sketch material; these should be included on both the examples and a separate page of example captions.

Please submit three copies of the text (no disks until requested) to Stephen Hinton, Editor-in-Chief, *Beethoven Forum*, Department of Music, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-3076.

Copies of books and materials for review should be sent to Richard Will, Reviews Editor, *Beethoven Forum*, Macintire Department of Music, 112 Old Cabell Hall, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22904-4716.

Abbreviations

Literature

Anderson	Emily Anderson, ed., <i>The Letters of Beethoven</i> , 3 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1961; rpt. New York: Norton, 1985).
Brandenburg	Sieghard Brandenburg, ed., <i>Ludwig van Beethoven: Briefwechsel: Gesamtausgabe</i> , Beethovenhaus edn., 8 vols. (Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 1996–)
BS I, BS II, BS III	<i>Beethoven Studies</i> , ed. Alan Tyson, vol. 1 (New York: Norton, 1973); vol. 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977); vol. 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982)
CB	Karl-Heinz Köhler, Grita Herre, and Dagmar Beck, eds., <i>Ludwig van Beethovens Konversationshefte</i> [= Conversation Books], vols. 1–9 (Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1968–88), vols. 10–11 (1993, 2001)
JTW	Douglas Johnson, Alan Tyson, and Robert Winter, <i>The Beethoven Sketchbooks: History, Reconstruction, Inventory</i> , ed. Douglas Johnson (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985)
Kerman, <i>Quartets</i>	Joseph Kerman, <i>The Beethoven Quartets</i> (New York: Norton, 1967)
Kinsky-Halm	Georg Kinsky, <i>Das Werk Beethovens: Thematisch-bibliographisches Verzeichnis seiner sämtlichen vollendeten Kompositionen</i> , completed and ed. Hans Halm (Munich and Duisburg: G. Henle, 1955)
MGG	<i>Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Musik</i> , ed. Friedrich Blume, 17 vols. (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1949–86; rev. 2nd edn. Ludwig Finscher, 1994–2000)
N I	Gustav Nottebohm, <i>Beethoveniana</i> (Leipzig and Winterthur: J. Rieter-Biedermann, 1872)

- N II Gustav Nottebohm, *Zweite Beethoveniana: Nachgelassene Aufsätze* (Leipzig: C. F. Peters, 1887)
- N 1865 Gustav Nottebohm, *Ein Skizzenbuch von Beethoven* (Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel, 1865); Eng. trans. in *Two Beethoven Sketchbooks* (London: Gollancz, 1979), pp. 3–43
- N 1880 Gustav Nottebohm, *Ein Skizzenbuch von Beethoven aus dem Jahre 1803* (Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel, 1880), Eng. trans. in *Two Beethoven Sketchbooks* (London: Gollancz, 1979), pp. 47–125
- New Grove* *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. Stanley Sadie, 20 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1980; 2nd edn. New York: Grove, 2001)
- Schindler (1840) Anton Schindler, *Biographie von Ludwig van Beethoven* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1840); Eng. trans. as *The Life of Beethoven*, ed. I. Moscheles, 2 vols. (London: H. Colburn, 1841)
- Schindler (1860) Anton Schindler, *Biographie von Ludwig van Beethoven*, 2 vols. (3rd edn., Münster: Aschendorff, 1860)
- Schindler-MacArdle Anton Schindler, *Beethoven as I Knew Him*, ed. Donald W. MacArdle, trans. Constance S. Jolly (London: Faber; Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966)
- Solomon, *Beethoven* Maynard Solomon, *Beethoven* (New York: Schirmer, 1977; 2nd edn. New York: Schirmer, 1998)
- Solomon, *Essays* Maynard Solomon, *Beethoven Essays* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988)
- TDR I–V Alexander Wheelock Thayer, *Ludwig van Beethovens Leben*, vol. I (rev.) continued by Hermann Deiters (Berlin: Breitkopf and Härtel, 1901); vols. IV–V completed by Hugo Riemann (Leipzig, 1907, 1908), vols. II–III rev. Riemann (Leipzig, 1910, 1911), Deiters's 1901 edn. of vol. I rev. Riemann (Leipzig, 1917); vols. II–V re-issued (Leipzig, 1922–23)
- Thayer I, II, III Alexander Wheelock Thayer, *Ludwig van Beethovens Leben*, 3 vols. (Berlin: F. Schneider, 1866, 1872, 1879)
- Thayer-Forbes *Thayer's Life of Beethoven*, rev. and ed. Elliot Forbes, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964)
- Thayer, *Verzeichniss* Alexander Wheelock Thayer, *Chronologisches Verzeichniss der Werke Ludwig van Beethovens* (Berlin: F. Schneider, 1865)
- Wegeler-Ries Franz Gerhard Wegeler and Ferdinand Ries, *Biographische Notizen über Ludwig van Beethoven* (Coblenz: K. Baedeker, 1838), suppl. Wegeler (Coblenz, 1845)

Journals

<i>Acta</i>	<i>Acta Musicologica</i>
AmZ	<i>Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung</i>
BJ	<i>Beethoven-Jahrbuch</i> (1908–1909) and <i>Beethoven-Jahrbuch, Zweite Reihe</i> (1953–)
JAMS	<i>Journal of the American Musicological Society</i>
JM	<i>The Journal of Musicology</i>
ML	<i>Music & Letters</i>
MQ	<i>Musical Quarterly</i>
NBJ	<i>Neues Beethoven-Jahrbuch</i>
19CM	<i>19th-Century Music</i>

Libraries

BL	British Library, London
BN	Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris
GDM	Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, Vienna
SBK	Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin–Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin

Presses and Publishers

(for citations in footnotes)

BH	Beethovenhaus
Cambridge UP	Cambridge University Press
Harvard UP	Harvard University Press
Oxford UP	Oxford University Press
Princeton UP	Princeton University Press
U Nebraska P	University of Nebraska Press
U California P	University of California Press
U Chicago P	University of Chicago Press
Yale UP	Yale University Press

2

To Interpret or to Follow? Mahler's Beethoven Retuschen and the Romantic

Critical Tradition

Katarina Marković-Stokes

On 4 November 1898, just two days before Gustav Mahler's first concert as music director of the Vienna Philharmonic, a letter entitled "The Jewish Regime at the Vienna Opera" appeared in the *Deutsche Zeitung*. Riddled with inflammatory anti-Semitic content and personal attacks, it harshly criticized Mahler's interpretation of Beethoven's *Eroica* Symphony, particularly his addition of the E♭ clarinet and some brass instruments in certain moments of dramatic climax. The correspondent, identified only as "E. Th.," states:

Yes, Herr Mahler has E♭ clarinets on the brain. Not content with adding one to the *Eroica* he has also reinforced the trombones and double basses, and it is even being said that he will send his brother-in-law to Jericho to rediscover Joshua's trumpet, because Aryan trumpets are not loud enough for him. . . . The orchestra is preparing to hold the forthcoming rehearsals of the *Eroica* on the Steinfeld, so that Mahler can employ the field artillery with some guns to reinforce the kettledrums.¹

While Mahler obviously did not have any intention of including field artillery, certain passages in his performances of the *Eroica* were undoubtedly more force-

This study was made possible by grants from the Max Kade Foundation, the Center for German and European Studies, and the Sachar Research and Travel Fund of Brandeis University. I would also like to thank Eric Chafe, Stephen Hinton, and Karen Painter for their valuable suggestions on earlier versions of this paper.

1. E. Th., "Das jüdische Regime an der Wiener Oper," *Deutsche Zeitung*, 4 November 1898 (cited in Henry-Louis de La Grange, *Gustav Mahler: Vienna: The Years of Challenge (1897–1904)*, vol. II [Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995], pp. 118–21).

ful and emphatic than in performances under other conductors. As the author of the letter correctly observed, Mahler's orchestra was heavily reinforced in several passages in the Symphony, the most notable being the famous syncopated passage in the development section of the first movement (mm.248–79). At this point, Mahler's annotated orchestral parts from which the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra played in this concert of November 1898 show that this passage received the most changes of any in the Symphony, including alterations in orchestration, dynamics, and articulation.² The fact that changes were so extensive suggests that the passage had some special significance in Mahler's vision of this work.

Of course, Mahler was not the first to recognize the dramatic importance of this section. During the nineteenth century it was often described with metaphors that evoked the idea of a powerful struggle and a sudden, unexpected shift toward transcendence in a hero's fate. In his 1841 novella *Das Musikfest oder die Beethovener*, the Romantic critic and music enthusiast W.R. Griepenkerl, for example, described the astonishment of the fictional organist Pfeiffer at the passage just before the entrance of the new E-minor theme in the development section: "One place in the first movement was marked with red on the score: 'thirty-six measures of nineteenth century'; and now with the defying ninth upon the B of the basses, the tremendous breakthrough [*Durchbruch*] followed in order to attain the heavenly spheres of E minor and A minor."³

Griepenkerl's usage of the term *Durchbruch* (breakthrough) in this context was not an arbitrary or isolated observation in the history of music criticism. Many authors in the nineteenth century observed moments of structural disruption in Beethoven's symphonies and described them in similar terms.⁴ I will argue that the notion of an abrupt shift in the trajectory of a work, which somehow opens

2. These scores and orchestral parts are a part of the Universal Edition's collection of Mahler's conducting scores kept in the *Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek*. They were sold to the Universal Edition by Alma Mahler-Werfel in 1927. For a full list of Mahler's scores and parts of Beethoven's symphonies in this collection, see Appendix 1.

3. "Eine Stelle des ersten Satzes war mit Roth angestrichen. 36 Takte Neunzehntes Jahrhundert—stand im Notenplan geschrieben, und nun folgte auf dem H mit trotzender None der ungeheuerere Durchbruch der Bässe, um die himmlischen Sphären von E-moll und A-moll zu gelangen" (W. R. Griepenkerl, *Das Musikfest oder die Beethovener* [Braunschweig: Eduard Leibrock, 1841], p.110 [my trans.]).

4. In recent years, the term *Durchbruch* has become one of the most important analytical concepts in the interpretation of Gustav Mahler's symphonies. James Hepokoski has also used the concept in his study on Richard Strauss. See Theodor W. Adorno, *Mahler: A Musical Physiognomy*, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Chicago: U Chicago P, 1991); James Buhler, "'Breakthrough' as Critique of Form: The Finale of Mahler's First Symphony," *19CM* 20 (1996), 125–43; Hermann Danuser, *Musikalische*

the door to a new realm of transcendence, resonates with many conceptions of transcendence or otherness found in early Romantic Idealist philosophy and criticism.

As an eminent interpreter of Beethoven's music in the nineteenth century and a self-proclaimed fervent follower of Beethoven, Mahler studied, performed, and wrote about Beethoven throughout his career as a conductor and composer. His intense, personal engagement with Beethoven's music is also evident through his letters and remarks made to friends, which reveal his aesthetic views as part of the Romantic Idealist tradition, with particular proximity to Wagner's musical thought. That he gave special attention to the moments described in the nineteenth-century literature in terms of a *Durchbruch* shows an awareness, however implicit, of this critical concept in Beethoven's music, no doubt bolstered by his familiarity with the writings of Wagner, Schopenhauer, and other figures in the nineteenth-century critical tradition.⁵ And it is the nature of the controversial revisions—Mahler's *Retuschen*—of Beethoven's scores,⁶ especially at the moments of *Durchbruch*, that can be read as further evidence of that familiarity.⁷

Prosa (Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1975); Hans Heinrich Eggebrecht, *Die Musik Gustav Mahlers* (Munich: Piper, 1982); James Hepokoski, "Fiery-pulsed Libertine or Domestic Hero? Strauss's *Don Juan* Reinvestigated," in *Richard Strauss: New Perspectives on the Composer and His Work*, ed. Bryan Gilliam (Durham: Duke UP, 1992), pp.135–75; Berthold Hoeckner, *Programming the Absolute: Nineteenth-Century German Music and the Hermeneutics of the Moment* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2002); David Lewin, "Some Theoretical Thoughts about Aspects of Harmony in Mahler's Symphonies" (paper presented at Music and the Aesthetics of Modernity: An Interdisciplinary Conference, Harvard University, November 2001); Bernd Sponheuer, *Logik des Zerfalls: Untersuchungen zum Finalproblem in den Symphonien Gustav Mahlers* (Tutzing: Schneider, 1978); Bernd Sponheuer, "Der Durchbruch als primäre Formkategorie Gustav Mahlers: Eine Untersuchung zum Finalproblem der Ersten Symphonie," in *Form und Idee in Gustav Mahlers Instrumentalmusik*, ed. Klaus Hinrich Stahmer, Taschenbücher zur Musikwissenschaft (Wilhelmshaven: Heinrichshofen, 1980); Susanne Vill, *Vermittlungsformen verbalisierter und musikalischer Inhalte in der Musik Gustav Mahlers* (Tutzing: Schneider, 1979).

5. In my *The World of Mahler's Early Symphonies: From Idea to Form* (Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University, 2004), I trace the history of the term *Durchbruch* and the aesthetic ideas surrounding that concept back to early Romantic Beethoven reception and argue that it is through the Romantic concept of Art as Religion that the *Durchbruch* emerged in Mahler's music.

6. *Retuschen* is the term most often used in scholarship for the discussion of Mahler's annotated conducting scores and his changes in the instrumentation of other composers' works. Other variants include: *retouches* and *retouchings*.

7. The issue of Mahler's *Retuschen* of the works of Beethoven and other composers has been examined by several scholars: Ernst Hilmar, "Mahlers Beethoven-Interpretation," in *Mahler-Interpretation: Aspekte zum Werk und Wirken von Gustav Mahler*, ed. Rudolf Stephan (Mainz: Schott, 1985), pp.29–44; Volker Kalisch, "Zu Mahlers Instrumentationsretuschen in den Sinfonien," *Schweizerische Musikzei-*

For many critics of the contemporary Viennese press, Mahler's revisions of Beethoven's scores went well beyond the accepted norms. While some critics admired the precision and clarity of detail in his performances, his Beethoven performances were often faulted for being arbitrary and overly interpretive rather than following the letter of Beethoven's scores. The conservative critic of the *Wiener Abendpost* Robert Hirschfeld, for example, bitterly attacked Mahler for trying to "understand" Beethoven's Ninth, for "interpreting it" instead of "believing in it and following its faith."⁸ These criticisms raise important questions regarding the status of Mahler's revisions. Are his *Retuschen* merely editorial revisions made in response to changes in orchestral technique and acoustic conditions, or do they amount to a kind of recomposition that reflects Mahler's own artistic goals? Mahler himself claimed he was following Wagner in trying to bring out Beethoven's true intentions. This belief led him to update Beethoven's orchestral technique in order to bring out the voice leading more clearly, to provide greater precision in dynamic nuancing, and to accommodate larger orchestras and concert halls as well as advances in the construction of individual instruments. Even so, his treatment of certain passages in Beethoven's music goes beyond such cosmetic changes and reflects not only Beethoven's creative goals but also his own. Mahler's interpretations reveal a process of interaction between Mahler the conductor and Mahler the composer: he recognizes an important aesthetic concept in Beethoven's music and imposes his own creative energy on it, all the while convinced that he is indeed carrying out his predecessor's true intentions.

The question of Beethoven's and Wagner's respective influences on Mahler is a controversial one. While his unconventional, even shocking interpretations of Beethoven's symphonies show how he absorbed Beethoven's musical solutions and

tung/Revue Musicale Suisse 121, no. 1 (1981), 17–22; Denis McCaldin, "Mahler and Beethoven's Ninth Symphony," *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association* 107 (1980–81), 101–10; David Pickett, *Gustav Mahler as an Interpreter: A Study of His Textural Alterations and Performance Practice in the Symphonic Repertoire* (Ph.D. diss., University of Surrey, 1988); Pickett, "A Comparative Survey of Rescorings in Beethoven's Symphonies," in *Performing Beethoven* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994), pp. 205–27. David Pickett's approach is based on a comprehensive gathering of Mahler's *Retuschen* and annotations to the orchestral music of Beethoven and other major composers on Mahler's repertoire. He evaluates them in terms of the development of the orchestra, instruments, and conducting practices. Although an invaluable source of information concerning the changes that Mahler made to these scores, his work does not address the aesthetic and musical implications of these *Retuschen* for Mahler's general approach to Beethoven.

8. Robert Hirschfeld, *Wiener Abendpost*, 18 February 1900 (cited in La Grange, *Gustav Mahler II*, 234–35).

yet revised his predecessor's ideas by imposing on them his own aesthetic views, a similar observation may be made with respect to Wagner's influence: while generally accepting Wagner's ideas about conducting Beethoven, he took risky and unprecedented steps that surpassed the nature of Wagner's revisions. One such instance is his massive orchestral reinforcements of the Ninth Symphony finale, where he clearly went beyond the interpretative ideas expressed in Wagner's essays on Beethoven's music.⁹ Mahler's interpretations can be seen as the kind of process Harold Bloom characterizes as typical of the creative influence, whereby the event of "reading" the older artist's work initiates in the younger artist an immediate impulse to revise. As Bloom explains: "What divides each poet from his poetic Father is an instance of creative revisionism."¹⁰ Mahler's *Retuschen* tell the story of his interaction with tradition, both in composition and in conducting, and of his discovery, in Beethoven's music, of aesthetic ideas that he evidently felt were relevant for the musical audiences of his time.

"All Beethoven's works need a certain amount of editing"

Except for Wagner's and his own works, Mahler most often performed Beethoven's symphonies and overtures in his concert repertoire. (For a list of Mahler's Beethoven performances, see Appendix 2.) He conducted Beethoven's symphonies in many important concerts of his career. He performed the *Eroica* Symphony, for example, at his farewell concert in Hamburg in 1897, for his debut concert with the Vienna Philharmonic in 1898, and at the first concert with the New York Philharmonic eleven years later. The Ninth Symphony, the first Beethoven symphony he performed, was in his repertoire from his early career in Prague, which began in February 1886. This work also defined many controversial moments of his career, including his two performances in Vienna in February 1900 and the performance of his arrangement of a section of the finale for brass on the occasion of the opening of the Secession's Beethoven exhibit in April 1902.

While writing his Second Symphony in 1893, Mahler commented on Beethoven's contribution to music history in conversation with Natalie Bauer-Lechner:

9. Richard Wagner wrote extensively on the Ninth Symphony in the following essays, which span almost thirty years: Wagner, "On the Performance of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony at Dresden: Programme," in *Wagner's Prose Works*, ed. and trans. William Ashton Ellis (rpt. New York: Broude Brothers, 1966), VII, 247–55; Wagner, "Jottings on Ninth Symphony," in *Wagner's Prose Works*, VIII, pp. 201–03; Wagner, "Beethoven," in *Wagner's Prose Works*, V, pp. 61–126; Wagner, "On Performing Beethoven's Ninth Symphony," in *Three Wagner Essays*, ed. Robert L. Jacobs (London: Eulenburg, 1979), pp. 95–127.

10. Harold Bloom, *A Map of Misreading* (New York: Oxford UP, 1975), p. 19.

In order to understand and appreciate Beethoven fully, we should not only accept him for what he means to us today, but must realize what a tremendous revolutionary advance he represents in comparison with his forerunners. Only when we understand what a difference there is between Mozart's G-Minor Symphony and the Ninth can we properly evaluate Beethoven's achievement. Of geniuses like Beethoven, of such a most sublime and most universal kind, there are only two or three among millions. Among poets and composers of more recent times we can, perhaps, name but three: Shakespeare, Beethoven, and Wagner.¹¹

After experiencing disappointment in the works of Brahms and Bruckner, Mahler was wont to return to Beethoven: "Now that I've worked my way through Brahms, I've fallen back on Bruckner again. An odd pair of second-raters. . . . Now I stick to Beethoven. There are only he and Richard—and after them, nobody."¹² During the summer of 1896, while struggling to achieve the sound quality that he envisioned for his Third Symphony, he made the following comments about the similarity of his and Beethoven's situation vis-à-vis the sizes and capabilities of orchestras:

It's frightening that, along with the content, the means of expression have also had to expand again. I need five trumpets, ten horns and six clarinets; I have never come across such things, and nowhere will I be permitted them willingly. The choice is before me: I can adapt my scoring for an orchestra which is inadequate and obsolete for my music (as Beethoven naïvely did with his Ninth; for the orchestra of his day was totally insufficient for it—it was cramped and restricted until someone suitably competent came to loosen its bonds, as I did, much to its advantage, in my performance a year ago).¹³

Mahler found in Beethoven's works the explanation and rationale for his own artistic ideology, so powerful was the image of Beethoven some seventy years after his death.

On several occasions Mahler was moved to explain and defend his views publicly, and in so doing he often referred to Wagner's legacy as a conductor. Perhaps

11. Natalie Bauer-Lechner, *Recollections of Gustav Mahler*, trans. Dika Newlin, ed. Peter Franklin (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980), pp.29–30.

12. Alma Mahler, *Memories and Letters*, ed. Donald Mitchell and Knud Martner, trans. Basil Creighton (London: Cardinal, 1990), p.239.

13. Bauer-Lechner, *Recollections of Gustav Mahler*, p.64. The concert that Mahler is referring to is probably the one held in Hamburg on 11 March 1895.

the most complete statement of his thinking appeared in a text circulated to the audience before his second performance of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony in Vienna in February 1900. Faced with fierce attacks by the Viennese press after his first performance, Mahler attempted to justify and explain his interpretive decisions. In this text, cited in full in Appendix 3, he adamantly rejects the assertion that his revisions were "arbitrary," arguing, as Wagner did before him in his essay "On Performing Beethoven's Ninth Symphony,"¹⁴ that his changes were meant only to bring out Beethoven's intentions more clearly: "The conductor can prove, score in hand . . . that, far from arbitrariness and premeditation, but also misled by no 'tradition,' it has been his sole purpose to sympathize with Beethoven's will even to its apparently most insignificant detail, and also not to allow the smallest of them to be sacrificed or submerged in the confusing tumult of sound."¹⁵

Like Wagner, Mahler argued that Beethoven's deafness, his loss of "contact with reality and the world of physical sound," as well as the limitations of the brass instruments of Beethoven's day, which affected the proper voice leading, were problems that left their mark on Beethoven's score. Rejecting the accusation that he made "re-instrumentations, alterations or 'improvements' of Beethoven's work," Mahler asserted that he was responding to the "long-practiced multiplication of the strings" by increasing the number of wind instruments in order to achieve a better balance between the winds and the strings.

In January 1899, Mahler published an open letter in the weekly newspaper *Die Wage* in order to justify his decision to reorchestrate Beethoven's String Quartet, op.95, for string orchestra. His justification abounds in statements that reveal his belief in an intimate knowledge, possessed only by him, of Beethoven's thoughts and opinions. He writes: "I do not act against the composer's intention, but rather in its meaning. Beethoven did not envisage, for his last quartets, all of the limited, small instruments. . . . He conveyed an immense idea in four voices." Again, he argues that he was neither interfering with Beethoven's wishes nor distorting the original sound. "What I intended is only an ideal representation of the quartet. . . . If

14. Wagner, "On Performing Beethoven's Ninth Symphony," pp.95–127.

15. "In diesem, wie in jedem Punkte, der die Interpretation des Werkes im Ganzen wie im Einzelnen betrifft, kann an der Hand der Partitur (und zwar je mehr in's Detail eingehend, desto zwingender) der Nachweis geführt werden, dass es dem Dirigenten überall nur darum zu thun war, fern von Willkür und Absichtlichkeit, aber auch von keiner 'Tradition' beirrt, den Willen Beethoven's bis in's scheinbar Geringfügigste nachzufühlen und in der Ausführung auch nicht das Kleinste von dem, was der Meister gewollt hat, zu opfern, oder in einem verwirrenden Tongewühle untergehen zu lassen." See full text cited in Appendix 3 (my trans.).

chamber music is transferred to the concert hall, its intimacy is already lost. But even more is lost. In a large space the four voices are lost and do not speak to the listener with the strength that the composer wanted to give them. I give them this strength by reinforcing the voices. I unravel the expansion, which sleeps in the voices, and give the tones wings.”¹⁶ As early as 1896, before becoming music director in Vienna, Mahler outlined his approach to Beethoven’s works.

It is true that all Beethoven’s works need a certain amount of editing. . . . Beethoven counted on artists, not artisans, for the conducting as well as the playing. He didn’t write everything in such a minute detail as Richard Wagner was later to do, nor was he so experienced in orchestral technique as never to make a mistake in notating the sound he wanted, particularly later on when he lost control over this because of his deafness. So in order that the music should be played as it was meant to sound, one has to add all sorts of dynamic indications to the parts, so that the principal voice stands out and the accompaniment retires into the background. One must take care, too, that the bowing and expression produce the effect that the composer wanted.¹⁷

In 1899 Mahler again recognized that the larger orchestras and performing spaces introduced new demands on the conductors of his day.

Beethoven’s symphonies present a problem that is simply insoluble for the ordinary conductor. . . . Unquestionably, they need *re-interpretation* and *re-working*. The very constitution and size of the orchestra necessitates it: in Beethoven’s time, the whole orchestra was not as large as the string section alone today. If, consequently, the other instruments are not brought into a balanced relationship with the strings, the effect is bound to be wrong. Wagner knew that very well; but he too had to suffer the bitter attacks because of it.¹⁸

All of these statements show that for Mahler there were a number of problems in Beethoven’s scores: Beethoven’s imperfect orchestral technique, the disproportion between the orchestral groups given the expansion of the size of the orchestras and concert halls in the nineteenth century, and inadequate writing for the

16. Cited in Ernst Hilmar, “Schade, aber es müsste sein: Zu Gustav Mahlers Strichen und Retuschen insbesondere am Beispiel der V Symphonie Anton Bruckners,” in *Bruckner Studien*, ed. Othmar Wessely (Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1975), pp. 190–91 (my trans.). For full text in original and English translation, see Appendix 3.

17. Bauer-Lechner, *Recollections of Gustav Mahler*, p. 45.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 140 (emphasis mine).

brass and other instruments owing to the limitations of instruments in Beethoven's day. His conducting scores reveal that many of his revisions are made with the goal of correcting these problems. Markings are also directed at giving greater precision to Beethoven's dynamics. On several occasions, Mahler expressed frustration over the lack of precision of dynamic nuancing in contemporaneous orchestral performances. He remarked to Natalie Bauer-Lechner:

People just can't observe the printed signs, and so they sin against the sacred laws of dynamics as well as against the inner rhythm that lies at the heart of any work. As soon as they see a *crescendo*, they immediately play loudly and get faster; for a *diminuendo*, they immediately play softly and hold back the tempo. In vain you may seek for the finer nuances of *mezzo-forte*, *forte*, *fortissimo*, of *piano*, *pianissimo*, *pianississimo*. Much less do *sforzando*, *fortepiano*, or any shortening or lengthening of the notes ever register.¹⁹

Mahler was ready to invest hours of his time in order to prepare the scores and parts for the rehearsals so that he could achieve finer dynamic gradients in his performances. Joseph Förster, a friend of Mahler during his years in Hamburg (1891–97), recalls his “pedantic strictness” in working on his annotations: “In these days I found Mahler always at the writing table. He was never satisfied with the score, perfecting it to the last detail with regard to dynamics and execution; he also transferred every one of his rigorously measured signs to individual orchestral parts.”²⁰ Using several different writing instruments, including blue pencil, red pencil, red ink pen, rusty-brown pencil, and lead pencil, Mahler added hundreds of rehearsal numbers and letters—as well as dynamic adjustments (gradual increases or decreases in volume) and changes (e.g., *f* instead of *p*) to Beethoven's scores. In many cases these changes give the players more precise instructions with regard to dynamics—for example, where to begin a crescendo or diminuendo, and how to achieve the most appropriate effect. Generally, however, they refine and enhance Beethoven's markings rather than alter the character of the music. Many of Mahler's other types of markings can also be characterized in this way. His doubling marks, tempo indications, range expansions (octave doublings), altered rhythmic configurations, changes in phrasing, redistribution of instruments, as well as new parts for additional instruments serve to enhance the sound in a way that follows Beethoven's lead. Also, his addition of extremely detailed expressive markings in

19. Ibid., p.78.

20. Josef Bohuslav Foerster, *Der Pilger, Erinnerungen eines Musikers*, trans. Pavel Eisner from Czech (Prague: Artia, 1955), p.385.

certain critical passages, for example, in the bass recitative of the finale of the Ninth Symphony, can be characterized in this way.

Occasionally, however, Mahler's changes represent a more significant intrusion into the original, from dynamic and orchestral alterations that significantly change the expressive qualities of a passage to the deletion of an entire section from the original score. In the scherzo of Beethoven's Seventh Symphony, for example, he eliminates entire sections of the movement, drastically altering its overall form. Similarly, in the Third Symphony his reorchestration and bold reinforcement of the climactic section in the development of the first movement carries a strong stamp of his own artistic vision. Terminology is a sensitive matter. These particular changes indicate that Mahler's actions went beyond "interpretation," with the kind of freedoms that this term bears. They amount instead to "revisions" and "transcriptions," or even to "re-compositions" in certain cases. Mahler himself never used the term *Retuschen*, nor did he label his annotations and changes as falling into one category or the other.²¹ In many cases, the term "editing" (*Redaktion*), which he used in his statements concerning his changes to Beethoven's scores, was more or less accurate where, for example, Beethoven did not include precise instructions for nuances of dynamics and phrasing. Mahler also used the terms "[re-]interpretation" (*Interpretation*) and "re-working" (*Nacharbeitung*) when he explained to Bauer-Lechner the need to attain a balanced orchestral sound in Beethoven's symphonies. There is, however, no indication that Mahler was consciously aiming at "re-composing" Beethoven's works; on the contrary, he expressly denied that his *Retuschen* were intrusions into Beethoven's original compositions and insisted that he was merely following Wagner's lead in carrying out the "Master's" true intentions. Denis McCaldin, however, maintains that in some instances, including several passages of the finale of the Ninth Symphony, Mahler's "re-touchings . . . amount to recomposition."²² In my view, Mahler's actual revisions do sometimes alter the expressive qualities of the original score. Yet one should also take Mahler's intent into consideration when deciding whether to label what he was doing

21. The only potentially contradictory indication in any of Mahler's "retouched" scores—the stamp *Mit instrumentaler retuschen / von / Gustav Mahler* on the first page of one of the copies of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony—is of highly questionable origin and authenticity. This score is a Peters Edition of the Ninth Symphony, kept at the University of Southampton, and shows the hands of several copyists. Pickett attributes some of the handwriting to Mahler, but finds discrepancies with the score from the Universal Edition, which is unquestionably annotated by Mahler. See Pickett, *Gustav Mahler as an Interpreter*, p. 398.

22. Denis McCaldin, "Mahler and Beethoven's Ninth Symphony," *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association* 107 (1980–81), 101–10.

as “recomposition” or creative “interpretation” and “revision.” In his desire to carry out Beethoven’s intentions as far as possible, Mahler may have overstepped his own initial goals and infused the final product with more of his own personal stamp than he realized.

As Mosco Carner has observed, Mahler’s *Retuschen* are part of a long tradition of one composer revising another, the most notable examples being Mozart’s interpretation of Handel’s *Messiah*, Wagner’s conducting of Gluck and Beethoven and Rimsky-Korsakov’s revisions of Mussorgsky’s *Boris Godunov*.²³ In many ways, Mahler’s revisions of Beethoven parallel his revisions of Schumann’s symphonies. Carner’s categories, which proceed from changes in dynamics, phrasing, and articulation through changes in tempo indications and orchestration to thematic and motivic reinforcements, alterations and finally cuts and eliminations of entire sections, easily apply to Mahler’s Beethoven *Retuschen* as well.²⁴ Mahler “re-touched” more than two dozen works in his symphonic and operatic repertoire, including Mozart’s operas, Beethoven’s *Fidelio* and overtures, Schubert’s symphonies, Weber’s operas, Wagner’s operas and overtures, Bruckner’s symphonies, and works by Smetana and Zemlinsky.²⁵ And although his *Retuschen* to the scores of these composers include many of the same kinds of changes he made to Beethoven’s works, he was not harshly judged for them. From Mahler’s perspective the public outcry concerning his *Retuschen* of certain works by Beethoven seemed unjust and inconsistent. He could not understand why his Beethoven interpretations were regarded any differently from the normal conductor’s practices of modifying details of orchestration in works of Haydn or Mozart: “We strengthen also an orchestral movement of Haydn, an overture by Mozart. Do we therefore change the character of those works? Certainly not.”²⁶ The reaction of the public and the critics to Mahler’s Beethoven *Retuschen*—a reaction often tainted with anti-Semitic remarks—indicates that a par-

23. Mosco Carner, “Mahler’s Re-Scoring of the Schumann Symphonies,” in *Major and Minor* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1980), pp. 71–73.

24. Ibid.

25. The individual “retouched” works as well as Mahler’s general retouches of these composers’ works are examined in the following studies: Albert Bing, “Zu Mahlers Retuschen an Schumanns Symphonien,” *Pult und Taktstock* 5 (1928), 53; Mosco Carner, “Mahler’s Re-Scoring,” pp. 71–73; Arno Forchert, “Mahler und Schumann,” in *Mahler-Interpretation*, pp. 44–60; Julia Bess Hubbert, *Mahler and Schoenberg: Levels of Influence* (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1996); Volker Kalisch, “Zu Mahlers Instrumentationsretuschen in den Sinfonien,” *Schweizerische Musikzeitung / Revue Musicale Suisse* 121, no. 1 (1981), 17–22; Bernhard Paumgartner, “Gustav Mahlers Bearbeitung von Mozarts ‘Cosi fan tutte’ für seine Aufführungen an der Wiener Hofoper,” in *Musik und Verlag: Karl Vötterle zum 65. Geburtstag am 12 April 1968*, ed. Richard Baum and Wolfgang Rehm (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1968), pp. 476–82.

26. Ernst Hilmar, “Schade, aber es müsste sein,” pp. 190–91.

ticularly strong performance tradition had developed as a result of the idolization of Beethoven in the nineteenth century.

That Mahler was aware of this tradition, and that he was nevertheless willing, in the name of his deep conviction about the proper interpretation of Beethoven, to undermine it and thus jeopardize his conducting career, should be seen as indicative of the importance that Beethoven's music held for him. As Bauer-Lechner remembers, Mahler failed in March of 1897 to attain the position of conductor of the Kaim orchestra in Munich when his interpretation of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony was received as "extremely unclassical and arbitrary."²⁷ Although apparently conscious of how his interpretation would be received, Mahler nevertheless remained true to his convictions: "I could have done what they wanted—played Beethoven in their soulless and senseless way, and spared myself a lot of effort in the process. But in music at least I will maintain my standards even if my life is a struggle in other respects."²⁸ Mahler also anticipated the way his interpretation of Beethoven would be received in Vienna even before he came to that city as Director of the Vienna Royal Opera and the Vienna Philharmonic. In a letter to his friend Friedrich Löhr, from spring 1894, Mahler writes: "Supposing I came to Vienna! How would I be treated in Vienna, with my way of going about things? I should only need to try once to convey my interpretation of one of Beethoven's symphonies to the famous Philharmonic Orchestra, trained as it has been by the honest Hans, to be involved forthwith in the most repulsive dog-fight."²⁹ The scandals that awaited him in Vienna starting from 1898 and surrounding in particular his performances of Beethoven's symphonies therefore come as no surprise.

Beethoven's *Eroica* and the Breakthrough

The famous orchestra was not prepared for Mahler's approach to Beethoven's scores. During the rehearsals for the first concert of the Vienna Philharmonic under its newly appointed director, one of the musicians circulated an anonymous letter in which he harshly criticized Mahler's "militaristic tone," his "Jewish audacity," and the dictates of his "caprices and whims." The letter was signed by "A musician who wants to hear the authentic, unadulterated Beethoven."³⁰ Letters such as this and the one

27. Bauer-Lechner, *Recollections of Gustav Mahler*, p.78.

28. *Ibid.*, p.79.

29. *Selected Letters of Gustav Mahler*, ed. Knud Martner, trans. Eithne Wilkins, Ernst Kaiser, and Bill Hopkins (London: Faber and Faber, 1979), pp.152–53.

30. This anonymous letter was sent to the *Intendant* in early November 1898 during rehearsals for the first Philharmonic concert under Mahler's leadership. In La Grange, *Gustav Mahler*, II, 120–21.

complaining about the “Jewish Regime at the Vienna Opera” circulated in the press and among the public even before Mahler’s debut in Vienna and attacked in advance his methods of “trying to improve Beethoven.”³¹ The apprehension on the part of orchestral musicians and critics about Mahler’s novel conception of the Beethovenian sound persisted throughout his career as music director in Vienna. Hans Geissler, the critic of the *Neue musikalische Presse*, recalls with indignation that Mahler repeatedly made the musicians play with their bells in the air.³² Mahler’s unconventional interpretation of Beethoven was, in the opinion of the critic Henri Krehbiel, almost “calculated to provoke discussion.” Krehbiel noticed Mahler’s passionate and personal approach to Beethoven’s music, especially in the second movement of the *Eroica*. In one climax in particular, there were “suggestions of the crack of doom and an agonized hymning of the Day of Wrath.”³³ Not all reactions to Mahler’s interpretations of the *Eroica* were initially negative, however. Important critics such as Max Kalbeck and Eduard Hanslick, for example, wrote favorably about his *Eroica* at the time of its Vienna debut. Kalbeck interpreted the warm reception by the audience as a consequence of Mahler’s detailed and perfectionist rendering of the Symphony: “The mood of the audience gradually grew warmer and there was loud applause after the closing strains of the ‘*Eroica*’ brought the concert to an end. Mahler conducted everything from memory; his calm and the economy of his gestures were remarkable. He was able to work out every tiny detail in rehearsal.”³⁴ Hanslick, in his review in the *Neue freie Presse* a day after the performance, also expressed appreciation for Mahler’s efforts. He noted the “new musical details that sparkled like diamonds without detracting from the unity of form and mood,” adding:

Mahler’s principal aim is to tune each piece to a dominating idea and preserve its character and style. . . . The Coriolanus Overture and the “*Eroica*” produced an indescribable impression. Seldom before have we heard this music performed with such clarity and transparency in the most delicate of textures and with such overwhelming overall grandeur and power. The public, used to the best, gave free rein to its enthusiasm after each movement of the “*Eroica*,” and never tired of calling back the man in command time and time again. All’s well that starts well!³⁵

31. La Grange, *Gustav Mahler*, II, 118–21.

32. Hans Geissler, *Neue musikalische Presse*, 4 November 1900 (cited in La Grange, *Gustav Mahler*, II, 314).

33. Cited in Pickett, *Gustav Mahler as an Interpreter*, p. 334.

34. Max Kalbeck, *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, 6 November 1898 (cited in La Grange, *Gustav Mahler*, II, 121).

35. Eduard Hanslick, *Neue freie Presse*, 7 November 1898 (cited in La Grange, *Gustav Mahler*, II, 123).

This positive reception was more of an exception, however, especially in the years to come. Mahler's performance of the *Eroica* would be criticized for a number of reasons, most notably its tempo changes, phrasing, instrumentation, seating arrangements on the stage, and excessive use of brass and kettledrums.

Theodor Helm, the well-known music critic of the *Neue musikalische Presse*, *Musikalische Wochenblatt*, and *Deutsche Zeitung*, had mixed feelings about Mahler's performances. Although he was generally positive about Mahler's conducting, praising his freedom which was "so different from the metronomic rigor" of classical conductors and identifying him as a fervent follower of Wagner's doctrines, his initial reaction to Mahler's first appearance with the Vienna Philharmonic was somewhat more reserved. Noting that the instrumental *Retuschen* had been almost imperceptible and had not deserved so much negative publicity, Helm nonetheless objected that Mahler's concern was limited mostly to "interesting and surprising detail" without attaining "the imposing, magisterial dignity of Hans Richter."³⁶ In 1900 Mahler's "slow tempos" in the *Eroica* were, however, a constant issue with the critics. What in 1894 Arnold Berliner considered a moderate tempo in the scherzo, one which allowed the eighth notes in m.9 to be played distinctly, was later considered unpardonable by Helm and Geissler in Vienna, as well as by Gustave Robert in Paris.³⁷

From the foregoing discussion, one common theme emerges in the responses of critics and especially musicians: Mahler's *Retuschen* emphasized the brass and the timpani too strongly in certain passages. Although Mahler played down the extent of his *Retuschen*, it is evident from his conducting scores that the critics were at least partially correct. On examination of the set of Breitkopf and Härtel printed orchestral parts for the Third Symphony,³⁸ we can see that he had indeed changed the orchestration of the original scores significantly, with the "breakthrough" passages heavily annotated and significantly altered.

The aforementioned thirty-six measures of syncopated chords in the development section of the first movement (mm.244–79) is one such moment noted by Romantic critics. (Example 1 shows this passage with Mahler's alterations and additions.) Up to this point in the music, Mahler mainly changed dynamics, emphasized more gradual crescendos or decrescendos, altered some of the phrasing,

36. Theodore Helm, *Deutsche Zeitung*, 7 November 1898 (cited in La Grange, *Gustav Mahler*, II, 124). Hans Richter was Mahler's predecessor at the Vienna Opera.

37. Pickett, *Gustav Mahler as an Interpreter*, p.328.

38. These are supplemented with a set of handwritten parts for the doubling of woodwinds, horns, and trumpets that contain Mahler's annotations as well. Breitkopf and Härtel Orchesterbibliothek Nr. 7/8. The score from which Mahler conducted the symphony is missing.

Example 1: Beethoven, *Eroica*
Symphony, movt. I, mm. 274–
83, with Mahler's annotations.

and doubled wind instruments. His most significant change before the development section was the crossing out of the repeat sign at the end of the exposition in all the instrumental parts. Starting with m.243, however, the alterations become more frequent and visible. To the original orchestral sound of strings and woodwinds consisting of flutes, oboes, and bassoons, he added an E♭ clarinet, full woodwind doubling, timpani, and three French horn parts. The added first and second clarinets double the parts of first and second oboe respectively, while the added horns reinforce the bassoon. The dynamic markings in the woodwinds are also changed from *sf* to *ff*. In m.248, where the syncopated, harmonically unstable section starts, Mahler added another rehearsal letter (H), changed the original marking of *ff* to *p*, and inserted vertical lines in blue pencil to separate the syncopated notes. In m.254 trumpets and horns continue playing instead of pausing as in the original score. Starting with m.260, Mahler strengthened and made fuller the sound of the string group by redistributing the instruments and refining the bowing and phrasing. As the music progresses it is clear that he is aiming for a gradually stronger and fuller orchestral sound. The harmonic progression here strives toward a strong arrival, since the syncopated climactic section that follows the F-minor fugato passage (m.236) proceeds through a series of elliptical harmonic resolutions from A minor toward a passing diminished-seventh chord and reaches in m.276 the Neapolitan six-five chord of E minor. After this, the E-minor dominant-ninth chord (m.280) leads to the tonic of E minor in m.284. At first the harmonies change every six measures, but after the E-minor seventh chord in m.271 the harmonic rhythm moves twice as fast. At the moment of climax in m.276 Mahler's orchestra reaches its greatest dynamic intensity: all the winds and trumpets are doubled, the timpani enter, and there are between seven and ten French horns playing.³⁹ In order to strengthen this full orchestral sound Mahler changed the dynamic marking from *f* to *fff* in all the brass and strings. In m.276 all the brass instrument parts have the instruction *Schallbecher in die Höhe* (Bells up) written in red ink and in some cases underlined or circled.

As mentioned earlier, W. R. Grienkerl described this passage in the trajectory of the Symphony as a "tremendous breakthrough" leading to the "heavenly spheres of E minor."⁴⁰ Similar metaphors appear in the writings of many other

39. Among the orchestral parts in the archive, the following French horn parts are present: Hn 1/1, Hn 1/2, Hn 2/1, Hn 2/2, Hn 3, Hn 4, Hn 6/1 and likely 6/2. The parts for the doubled third horn and a fifth horn are not among the parts. We may suppose that they are most likely missing, since it is unlikely that the third horn alone was not doubled. Also it seems likely that Mahler included a fifth horn part since he added parts for fourth and sixth horns.

40. Grienkerl, *Das Musikfest*, p.110.

Romantic writers. Wagner, for example, in his 1852 program notes for the *Eroica*, identified the same passage as a “tragic crisis” toward which the force and the energy (*Kraft*) of the movement is rushing.⁴¹ In his interpretation of the first movement, he states that the movement’s governing energy “clinches toward the middle of the movement—to the violence of the destroyer, and in its braggart strength we think we see a Wrecker of the World before us, a Titan wrestling with the gods.”⁴² Wilhelm von Lenz saw the violent energy of this section as resembling the “thirty-two stabbing thrusts” by which “Caesar is slain at the foot of Pompey’s column.”⁴³ Berlioz felt the inability to “repress a sensation of fear at such a picture of ungovernable fury.” He understood the “rude dissonances” as “the voice of despair and almost of madness.”⁴⁴ Alexandre Oulibicheff associated this moment with a “superior resistance suddenly breaking through the forces of an invincible phalanx” and producing “nothing but notes without melody or harmony—a repeated E against F.”⁴⁵

Like so many of his contemporaries, Mahler clearly recognized this passage as an important moment in the trajectory of this Symphony, and through his *Retuschen* he both emphasized it and gave it his own interpretation. The question that Oulibicheff asks himself—“but what can be signified by these terrifying dissonances that stop so abruptly and remain unresolved?”—is one that evidently perplexed Mahler as well, since the latent resolution to E minor that occurs in the passage between mm.276 and 284 is not brought out by Mahler’s interpretation. Rather, the E-minor episode in m.284 starts with a drastic contrast—the instrumental texture is significantly lighter with all the doubling instruments, the brass, timpani, and clarinets dropping out and the dynamics shifting suddenly from *fff* to *pp*. Mahler

41. Wagner, *Wagner’s Prose Works* (see footnote 9), I, 222.

42. The similarity of the language that Wagner uses to describe this moment in the *Eroica* to the language Mahler uses to describe the *Durchbruch* of his First Symphony is further explored in my dissertation.

43. Wilhelm von Lenz, *Beethoven: Eine Kunst-Studie* (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1855), p.295.

44. Hector Berlioz, *A Travers Chants* (Paris: Gründ, 1971 [1862]), p.41.

45. “L’invincible phalange ne marche plus droite et fière; elle se tord comme un serpent blessé, à travers une modulation frénétique; elle avance, elle monte avec rage, elle monte encore, et tout-à-coup elle s’arrête. Ses forces se brisent contre une résistance supérieure, que Beethoven n’accuse point. Est-ce Dieu, est-ce l’ennemi, je l’ignore. L’orchestre ne fait plus entendre que des notes sans mélodie et sans harmonie, des *mi* contre *fa* (*Mi contre fa est diabolus in musica*, disaient les anciens théoriciens) rauques et déchirants, le râle de la mort, exprimé avec cette vérité trop vraie qui devient un mensonge par rapport à l’art. Mais que pourraient signifier ces épouvantables dissonances qui s’arrêtent brusquement et demeurent sans résolution?” (Alexandre Oulibicheff, *Beethoven ses critiques et ses glossateurs* (Paris: Jules Gavelot, 1857), pp.177–78 (my trans.).

thus emphasizes the disruption of the expected musical trajectory. The emphasized suddenness of the *Durchbruch*—an effect of rupture at the moment of resolution in Mahler's interpretation—undermines the expectations of an arrival in E minor. The expected resolution is experienced less as a result of internal harmonic logic and more as a transport “into the heavenly spheres” brought about through the destructive force of the previous *Durchbruch*.

For Griepenkerl, the unsettling effect of the emergence of the new E-minor theme from the tumult of the breakthrough was something beyond the conventional musical expression of the time; it was an event of incomprehensible power. For Wilhelm von Lenz, the establishment of E minor here suggests a path to the afterlife. In a poetic interpretation of the E-minor theme, Lenz describes the hero's farewell to life: “The world shall know that the lion now dies, and Vienna shall light his funeral torch.”⁴⁶ The almost surreal effect of the horn-call motive that emerges in m.284 after the E/F clash of the previous chord was described by A. B. Marx, for example, as a “reminding, promising call,” a “prophetic warning, not yet understood,” a “voice of recollection heard from a distance.” He characterized the preceding syncopated passage as “drifting entirely from a distance,” after which the E-minor horn-call motive represents a moment “not at all belonging to the present” but as a “premonition of the redeeming glory to come.”⁴⁷

By emphasizing and enhancing the moment of *Durchbruch*, Mahler thus espouses the Romantic Idealist reading of this concept, according to which the *Durchbruch* idea is associated with a sudden shift of realms—from the physical into the spiritual sphere. This shift of realms and the interchanging roles of the spiritual and the secular are characteristic of nineteenth-century Idealist philosophical and religious trends in the period after the French Revolution.⁴⁸ In the aftermath of the Revolution, as Reinhold Brinkmann has pointed out, the Symphony's spiritual dimensions were emphasized over its political meaning; seen as a spiritual force in the history of ideas; the Revolution emanates as “a historical turning point in modern consciousness.”⁴⁹ The revolutionary narrative pattern, according to Lawrence Kramer, emerged in the late eighteenth century as a means of coming to terms with the dilemmas of revolutionary politics and thus always involves the spiritual,

46. Wilhelm von Lenz, *Beethoven et ses trois styles* (Paris: G. Legouix, 1982), p. 31.

47. Adolph Bernhard Marx, *Ludwig van Beethoven: Leben und Schaffen* (3rd edn. Berlin: Otto Janke, 1875), p. 281.

48. This topic is further explored within the context of the Romantic notion of *Kunstreligion* (Art-religion, Religion of Art) by Carl Dahlhaus, *The Idea of Absolute Music*, trans. Roger Lustig (Chicago: U Chicago P, 1989).

49. Reinhold Brinkmann, “In the Time(s) of the *Eroica*,” in *Beethoven and His World*, ed. Scott Burnham and Michael P. Steinberg (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2000), p. 2.

often unexpected and sudden overcoming of a symbolic secular crisis.⁵⁰ The striving for the realm of the Absolute as the constant motivation of this struggle is resolved only through a spiritual intervention, a sudden shift of realms, like the one that occurs in the *Durchbruch* passages. As M. H. Abrams has noted, this shift from the external and secular to the internal and spiritual results in “a spiritual and moral revolution, which will transform our experience of the old world.”⁵¹

The connection of the notion of *Durchbruch* to the French Revolution in the minds of nineteenth-century music writers is explicitly shown in the preface to Griepenkerl's *Musikfest*, which he states, “The French Revolution of 1789 represents the breakthrough [*Durchbruch*]” through which a “new type of consciousness achieved its . . . implementation during the process of recent history.”⁵² In Griepenkerl's explanation, the historical circumstances of the postrevolutionary era have brought the “Idea” (*Idee*) into the consciousness of the people. Further, Griepenkerl's usage of the term “Idea” in relation to the Revolution reflects Hegel's writings on the same subject. Hegel saw the French Revolution as a crucial moment in the Spirit's (*Geist*) historical development toward freedom, its ultimate purpose being the attainment of the Absolute. He regarded the Revolution—or as he saw it, the “glorious sunrise” in the human consciousness—as the historic instance of “the actual reconciliation of the divine and the secular.”⁵³

The post-revolutionary, Hegelian ideals of freedom and secular life inspired by the teleological development of the Absolute Spirit nowhere found a stronger echo than in the tradition of Beethoven criticism. Kramer's warning against the truism that “music of Beethoven's heroic style is resonant with the ideals of individual and social freedom that swept Europe in the wake of the French Revolution” may be warranted.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, the long line of Romantic writers describing Beethoven's music in terms reminiscent of those associated with the Revolution and its spiritual dimension—from E. T. A. Hoffmann, Ludwig Tieck, Wilhelm Wackenroder through Marx, Oulibicheff, Lenz, and Wagner—shows that the concept of *Durchbruch* assumes its meaning on the junction between an important development in the history of ideas and its transfer into the realm of music criticism. And while the *Durchbruch* moment in

50. Lawrence Kramer, “*Eroica*-Traces: Beethoven and Revolutionary Narrative,” in *Musik/Revolution: Festschrift für Georg Knepler zum 90. Geburtstag*, ed. Hanns-Werner Heister (Hamburg: Bockel, 1997), pp. 35–47.

51. M. H. Abrams, “English Romanticism: The Spirit of the Age,” in *Romanticism Reconsidered*, ed. Northrop Frye (New York: Columbia UP, 1963), p. 60.

52. Griepenkerl, *Das Musikfest*, p. vi.

53. Georg Friedrich Wilhelm Hegel, *The Philosophy of History*, trans. J. Sibree (New York: Dover, 1956 [1899]), p. 443.

54. Kramer, “*Eroica*-Traces,” p. 35.

the *Eroica* found meaning in the verbal explanations of the nineteenth-century music writers, Mahler attempted to express its underlying spiritual dimension musically. His reinforcement of the forceful, disruptive, syncopated passage of the *Eroica* and the undermining of the harmonic progression toward E minor in order to illuminate the E-minor theme as an unexpected and cathartic moment follows closely the Romantic Idealist reading of *Durchbrüche* in Beethoven's music as brief moments of revelation of the Ideal in the world of human consciousness.

The second movement of the *Eroica* also has a moment that Romantic critics referred to as an intervention of a force from outside of the music itself. August Wilhelm Ambros interpreted the climactic moment (mm. 145–54) of the long intensifying passage starting with the fugato in m. 114 as a sudden sound that “summons to a terrifying battle of annihilation, a titanic offensive.”⁵⁵ In the orchestral parts that Mahler annotated for his performances of this movement, he made a number of alterations in this passage. Starting from m. 130, when the woodwinds in unison reiterate the theme of the previous fugato section, Mahler instructs the winds to “Lift the bell” and provides three additional parts for the French horns, which double the theme of the winds. It seems, however, that Mahler intended to create a gradual dynamic and expressive buildup in this whole section, since he consistently reduced and softened the dynamics by changing *ff* to *ffp*. In m. 145, he adds a low D to each downbeat of the French horns, with a *sf* indication, but allows the whole climax to die out in the decrescendo of mm. 151–56. It is only in m. 160, after a pause following the single Ab in the first violins, that he engages the full strength of the orchestra used in the climax of the first movement. This is the moment where the extra trumpet parts (trumpets 3 and 4) enter for the first time in the Symphony, and it also incorporates all the horns that played in the *Durchbruch* passage in the development of the first movement. All the brass parts have the instruction *Schallbecher heben* or *Trompet aufheben hoch. hoch.* written in red ink above the unison C half note marked with a *marcato* accent, and the dynamics are raised to the level of *fff* instead of *ff* as in the original score.⁵⁶ The strings have the instruction *griffbrett* (fingerboard) at that moment written in red ink in their parts as well (mm. 159ff.). From these *Retuschen* we can see that Mahler's performance

55. “Der Marsch, der wiedereintreten will, wird unterbrochen und zurückgewiesen, dann werden im Fugato die Kräfte von allen Seiten herbeigeholt und versammelt—aber sie bleiben in dumpfer Resignation stehen—plötzlich ein Aufraffen zum furchtbarsten Vernichtungstapfe, ein titanisches Anstürmen—vergebens!” See August Wilhelm Ambros, *Die Grenzen der Musik und Poesie: Eine Studie zur Ästhetik der Tonkunst* (Leipzig: Matthes, 1855/56), pp. 133–34 (my trans.).

56. The part of the trumpet I/1 has the instruction “Bell up” in English, suggesting that the annotation was made after 1909 when Mahler conducted this symphony in New York.

clearly focused on the sudden burst of brass instruments after the apparent failure of the preceding intensifying section. The breakthrough here comes as a sudden, “unearned” chance for the funeral march to reach its conclusion.

The unconventionality of Mahler’s performances was not always received with criticism. In 1902, for example, his *Eroica* was received in St. Petersburg with ovations and, as his wife Alma overheard in the audience, with an appreciation for his radically different tempos in comparison with the traditional ones and for his overall interpretation, which was “beautiful and new.”⁵⁷ That comment prompted Alma to reflect on the conservative nature of the musical establishment in Vienna: “Imagine such a criticism among us in Vienna, where everyone has a leasehold on his own Beethoven.”

The Fifth Symphony: “An arbitrary gift of grace”

The established perception of Beethoven was indeed strong in Vienna, and Mahler’s novel interpretations of well-known and loved works such as the Fifth and Ninth Symphonies also created controversies. These were usually sparked by Mahler’s enemies in the orchestra, who had “their own leasehold” on Beethoven and who started spreading rumors about Mahler’s sacrilege of the untouchable Beethoven soon after the initial rehearsals, where it became obvious that the conductor had changed certain elements of the scores from which they were used to playing. Yet many listeners, after waiting with anticipation for the scandalous passages, were disappointed to discover that the changes were almost unnoticeable. The critic Ludwig Karpath, for example, commented on the infamous *Retuschen* in the finale of Beethoven’s Fifth in the following way:

The news of this unheard-of sacrilege was brought into the open soon after the rehearsals by a few members of the Philharmonic orchestra who were jealous of Mahler, which literally meant that the world-shattering communication was reported directly to the editors of newspapers hostile to Mahler. The battle already began, therefore, before the performance: the unsuspecting public awaited with the most eager interest the dreadfully disfigured theme, and was highly disappointed not to be able to find it. Had members of the orchestra not drawn their attention to it, nobody among the public would have had the faintest suspicion of the minute instrumental strengthening, and maybe one of ten critics would have noticed it.⁵⁸

57. Alma Mahler, *Memories and Letters*, p.34.

58. Ludwig Karpath, *Begegnung mit dem Genius* (Vienna: Fiba, 1934), p.43.

Comments such as these testify to Mahler's success in realizing his desire to bring out what is inherent in Beethoven's score. Looking at Mahler's conducting scores,⁵⁹ we find that many of his annotations simply amplify or refine Beethoven's own dynamic nuancing. In the last thirty measures of the finale, for example, the addition of dynamic nuancing creates two waves of dynamic crescendo from *fp* to *ff*, thereby reinforcing the intention already obvious in the original score.

One change that did get noticed by critics, however, was the bassoon doubling in the coda of the finale, which both Robert Hirschfeld and Gustav Schönaich, though generally positive about Mahler's interpretation, criticized.⁶⁰ In Mahler's conducting scores, there are extensive markings in red ink and in lead, blue and red pencil in the section in question, from m.390, indicating that all the woodwinds are doubled, with third and fourth horns mostly doubling first and second horns or bassoons. All these alterations to the original score serve to highlight this passage, which Wagner described as an "arbitrary gift of grace" that finally resolves the conflict of the Symphony. Comparing Beethoven's Fifth Symphony to a "musical ship (guided) out of the ocean of endless longing," Wagner describes in Schopenhauerian terms the hopeless process of the composer's striving to lift "the musical expression to the level of moral resolve." He writes: "After each effort of the will, and deprived of any firm ethical grounds, we find ourselves troubled by the possibility that this final triumph might just as easily regress back to a state of suffering. In fact, such a regression must strike us as really more plausible than the morally unmotivated triumph which occurs here, less as a convincing achievement than as an arbitrary gift of grace."⁶¹

Another moment that received special attention in Mahler's performance was the oboe cadenza in the recapitulation of the first movement (m.268), a passage that Wagner focused on in his 1869 essay *On Conducting*. Wagner thought of this small but very prominent detail in the music as the key to the movement's meaning. In the context of his discussion concerning the importance of proper interpretation of German music, he emphasized the oboe cadenza as a moving passage, otherwise often "thrown away" by contemporaneous conductors. For Wagner, that was the point in the music where, in order to grasp the expressive qualities of the

59. Published by Breitkopf and Härtel, as well as a set of orchestral parts carrying the stamp *Gustav Mahler / Wien*.

60. Ever since Mahler performed the Fifth Symphony in Budapest in 1890 (or any other Beethoven symphony for that matter), his tempi never failed to be noticed and in most cases appreciated, although critics objected to the "surprising and unusual" features of the fast tempo of the first movement and the slow tempo of the next two.

61. Wagner, "The Art-Work of the Future" (trans. Ellis) in *Wagner's Prose Works*, I, 123.

music, it was necessary to understand the interconnections between drama and music in opera. Had the Kapellmeisters of his time been aware of the importance of the “application to music of dramatic song and expressions,” that knowledge would have illuminated their conducting of “modern German music.”⁶² The oboe passage, in Wagner’s view, also functioned as a correspondence and a reminder of the previous first violin fermata in the exposition (m.21). Although he did not specify what exact significance the oboe passage held for him, he was explicit that it provided the key to the understanding of the movement as a whole: “My handling of it [the oboe cadenza] made me realize the importance of the first violin’s fermata in the corresponding passage of the exposition and the powerful impression I drew from those two apparently insignificant details led to a fresh understanding of the movement as a whole.”⁶³

The two passages indeed stand in close relationship to each other, sharing the same motivic and harmonic structure. In the exposition passage, the motivic buildup stops in m.21 on the first clear dominant, after which a forceful unison transposition of the main motive a half step higher throughout the entire orchestra initiates the unstoppable unleashing of the movement’s motivic energy. In his review of the Fifth Symphony, E. T. A. Hoffmann suggests that at this moment “a presentiment of the unknown, of the mysterious, is instilled in the listener.”⁶⁴ When the same passage reappears again in m.268, instead of the massive, thrice repeated A \flat sonority, the oboe cadenza gently unwinds from the sustained G, exploring in a leisurely way the area of the subdominant forcefully introduced in the corresponding section in the exposition.

Thomas Grey elaborates on Wagner’s peculiar emphasis on this detail and argues that there is an “overt projection of a vocal persona by this declamatory interpolation, the oboe being typecast . . . as a plangent vocal stand-in.” Grey concludes that this oboe intrusion “seems to enter a feeble protest against the ‘inexorable’ process of recapitulation now underway.”⁶⁵ Grey’s referral to an imaginary “vocal persona” resonates with Wagner’s emphasis on the importance of musicodramatic connectedness in relation to this passage. By criticizing other conductors who treated opera as “tiresome drudgery” and who therefore impaired the quality of their

62. Wagner, “On Conducting” (trans. Jacobs) in *Three Wagner Essays*, p.53.

63. *Ibid.*, p.54.

64. E.T.A. Hoffmann, “Review of the Fifth Symphony,” *AmZ* 12, nos.40, 41 (4 and 11 July 1810), trans. F. John Adams, Jr., in *Ludwig van Beethoven: Symphony No.5 in C Minor*, ed. Elliot Forbes, Norton Critical Scores (New York: W.W. Norton, 1971).

65. Thomas S. Grey, *Wagner’s Musical Prose: Text and Context*, *New Perspectives in Music History and Criticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995), p. 100.

orchestral conducting, Wagner seems to treat this oboe passage as an essentially theatrical moment, pregnant with dramatic significance for the understanding of the movement.

In Mahler's interpretation of this moment, he clearly intended a dramatic break since the doubling of selected instrumental groups gradually increases in number until in m.267 a *ff* (instead of the original *f*) is reached. After an added apostrophe in m.268, Mahler designates two oboes instead of one to play the cadenza and adds minute dynamic instructions that bring out the melodic contour even more prominently. This short cadenza finishes in *pp*, after which the recapitulation of the movement resumes its course. If we bear in mind Mahler's concern with balancing the sound according to the size of the concert hall, his reinforcement of the oboe passage appears as a practical way of giving this short phrase added recognition. Furthermore, by inserting an apostrophe after the fermata on G in m.268, he clearly separates the cadenza from not only the previous climactic surge but also the rest of the movement. By adding micro dynamic markings to the embellished notes in the oboe passage, Mahler for a moment emphasizes the contrast between the sense of the orchestral group of instruments and the seemingly vocal, individual intrusive element. The element of "intrusion" by the oboe into the musical process of the recapitulation thus appears as a breakthrough-like moment and was clearly noted and emphasized by Mahler.

The Seventh Symphony and the "lifting of the veil"

Mahler also followed Wagner's path in his performances of Beethoven's Seventh Symphony. Like Wagner, who described this work as the "apotheosis of the dance,"⁶⁶ Mahler strove for a "Dionysian effect" on the audience, and, according to the reviews and reports of the time, he was successful. Reminiscing to Bauer-Lechner about one performance in February of 1899, he says: "But you should have heard the power that I unleashed! And yet it didn't sound out of proportion, because the melody kept the upper hand; but in addition, every figuration, passage and ornament came through as clearly and distinctly as possible."⁶⁷ In order to achieve this clarity he made a number of subtle changes to the orchestration, phrasing, dynamics, and rhythmic configuration of the original score.⁶⁸ His intention to produce a strong effect at the end of the Symphony is clear from the annotations he made on the

66. Wagner, "The Art-Work of the Future," in *Wagner's Prose Works*, I, 124.

67. Bauer-Lechner, *Recollections of Gustav Mahler*, p.124.

68. For a list of changes that Mahler made to this score, see Pickett, *Gustav Mahler as Interpreter*, pp.375-93.

last page of both scores that he used, one Peters edition used probably in Hamburg in 1894 and one Breitkopf and Härtel score with matching parts used later, starting with the Vienna performance of 1899. Referring to the fermata in m. 129 that was meant to prepare the final outburst of the coda, Mahler wrote the following instruction in red ink: "N.B. Small stops for the production of a formidable crescendo through frequent but unnoticeable bowing changes!"⁶⁹ To Bauer-Lechner Mahler explained his instruction for this effect: "But in order to achieve this, everyone must give his all—in fact, more than that: he must go a step beyond his own capacity. And I force them to do it; for each one feels that I'll immediately pounce on him and tear him to pieces if he doesn't give me what I want. This extreme concentration of all their faculties enables them to achieve the impossible."⁷⁰

Mahler believed that the Seventh, in comparison with the other Beethoven symphonies, "suffers even more than the others from bad performances," especially the finale, since the Seventh was one of the least popular of Beethoven's symphonies at the time. Attempting to honor all the surprising features of this work, Mahler envisioned a "free and animated interpretation that holds back here, forges ahead there and broadly lingers elsewhere."⁷¹ Critics, such as the correspondent of the *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* who felt that Mahler "performed miracles," seemed to recognize Mahler's passion for bringing out the full potential of this work, appreciated his ability to create a "true Beethovenian atmosphere," and praised his interpretation as "unsurpassable."⁷²

As with other symphonies, many of Mahler's changes to the score of Beethoven's Seventh Symphony had the purpose of reinforcing what was already indicated in Beethoven's score, and thereby ensuring a correct and precise execution of the desired sound by the orchestra. More significant alterations, however, pertain to Mahler's vision of the form of the Symphony and its movements as a whole. Except for eliminating the repeats of the expositions of both first and last movements, Mahler's most drastic changes occur in the scherzo of the Symphony. Indeed, it is in the scherzo that Theodor Adorno, in his 1960 monograph on Mahler, identified the caesura on the octave A (mm. 145–48, 405–08, 641–44) as a moment of *Durchbruch*. Writing that in this moment there is a "rending of [the] veil" that all music promises with its first note, Adorno compared it to an "adolescent woken at five

69. "N.B. Kleine Halte zur Hervorbringung eines furchtbaren crescendo und zwar durch starken aber unmerklichen Bogenwechsel!" (my trans.).

70. Bauer-Lechner, *Recollections of Gustav Mahler*, p. 124.

71. Ibid.

72. La Grange, *Gustav Mahler*, II, 603.

in the morning by the perception of a sound that descends overpoweringly upon him” and who continues to “await the return of what was heard for a second between sleeping and waking.” That moment between sleeping and waking in the musical work is in Adorno’s view “a moment that rebels against the illusion of the successful work.”⁷³

At that moment, the scherzo ends with a crescendo halting for four measures on a sustained unison A throughout the orchestra, after which the scherzo is repeated. The A is therefore a turning point; either it returns to being the third scale degree of the original F major or it proceeds forward as the dominant pitch of the trio’s D major. Following Adorno’s interpretation, the pause on the A could be viewed as a moment of introspection, when the success of the work comes into question, when the “rending of the veil” occurs. In Mahler’s interpretation, the scherzo was not to be repeated, and he clearly marked that in his scores, crossing out with red ink the *prima volta* and annotating the *seconda volta* with dynamic markings. At the end of the *seconda volta*, Mahler removed the oboe and bassoon after the first A quarter note in mm. 147–48, thinning out the texture of the decrescendo section. If the scherzo were to be repeated, the long A would not successfully lift the veil since the first note of the piece would literally return and bring with it only another promise that “something that is different” may later occur. In the case of the literal repetition of the scherzo, the function of the sustained unison A would not be to effect “something that is different,” but would be to bring to a halt the forward motion of the piece and reverse the direction of the musical narrative to the original F major.

If the scherzo is not repeated, however, the A becomes the dominant of D major, the gateway to a new tonality. The calm tempo and sparse texture of the trio contrasts the vigor and breathlessness of the previous scherzo, creating the illusion of a new world into which the listener enters. Therefore, in eliminating the repeat of the scherzo, Mahler transforms the promise of the long A into a dominant that resolves to the D major of the trio. The caesura on A thus serves to rend the veil, allowing the music to proceed into something new, into the tranquil D major of the trio.

Mahler did not take out this repeat simply to save time or because he felt it tedious to repeat the scherzo once more. As we can see from the remaining part of the score for this movement, the next time the sustained A occurs, at the end of the scherzo that follows the trio, he revises Beethoven’s score even more drastically. Starting in m. 400—the passage that corresponds to mm. 140–48—he eliminates the entire second repeat of the trio as well as parts of the third repeat of the scherzo.

73. Theodor Adorno, *Mahler: A Musical Physiognomy*, trans. by Edmund Jephcott (Chicago: U Chicago P, 1992), p. 5.

zo and proceeds directly to m.637, four measures before the movement's coda. All of the scores as well as all of the individual orchestral parts have that whole section consisting of more than 200 measures either crossed out with blue lead pencil or pasted over with blank note paper. This way, the next time the unison sustained A is heard it leads directly into the conclusion of the movement, without returning to the scherzo. Figure 1 shows schematic diagrams of the movement in Beethoven's original version and in Mahler's revised version.

Scherzo			Caesura	Trio		Scherzo		Caesura	Trio		Scherzo		Caesura	Coda				
:aa	b	a ₁ :]		a	:b	a ₁ :	aa		b	a	a	:b			a ₁ :	aa	b	a
F	B ^b	F		[A]	D		F		B ^b	F	[A]	D				F	B ^b	F

Figure 1a: Diagram of
Symphony No.7, movement
III (Beethoven's original)

Scherzo			Caesura	Trio			Scherzo	DELETED			Caesura	Coda
aa	b	a ₁	[A]	a	:b	a ₁ :	aa	b	a		[A]	F
F	B \flat	F		D			F	B \flat	F			

Figure 1b: Diagram of
Mahler's revisions to Beet-
hoven's formal outline

Mahler's alteration of the overall form of Beethoven's movement thus reflects his awareness of the *Durchbruch* quality of the caesura on A. Because the sustained A leads to the trio only once—the second sustained A passage leads directly into the conclusion of the movement—its power to “rend the veil” or to break through to a new realm is not spoiled. By eliminating the repetition, therefore, Mahler enhances the moment of *Durchbruch* that Adorno describes.

The Ninth Symphony: A Breakthrough Toward the Word

Of all Mahler's Beethoven performances, that of the Ninth Symphony was the most controversial. Mahler's first appearance with the Ninth in front of the Viennese

public took place on 18 February 1900 and immediately caused a storm of criticism.⁷⁴ Although audiences were more enthusiastic than ever, including even the chorus in the long ovations, the critics took this opportunity to abandon all restraint in their attacks on Mahler. The only critic who remained positive was Kalbeck; everyone else, including Schönaich, Heuberger, Hirschfeld, as well as the contributors to anti-Semitic papers like Helm and the correspondents to the *Deutsche Zeitung* and the *Deutsche Volksblatt*, lashed out in indignation against Mahler's interpretation of the Ninth. As mentioned earlier, it was because Mahler "interpreted" rather than "believed in and followed" that was most disturbing for Hirschfeld. The "interpreting," according to Hirschfeld, came from Mahler's intellectual approach to Beethoven's score. "This Ninth symphony is a triumph of lucidity. . . . With it, Mahler has asserted himself as a modernist, at least in so far as this modern age drives towards science. . . . Instead of silencing him, the grandeur of the Ninth Symphony has aroused his intellect . . . and he has scaled its heights with clever interpretations and pretty details." As an example of these "clever interpretations," Hirschfeld observed that although the horn diminuendo in the D-major melody in the trio of the scherzo was superb, it was not in the original score and was therefore problematic. "Where should we be," he asked, "if we agreed with Mahler that the letter of the score is meaningless and that interpretation is all?"⁷⁵

Compared with Hirschfeld's relatively thoughtful remarks, however, other critics' comments seem belligerent at best. Heuberger, for example, writes that the "dreadful practice of 'painting over' [*übermalen*; the "h" added to "malen" no doubt intended as a pun on Mahler's name] the works of classic masters was erroneous and barbaric" and comparable in its criminality to the "remodeling of Michelangelo's Moses."⁷⁶ Helm saw the Ninth under Mahler's baton as "literally disfigured" to the point of being unrecognizable.⁷⁷

Mahler himself was not indifferent to this violent attack by the Viennese critics, who in 1900 finally turned against him and launched a campaign opposing him as Vienna's principal conductor. Since the first concert was sold out and there was a strong demand for another performance, another concert with the same program

74. Mahler performed Beethoven's Ninth Symphony three times before: twice in Prague—in 1886 and in 1899—and in Hamburg in 1895.

75. Robert Hirschfeld, *Wiener Abendpost*, 18 February 1900 (cited in La Grange, *Gustav Mahler*, II, 234, 235).

76. Richard Heuberger, *Neue freie Presse*, 18 February 1900 (cited in La Grange, *Gustav Mahler*, II, 234).

77. Theodor Helm, *Deutsche Zeitung*, 18 February 1900 (cited in La Grange, *Gustav Mahler*, II, 235).

was scheduled for 22 February. This was the occasion on which Mahler distributed a handout to the audiences in which he publicly rebutted the claims that he had reorchestrated Beethoven. Unfortunately for Mahler, the text with which he tried to appease the critics only enraged them further, resulting in their persistent and bitter attacks that, paired with a growing negativity among the musicians of the Philharmonic and the Opera orchestras, ultimately drove Mahler out of Vienna seven years later.

Mahler's references to Wagner in his published rebuttal were not simply appeals to Wagner's prestige in the eyes of the Viennese public. We know that Mahler was deeply familiar with Wagner's texts on Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, and their spirit infused his own view of the Ninth. In a letter to Arthur Seidel, music critic and professor of music history at Leipzig University, Mahler's view of the Ninth closely echoes Wagner's interpretation. Comparing the problems he was facing in composing his own Second Symphony with Beethoven's vision of the Ninth, he states: "Whenever I plan a large musical structure, I always come to a point where I have to resort to 'the word' as a vehicle for my musical idea. It must have been pretty much the same for Beethoven in his Ninth, except that the right materials were not yet available in his day." In the same letter, Mahler declared that Schiller's poem was inadequate for expressing the "wholly new, unique idea that [Beethoven had] in mind."⁷⁸ In Mahler's opinion, what both he and Beethoven were looking for was that right word, the "Open Sesame" gesture that resonates clearly with Wagner's own view of the Ninth in which the word serves to "[break] the bounds of absolute music." In Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, Mahler identified with the progression from what Wagner described as "the mode of infinite, indefinite expression" of the instrumental movements, through the "speaking character" of the instrumental recitative to the final conquering of instrumental music by the power of human voice.⁷⁹

It is well known that Wagner had studied and thought about Beethoven's Ninth Symphony for more than thirty years, during which he had begun the tradition of "retouching" certain elements of the orchestration of this piece. Starting in 1830 when he copied out the full score and made a piano reduction of it, through his conducting of the work on several occasions in Dresden and London, until finally his famous performance at the inauguration of the *Bayreuth Festspielhaus* foundation in May of 1872, Wagner developed a view of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony that was not only influential for generations of conductors to come but seminal for his own aesthetic and philosophical ideas about music and art in general.

78. Martner, *Selected Letters of Gustav Mahler*, p. 212.

79. Wagner, "On the Performance of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony at Dresden: Programme," in *Wagner's Prose Works*, VII, 252.

In his later essay “On Performing Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony,” written in 1873, Wagner explains in practical terms the changes he made and that, he felt, were necessary for the successful performance of this work.⁸⁰ In order to evaluate the idea behind Mahler’s *Retuschen* of Beethoven’s Ninth, it is important to have Wagner’s interpretation of this work in mind. In general, Wagner emphasized the need to accommodate the development of brass instruments, which in Beethoven’s time were not able to play many of the notes that Beethoven wished, therefore forcing him in some cases to make awkward jumps of more than an octave. Similarly, the ranges of the flute and violin parts in Wagner’s performance were extended upward so that the melodic line in certain passages would not be broken into the lower octave. He justified his actions by stressing that he “provided for an extensive rendering on the part of the orchestra by marking in the band-parts themselves everything [he] deemed needful for a drastic bringing out of nuances.”⁸¹ Like Mahler, his primary goal was to bring out “the master’s true intention.”

Looking at Mahler’s conducting scores for the Ninth Symphony, we find that although he clearly followed Wagner’s lead, he took the older composer’s ideas further, not only with his changes to details of orchestration but also in bringing out certain Romantic aesthetic notions, such as, his enhancements to the moments of *Durchbruch*. Comparing Wagner’s and Mahler’s changes to the opening fanfares of the finale, for example, we find that Mahler adopts Wagner’s addition of extra trumpet parts to reinforce the woodwinds, but that he goes further with the doubling of all of the winds, raising the flutes and oboes an octave higher, and most important, adding to the fanfares four more horns, three trombones, and a tuba. Mahler’s sound was even more inflated than Wagner’s, for which he was harshly criticized by the critics.

From Mahler’s conducting scores and parts, we also see that he intended the fanfares to burst into the Symphony unexpectedly and to create a striking contrast with the previous movement. At the end of the third movement Mahler carefully annotated the dynamic markings, reducing drastically the dynamics to *ppp*, and thinned out the texture by eliminating the doubling of the oboes. Instead of Beethoven’s *forte pizzicato*, Mahler wanted the last *pizzicato* in the strings to be *pianissimo*. In the absence of a strong downbeat ending of the movement, the forceful entrance of the full orchestra in the finale surely created an extraordinary dramatic contrast. The fanfares break into the Symphony “as though coming from the outside,” echoing what Wagner described in his “Beethoven” essay as the tone

80. Wagner, “On Performing Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony,” in *Three Wagner Essays*, pp. 95–127.

81. *Ibid.*, p. 243.

bursting through the night “upon the world of waking.”⁸² At the end of the fanfares, Mahler further emphasized the fanfares by adding fermatas and thereby separating them from the entrance of the instrumental recitative of the cellos and basses.

In his essay, Wagner proudly reports that he gave attention to the “unusual recitative-like passage for the violoncelli and contrabassi” and “succeeded in arriving at a phrasing that sounded almost spontaneous and bringing out the most striking expression alike of feeling tenderness and puissant energy.”⁸³ Following Wagner’s cue, Mahler added detailed expressive markings to almost every note of the eight-measure phrase. By adding several *ritenuto* and *accelerando* markings, refining the phrasing and bowing, and shortening some of the rhythmic values, he strove to give the passage what Wagner called a “speaking character” that “quits the mould of purely instrumental music.”⁸⁴ In Wagner’s interpretation, this is the moment in the Symphony when “the musical poem is urging toward a crisis, a crisis only to be voiced in human speech,” when Beethoven “makes the arrival of Man’s voice and tongue a positive necessity.”⁸⁵ After m.17 Mahler carries this notion further, making the entrance of the voice in mm.216 and 237 an event anticipated and longed for from the beginning of the movement. That almost all of Mahler’s *Retuschen* pertain to the music leading up to the actual entrance of the voice while the vocal sections of the movement are only slightly marked reveals Mahler’s need to increase the expressive character of the instrumental passages. In this way, as Wagner suggested, the dramatic tension created by the striving of the instruments in the recitative to “break the bounds of absolute music” makes the entrance of the voice—which “could not be sung in the ordinary way at all, but must be shouted out as if in highest transport”—a “breakthrough” event, a moment of rapture when “Light breaks on Chaos.”⁸⁶ In Wagner’s view, Beethoven’s breakthrough toward Joy may be achieved only after the movement’s initial “shriek of horror,” its “terror fanfare” (*Schreckensfanfare*) as he named the beginning of the finale in his 1873 article on performing the Ninth. Klaus Kropfnger, in his study of Wagner’s reception of Beethoven, points out the relationship of the idea of the revolution with the main idea of the Ninth Symphony. He notes that both Wagner’s program for the Ninth and his article “Revolution” written under the influence of the Dresden performance of this Symphony are based on the idea of a “victory over un-

82. Wagner, “Beethoven,” in *Wagner’s Prose Works*, V, 68.

83. Wagner, “On the Performance of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony at Dresden: Programme,” VII, 245.

84. *Ibid.*, p.251.

85. *Ibid.*, p.252.

86. *Ibid.*, p.253.

bearable, tormenting conditions.” The connection of the idea of redemption to the moment of the breakthrough is evident since in both cases “the development reaches its climax with a redemptive breakthrough to human happiness.”⁸⁷ The moment of the entrance of the word “O Freunde” thus symbolizes man’s redemption in general, or in Wagner’s interpretation, a breakthrough toward “the Word” in its broadest meaning as a symbol of the realm of ideas. In Mahler’s interpretation, the tremendous increase in the performing forces and the increase in volume of the fanfare passages leading up to the “O Freunde” of m.216 create a sharp contrast against the solitary vocal recitative, where the entrance of the voice breaks into a different realm of sound in which, as Wagner thought, “a sure and definite mode of utterance is won.”⁸⁸

It is clear that the moments of breakthrough or those representing a sudden change in the Symphony’s expected course were noticed and carefully executed in Mahler’s performances. Furthermore, by a series of bold gestures that went a step further than Wagner and that involved in some cases Mahler’s intervention into the structure of the symphonic movements (for example, in the scherzo of the Seventh Symphony) Mahler reveals that he did not merely “follow,” but indeed “interpreted” in the fullest sense the works of Beethoven. By reinforcing the forceful, disruptive, syncopated passage of Beethoven’s *Eroica* and by illuminating the E-minor theme as an unexpected and cathartic moment, as well the similar treatment of other breakthrough moments in Beethoven’s symphonies, Mahler closely follows the Romantic Idealist reading of *Durchbrüche* in Beethoven’s music as brief moments in which a sudden shift of realms occurs—from the physical to the spiritual. Although Mahler’s interpretations part with an established performance tradition and render Beethoven’s symphonies in a new light, they nevertheless resonate with philosophical and aesthetic concepts rooted in the notion of the Ideal as well as with the Romantic imperatives of originality and individuality. In his essay “On Liszt’s Symphonic Poems,” Wagner posited the importance of differentiating between mere “re-production” and “production” in musical performance. In the context of praising Liszt’s performances of Beethoven, he states: “Whoever had frequently occasion to hear Liszt play Beethoven . . . must surely have always been struck with the fact that there was no question here of re-production, but of genuine production. To accurately lay down the line that parts both functions, is much harder than one commonly assumes.”⁸⁹

87. Klaus Kropfinger, *Wagner and Beethoven*, trans. Peter Palmer (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, [1974] 1991), p.43.

88. Ibid.

89. Richard Wagner, “On Liszt’s Symphonic Poems,” in *Wagner’s Prose Works*, III, 240.

As Wagner concludes, “to be able to reproduce Beethoven, one must oneself be also able to produce.” The nature of original performance is a complex process of creation through interpretation. Instead of treating Beethoven’s scores as unalterable, or merely “re-producing” them, Mahler infused them with his own artistic spirit, “producing” them anew. In this sense, Mahler the conductor and Mahler the composer were inseparable. While his *Retuschen* to Beethoven’s scores may remain controversial, they show that the line between mere reproduction and genuine production is permeable.⁹⁰

90. Mahler’s Beethoven interpretations were adopted by Schoenberg and Webern, both of whom used his retouched scores in their own performances. Echoes of his approach may be heard in the performances of his disciples Bruno Walter and Wilhelm Mengelberg. A trend to reconstruct Mahler’s retouched versions of Beethoven’s works seems to have emerged recently with several recordings of Mahler’s “re-touched” versions of Beethoven’s symphonies. The Ninth Symphony was recorded in 1991 by the Cincinnati Philharmonia Orchestra under the direction of Gerhard Samuel. In the same year, the Ninth was recorded by the Brno Philharmonic Orchestra and Peter Tiboris, who has also recorded Beethoven’s Symphony No. 3, *Coriolan*, *Leonore* 2 and 3 overtures, and Mozart’s Symphonies Nos. 40 and 41, all on the basis of Mahler’s instrumental *Retuschen*. In addition, Mahler’s “retouched” Beethoven scores were performed by Leonard Slatkin and the National Symphony Orchestra as part of the annual NSO Beethoven Festival in September 2000, in Washington, D.C., and on tour in February and March 2004.

Appendix 1: List of Mahler's annotated conducting scores of Beethoven's symphonies in the Universal Edition archive in the Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek

Third Symphony op.55

Parts—Edition Breitkopf & Härtel Orchesterbibliothek no.7/8

Fifth Symphony, op.67

Score—Edition Breitkopf & Härtel, Partitur-Bibliothek no.9, stamp of Ròzsavölgyi és Tàrsa.

Score—Edition C. F. Peters, Leipzig; plate number 5446, stamp on title page of Ròzsavölgyi és Tàrsa.

Parts—Edition Breitkopf & Härtel Orchesterbibliothek no.10

Sixth Symphony, op.68

Score—Edition C. F. Peters; plate number 5447, stamp on title page of Ròzsavölgyi és Tàrsa.

Seventh Symphony, op.92

Score—Edition C. F. Peters, Leipzig; plate number 5448, stamp on title page of Ròzsavölgyi és Tàrsa.

Score—Edition Breitkopf & Härtel, Partitur-Bibliothek B.7. Inscription “Mahler Bearbeitung” is written with pencil in Mahler's handwriting on title page.¹

Score—Edition Breitkopf & Härtel, Partitur-Bibliothek B.11

Parts—Edition Breitkopf & Härtel Orchesterbibliothek no.12/13, all containing signature stamp “Gustav Mahler / Wien” (all annotations correspond to the Breitkopf & Härtel, Partitur-Bibliothek B.11 score)

Eighth Symphony, op.93

Score—Edition C. F. Peters, Leipzig; plate no.5449 (Bound together with the Peters edition of the Seventh Symphony)

Ninth Symphony, op.125

Score—Edition C. F. Peters, Leipzig; plate no.5450

1. This score is not in the list provided by Ernst Hilmar in “Mahleriana in the Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek,” *News about Mahler Research* 5 (1979), 10–12, or in David Pickett's diss. *Gustav Mahler as an Interpreter: A Study of His Textural Alterations and Performance Practice in the Symphonic Repertoire* (Ph.D. diss. University of Surrey, 1988).

Appendix 2: Mahler's Beethoven Performances

(The following list, compiled from Knud Martner's *Gustav Mahler im Konzertsaal*, shows all the occasions on which Mahler conducted Beethoven's symphonies.)

First Symphony:

16 December 1900 (Vienna)

Second Symphony:

19 November 1899 (Vienna)

19 November 1909 (New York)

Third Symphony:

14 March 1892 (Hamburg)

26 February 1894 (Hamburg)

24 April 1897 (Hamburg)

6 November 1898 (Vienna)

21 June 1900 (Paris)

4 November 1900 (Vienna)

17 March 1902 (St. Petersburg)

25 March 1907 (Rome)

4 November 1909 (New York)

5 November 1909 (New York)

21 November 1909 (New York)

Fourth Symphony:

31 December 1909 (New York)

Fifth Symphony:

24 February 1890 (Budapest)

12 December 1893 (Hamburg)

15 April 1893 (Hamburg)

15 March 1897 (Moscow)

24 March 1897 (Munich)

31 March 1897 (Budapest)

5 November 1899 (Vienna)

8 November 1899 (Vienna)

18 June 1900 (Paris)

9 October 1907 (Wiesbaden)

1 November 1907 (Helsinki)

13 December 1908 (New York)

3 December 1909 (New York)

8 December 1909 (New York)

12 December 1909 (New York)

14 January 1910 (New York)

17 January 1910 (Philadelphia)

4 March 1910 (New York)

7 February 1911 (New York)

10 February 1911 (New York)

19 February 1911 (New York)

Sixth Symphony:

3 December 1894 (Hamburg)

17 March 1895 (Hamburg)

17 December 1899 (Vienna)

14 January 1910 (New York)

5 December 1910 (Pittsburgh)

6 December 1910 (Cleveland)

7 December 1910 (Buffalo)

8 December 1910 (Rochester)

9 December 1910 (Syracuse)

10 December 1910 (Utica)

13 December 1910 (New York)

16 December 1910 (New York)

15 February 1911 (Hartford)

Seventh Symphony:

1 March 1894 (Hamburg)

22 October 1894 (Hamburg)

19 March 1899 (Vienna)

4 April 1903 (Lvov)

1 April 1907 (Rome)

26 October 1907 (St. Petersburg)

23 May 1908 (Prague)

9 November 1908 (Hamburg)

13 March 1909 (New York)

Eighth Symphony:

18 December 1898 (Vienna)

Ninth Symphony:

12 February 1886 (Prague)

11 March 1895 (Hamburg)

4 June 1899 (Prague)

18 February 1900 (Vienna)

22 February 1900 (Vienna)

27 January 1901 (Vienna)

15 April 1902 (Vienna)—("Ihr stürzt nieder" from the fourth movement arr. for six trombones by Mahler)

22 May 1905 (Strasbourg)

6 April 1909 (New York)

1 April 1910 (New York)

2 April 1910 (New York)

String Quartet op.95 (arr. for string orchestra by Mahler):

15 January 1899 (Vienna)

Mahler's text distributed at the performance of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, Vienna, 22 February 1900*

As a consequence of certain public assertions, a portion of the public may develop the opinion that in today's performance of Beethoven's works the conductor has made arbitrary transformations of details, particularly in the Ninth Symphony. It therefore seems necessary not to hold back anything in clearing up this point.

Beethoven has, through the degeneration of his hearing until complete deafness, lost the essential intimate contact with reality, with the world of physical sound, at the very stage of his creativity in which the enormous increase of his conception urged him to discover new means of expression and until-then undreamt of drastic vigor in the treatment of the orchestra. Just as well known is the fact that the condition of the development of brass instruments at that time virtually excluded certain pitch progressions necessary for the development of a melody. This very deficiency has gradually caused the perfection of those instruments; it would seem now almost outrageous not to use them in order to perform Beethoven's works as perfectly as possible.

Richard Wagner, who throughout his life, both in work and in deed, was passionately devoted to rescuing the execution of Beethoven's works from what became intolerable neglect, pointed out in his essay *Concerning the Execution of the Ninth Symphony* the way to execute this Symphony closest to the intentions of its creator, and one that all the new conductors have followed. As a result of his own gained and confirmed conviction and experience of this work, the conductor of today's concert has done the same, without essentially going beyond the borderlines indicated by Wagner.

There can, naturally, be no talk of any re-instrumentation [Uminstrumentierung], alteration [Änderung] or even "improvement" [Verbesserung] of Beethoven's work. The long-practiced multiplication of the strings has—already for a long time—resulted likewise in an increase in wind instruments that should serve exclusively for the reinforcement of the sound, but which by no means give them a new orchestral role. On this point, as on every other concerning the interpretation of the particular entire work, the conductor can prove, score in hand (and even more compellingly by examining the details), that, far from arbitrariness and premeditation, but also misled by no 'tradition,' it has been his sole purpose to sympathize with Beethoven's will to its apparently most insignificant detail, and also not to allow the smallest of them to be sacrificed or submerged in the confusing tumult of sound.

*Text cited in Kurt Blaukopf, *Mahler: sein Leben, sein Werk und seine Welt in Zeitgenössischen Bildern und Texten* (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1976), p.224 (my trans.).

[Da in Folge gewisser öffentlich gefallener Aeusserungen bei einem Theil des Publikums die Meinung entstehen könnte, also wären seitens des Dirigenten der heutigen Aufführung an den Werken Beethoven's, und insbesondere an der Neunten Symphonie, willkürliche Umgestaltungen in irgend welchen Einzelheiten vorgenommen worden, so scheint es geboten, mit einer aufklärenden Bemerkung über diesen Punkt nicht zurückzuhalten.

Beethoven hatte durch sein in völlige Taubheit ausgeartetes Gehörleiden den unerlässlichen innigen Contact mit der Realität, mit der physisch tönenden Welt gerade in jener Epoche seines Schaffens verloren, in welcher ihn die gewaltigste Steigerung seiner Conceptionen zur Auffindung neuer Ausdrucksmittel und zu einer bis dahin ungeahnten Drastik in der Behandlung des Orchesters hindrängte. Ebenso bekannt wie diese Thatsache, ist die andere, dass die Beschaffenheit der damaligen Blechinstrumente gewisse zur Bildung der Melodie nöthige Tonfolgen schlechterdings ausschloss. Gerade dieser Mangel hat mit der Zeit eine Vervollkommnung jener Instrumente herbeigeführt, welche nunmehr nicht zu möglichst vollendeter Ausführung der Werke Beethoven's auszunützen, geradezu als Frevel erschiene.

Richard Wagner, der sein ganzes Leben hindurch in Wort und That leidenschaftlich bemüht war, den Vortrag Beethoven'scher Werke einer nachgerade unerträglich gewordenen Verwahrlosung zu entreissen, hat in seinem Aufsatz 'Zum Vortrag der Neunten Symphonie Beethoven's' (Ges. Schriften, Bd. 9) jenen Weg zu einer den Intentionen ihres Schöpfers möglichst entsprechenden Ausführung dieser Symphonie gewiesen, auf dem ihm alle neueren Dirigenten gefolgt sind. Auch der Leiter des heutigen Concertes hat dies in vollster, aus eigenem Durchleben des Werkes gewonnener und gefestigter Ueberzeugung gethan, ohne im Wesentlichen über die von Wagner angedeuteten Grenzen hinauszugehen.

Von einer Uminstrumentirung, Aenderung, oder gar 'Verbesserung' des Beethoven'schen Werkes kann natürlich absolut nicht die Rede sein. Die längst geübte Vervielfachung der Streichinstrumente hat—und zwar ebenfalls schon seit Langem—auch eine Vermehrung der Bläser zur Folge gehabt, die ausschliesslich der Klangverstärkung dienen sollen, *keinswegs aber eine neue orchestrale Rolle zugetheilt erhielten.* In diesem, wie in jedem Punkte, der die Interpretation des Werkes im Ganzen wie im Einzelnen betrifft, kann an der Hand der Partitur (und zwar je mehr in's Detail eingehend, desto zwingender) der Nachweis geführt werden, dass es dem Dirigenten überall nur darum zu thun war, fern von Willkür und Absichtlichkeit, aber auch von keiner 'Tradition' beirrt, den Willen Beethoven's bis in's scheinbar Geringfügigste nachzufühlen und in der Ausführung auch nicht das Kleinste von dem, was

der Meister gewollt hat, zu opfern, oder in einem verwirrenden Tongewühle untergehen zu lassen.]

Mahler's text on the orchestration of Beethoven's String Quartet op.95 published in the weekly newspaper *Die Wage*, January 1899*

A quartet for string orchestra! That sounds strange to you. I know already all the objections that will be raised: destruction of intimacy, of individuality. But that is an error. What I intended is only an ideal representation of the quartet. Chamber music is primarily written for the room. It is really enjoyed only by the performers. The four Masters, who sit at their stands, are also the audience towards which the music is turned. If chamber music is transferred to the concert hall, its intimacy is already lost. But even more is lost. In a large space the four voices are lost and do not speak to the listener with the strength that the composer wanted to give them. I give them this power by strengthening the voices. I unravel the expansion, which sleeps in the voices, and give the tones wings. We strengthen also an orchestral movement of Haydn, an overture by Mozart. Do we therefore change the character of those works? Certainly not. The sonority which we give to a work depends on the area in which we perform it. I would rather give the *Nibelungen* in a small venue with a reduced orchestra, than in an enormous theater hall where I must additionally reinforce the orchestra. I do not act against the composer's intention, but rather in its meaning. Beethoven did not envisage, for his last quartets, all of the limited, small instruments. . . . He conveyed an immense idea in four voices. That idea must be recognized, and be correctly valued. The sound of one violin in a room carries just the same weight as twenty violins in a hall. And twenty violins can bring out in a hall a piano, a pianissimo even more sweetly, more finely, yes, let's say more intimately than one violin—which one will hear either too strong or not at all. Intimacy! That is a misused word. The one who truly enjoys and feels is always in an intimate contact with music. For him, the hall does not have walls; he knows nothing of his neighbors. He is alone with the music even in the concert hall, where a thousand people sit. It is for these who enjoy that we play. To them, the twenty violins will sound as one, he will not think of the number of performers, but will only listen to the sound of the four voices. . . . Our whole chamber music [repertoire] suffers in the concert hall from that spatial disparity. If one wants to give it

*Ernst Hilmar, "Schade, aber es müsste sein: Zu Gustav Mahlers Strichen und Retuschen insbesondere am Beispiel der V Symphonie Anton Bruckners," in *Bruckner Studien*, ed. Othmar Wessely (Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1975), pp. 190–91 (my trans.).

recognition, than one must equally take into consideration the space. Now, I do just that. And with the first two measures of the Quartet I will have already convinced the audience of that. That, I know. Starting with our performance next Sunday, an entirely new era of concert literature will, therefore, begin.

[Ein Quartett für Streichorchester! Das klingt Ihnen befremdend. Ich weiß schon alle Einwände, die man erheben wird: Zerstörung der Intimität, der Individualität. Aber man irrt sich. Was ich beabsichtige, ist nur eine ideale Darstellung des Quartetts. Die Kammermusik ist von Haus aus für das Zimmer geschrieben. Sie wird eigentlich nur von den Mitwirkenden recht genossen. Die vier Herrschaften, die an ihren Pulten sitzen, sind auch das Publicum, an das sich diese Musik wendet. Wird die Kammermusik in den Concertsaal übertragen, ist diese Intimität schon verloren. Aber mehr noch ist verloren. Im großen Raum verlieren sich die vier Stimmen, sie sprechen nicht mit der Kraft zu den Hörern, die der Componist ihnen geben wollte. Ich gebe Ihnen diese Kraft, indem ich die Stimmen verstärke. Ich löse die Expansion, die in den Stimmen schlummert, aus, und gebe den Tönen Schwingen. Wir verstärken ja auch einen Orchestersatz von Haydn, eine Ouvertüre von Mozart. Ändern wir deswegen den Charakter ihrer Werke? Gewiß nicht. Die Tonfülle, die wir einem Werke geben, hängt vom Raum ab, in dem wir es executieren. Ich werde die "Nibelungen" in einem kleinen Hause mit einem anderen, verringerten Orchester aufführen müssen als in einem riesigen Theatersaale, wo ich das Orchester noch verstärken muß. Ich handle nicht gegen die Intention des Componisten, sondern in seinem Sinne. Beethoven dachte bei seinen letzten Quartetten gar nicht an die beschränkten, kleinen Instrumente. . . . Er führte eine gewaltige Idee in vier Stimmen aus. Die Idee muß zur Geltung, zur richtigen Geltung kommen. Die Stimme einer Geige gilt aber in einem Zimmer ebensoviel wie zwanzig Geigen in einem Saal. Und zwanzig Geigen können im großen Saal ein Piano, ein Pianissimo noch viel zarter, feiner, ja, sagen wir intimer herausbringen als eine Geige—die man entweder gar nicht oder zu stark hören wird. Intimität! Das ist ein mißbrauchtes Wort. Der recht Genießende, Mitfühlende ist immer im intimen Contacte mit der Musik. Für ihn hat der Saal keine Wände, er weiß nichts vom Nachbar. Er ist allein mit der Musik auch im Saale, wo tausend Menschen sitzen. Für diese Genießenden spielen wir. Ihm werden die zwanzig Geigen so klingen, wie eine Geige, er wird nicht an die Zahl der Ausführenden denken, sondern nur dem Gesang der vier Stimmen lauschen. . . . Unsere ganze Kammermusik im Concertsaal leidet unter dem Mißverhältnisse des Raumes. Will man sie zur Geltung bringen, so muß man eben dem Raum Rechnung tragen. Nun, das tue ich eben jetzt. Und mit den beiden ersten Tacten des Quartetts werde ich das Publicum auch schon überzeugt haben. Das weiß ich. Von unserer Aufführung am nächsten Sonntag an aber beginnt eine ganz neue Aera der Concertliteratur.]

On the Inner Dimension of Heroic Struggle in Beethoven's Eroica: A Mahlerian Perspective
(and What That Might Tell Us)

Raymond Knapp

Tradition ist Schlamperei!

Certain quotations attributed to Mahler have become isolated from their original contexts, to stand more generally for his aesthetic or cultural position in the manner of personal manifestos. "Tradition ist Schlamperei!" (Tradition is slovenliness) is such a phrase. Originally applied to operatic traditions,¹ it has, like "Each repetition is already a lie" and "I am thrice homeless,"² been taken as an instance of Mahler's self-positioning, despite that its application is often difficult to reconcile with other aspects of his musical personality and ambitions. Although the phrase appeals to moralistic elitism and suggests a strong affinity to modernism, Mahler was elitist about traditions in only some respects, and only reluctantly cast as a modernist, for one tradition in particular mattered tremendously to him: the Beethovenian symphonic tradition, through which he strove as a conductor and with his own works to occupy the center of the larger Germanic musical tradition. It may well seem ironic, then, that he was not only criticized severely for the way he conducted Beethoven,³ but also regarded by many

1. See Henry-Louis de La Grange, *Gustav Mahler*, Volume 3: *Vienna: Triumph and Disillusion (1904–1907)* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999), pp.4–5, for an extensive account of this widely attributed phrase.

2. The first of these is part of a complaint about Schubert; see Natalie Bauer-Lechner, *Recollections of Gustav Mahler*, trans. Dika Newlin, ed. and ann. Peter Franklin (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980) (orig. publ. Leipzig: E. P. Tal, 1923), p. 147. For the other, see Alma Mahler, *Gustav Mahler: Memories and Letters*, ed. Donald Mitchell, trans. Basil Creighton (Seattle: U Washington P, 1975), p. 109.

3. On this subject, see esp. K. M. Knittel, "'Ein hypermoderner Dirigent': Mahler and Anti-Semitism in *Fin-de-siècle* Vienna," *19CM* 18 (1995), 257–76.

as a despoiler of the German symphonic tradition because of his own contributions to the genre.⁴ But his supposed railing against any and all traditions, his heightened veneration of this particular tradition, and the kind of criticisms he had to endure as conductor and composer may nevertheless be reconciled, or at least better understood, if we imagine that Mahler's Beethoven was not the same Beethoven that audiences had by the late nineteenth century grown accustomed to hearing, and that it was Mahler's Beethoven who was in some very basic ways the more directly grounded in Beethoven's scores—even keeping in mind Mahler's willingness to tamper with those scores.

In setting out this proposition, I aim first to demonstrate how much a Mahlerian perspective can tell us about the work whose “success forever redefined the potential of symphonic expression”⁵—that is, Beethoven's *Eroica*, and especially its first movement, which Adorno insisted “is really *the* Beethovenian piece, the purest embodiment of principle”⁶—and then to show how much an understanding of Beethoven's musical discourse along these lines can illuminate both Mahler's approach to instrumentation and, more specifically, the broader gestural dynamic for a culminating moment in Mahler's culminating symphony: the opening of the finale of his Ninth. To begin, however, it will be useful to think through the governing premise and larger context of the proposition, which depends on what might seem an eccentric claim: that the Beethoven performing tradition cannot be easily reconciled with the scores Beethoven actually left us.

Beethoven's symphonies became the cornerstone for the nineteenth century's fashioning of a specifically *German* musical tradition, and as such they were performed repeatedly for a public who were assured that listening to Beethoven and

4. See the discussion in Francesca Draughon and Raymond Knapp, “Mahler and the Crisis of Jewish Identity,” *Echo: A Music-Centered Journal* (www.echo.ucla.edu) 3, no.2 (2001). “Aberrations” in Mahler's symphonic style were widely noted; ascribing them to Mahler's Jewishness was common, but scarcely the only way they were read. Often, however, a growing anti-Semitism around the turn of the century bled into critiques of modernism and other seeming departures from tradition; which intertwined in turn with a preservationist approach to German musical traditions specifically and German cultural traditions more generally; which, perforce, cycled back to anti-Semitism and other species of xenophobia.

5. Thomas Sipe, *Beethoven: Eroica Symphony* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998), p.ix.

6. Theodor W. Adorno, *Beethoven: The Philosophy of Music: Fragments and Texts*, ed. Rolf Tiedemann, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1998), p.66. In a similar vein, from Scott Burnham, *Beethoven Hero* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1995), p.xvi: “The *Eroica* [stands] as the fulcrum upon which generations of critics have levered the subsequent history of Western music. And not only is the *Eroica* Symphony said to have changed the course of music history but, more astonishing still, it is primarily the first movement of the *Eroica* that carries the force of this historical turn.”

becoming familiar with his symphonies would make them both better as individuals and stronger as a people.⁷ Learning music in this way, as with children memorizing poetry, tends to encourage an appreciation in terms of *flow*, and a grasp of what is being learned as a seamless totality rather than a particularized appreciation of what is novel, surprising, and dramatic along the way; one thereby learns how a poem, a speech, or a symphony “goes,” not how it might sometimes seem to get in the way of its own sense of “going.” Small wonder that this increasingly common experience of symphonic music across the nineteenth century would lead to a widely embraced theory of music’s absoluteness,⁸ which led in turn not only to an appreciation of music’s presumed separateness as a discourse usefully disconnected from the real world, but also, and partly in consequence, to a variety of analytical approaches that would establish the nature of that discourse when practiced at its highest level—that is, a discourse as practiced by Beethoven, with its every detail absorbed into the larger unity of an organic artwork. Whether an analytical approach highlighted musical form (A. B. Marx), a single melodic unfolding of a chord and its accessories (Heinrich Schenker), or motivic work (Rudolph R  ti), the aim has been for all practical purposes the same: to establish and celebrate the organic integration of single unified works of music.⁹ Not surpris-

7. See Sanna Pederson, “A. B. Marx, Berlin Concert Life, and German National Identity,” *19CM* 18 (1994), 87–107. For a contrasting view, see Celia Applegate, “How German Is It? Nationalism and the Idea of Serious Music in the Early Nineteenth Century,” *19CM* 21 (1998), 274–96.

8. Music’s absoluteness was most persuasively and definitively set forth by Eduard Hanslick in his 1854 *Vom Musikalische-Sch  nen*, although he did not use the term (Eduard Hanslick, *On the Musically Beautiful: A Contribution towards the Revision of the Aesthetics of Music*, trans. Geoffrey Payzant [Indianapolis: Hackett, 1986]). Concerning the evolution of the ideas behind Hanslick’s monograph, see Carl Dahlhaus, *The Idea of Absolute Music*, trans. Roger Lustig (Chicago: U Chicago P, 1989) (orig. publ. Kassel: B  renreiter, 1978). Regarding Wagner’s use of the phrase, see Carl Dahlhaus, “The Two-fold Truth in Wagner’s Aesthetics: Nietzsche’s Fragment ‘On Music and Words,’” in his *Between Romanticism and Modernism: Four Studies in the Music of the Later Nineteenth Century*, trans. Mary Whittall (Berkeley and Los Angeles: U California P, 1980), pp. 19–39 (orig. publ. Munich, 1974).

9. I am here tracing a longer history than would have been relevant to Mahler, although both Schenker’s and R  ti’s work had important predecessors in the late nineteenth century. Two figures who would have been more directly relevant to Mahler were Hermann Kretzschmar, who began publishing interpretive accounts of musical works tied securely to motivic work in 1887, including a discussion of the *Eroica* (*F  hrer durch den Konzertsaal* [Leipzig: Breitkopf and H  rtel, 1919]); and Paul Bekker, discussed below. For a useful summary of how developing theories of music have been built around Beethoven, see Scott Burnham, *Beethoven Hero*, pp. 66–111. Burnham also lays out how Beethoven contributed to evolving notions of self-formation (pp. 149–53); regarding the latter, see also my “‘Selbst dann bin ich die Welt’: On the Subjective-Musical Basis of Wagner’s *Gesamtkunstwelt*” (forthcoming in *19CM*).

ingly, performance was complicit in this enterprise, especially as musicians themselves took part in the ceremonial enactment of these works in the manner of reciting holy writ, learning them with religious devotion if they didn't already know them, and solemnly performing them in a context that demanded uniformity of interpretation. (Any performer of this repertory in an orchestra today knows that this uniformity is still present, although its nature has shifted across the intervening century in various ways—for example, by embracing a greater constancy of tempo.)

By Mahler's time, performing traditions had frozen Beethoven's symphonies into ritualized flows of musical sound, and traditions of analysis had begun to establish the extent to which Beethoven himself had frozen his symphonies by the very selection of the notes. But more than Beethoven's music was at stake in this process of reverent petrification, characterized by, in Mahler's justifiable term, *Schlamperei*. *Music itself*, understood as an elevated, otherworldly flow of sound composed by revered past masters, was systematically cleansed of what animated it dramatically. *Music itself*—that is, the best that music could be—was elevated into a quasi-religious *tradition*, in part so it could provide a soundtrack of sorts for German nationalism. From this perspective, the process of elevating music necessarily reduced its performance to a species of *Schlamperei* that could masquerade quite effectively as *discipline* (for it was that too), enacting a process of indoctrination akin to children reciting the "Pledge of Allegiance," memorized poetry, or speeches; singing folk songs together in unison; or learning to play music by slavishly reproducing normalizing recordings, and then performing facsimiles of those recordings in aptly named "recitals." If Beethoven's symphonies by the late nineteenth century expressed and even seemed to embody the soul of an imagined pan-German nation, they had in the process lost a good deal of what might be termed their individual souls, their individualized animating impulses, whose suppression was mandated by their higher calling.

The *Eroica* seems an apt place to begin the "perspective-analysis" I am proposing, since it was a particularly significant symphony for Mahler, perhaps even more so than Beethoven's Ninth. Mahler performed the *Eroica* not only at his last concert in Hamburg before accepting the position in Vienna, but also at his first concert with the Vienna Philharmonic; indeed, the Vienna concert directly succeeded Hans Richter's performance of the *Eroica* at *his* last concert before Mahler took over as director. Mahler's performance of the *Eroica* in Vienna was the occasion for much controversy: in response to the rehearsals for this concert some of the musicians published in the *Deutsche Zeitung* a frequently quoted and vicious anti-Semitic attack on him. And while the concert itself met with approval in some quarters (most notably from Eduard Hanslick, who had recommended Mahler's appoint-

ment and thus had a stake in his success), it also drew much vitriolic comment.¹⁰ The attacks tended to center on tempo choices in the finale, amounting to a complaint that the Symphony wasn't supposed to "go" the way Mahler performed it. To make it even clearer that the reading I offer here is a *projection* of what a Mahlerian reading/performance of the work *might* be like, however, I will focus mainly on the opening movement.

This is not the first reading of the *Eroica* to focus on the first movement, or to take up specifically those half-dozen passages or so in the first movement that seem to cry out for interpretation, all of them revisited countless times by others and central here.¹¹ Nor is it the first to identify an inner or psychological dimension of heroism in the *Eroica*, or even to attempt to connect that inner dimension to the details of Beethoven's score; most noteworthy in the latter regard is Paul Bekker, whose discussion of the *Eroica* includes the following: "At the beginning of the first movement, Beethoven portrays a conflict within the soul of his hero between impetuous forceful activity and pensive resignation. The active side of his nature triumphs. . . . The two opposing tendencies are perceptible throughout the movement, crossing each other, coming to grips, the resolve to heroic action conquering in the end."¹² The understanding of Beethoven's orchestral syntax explored here is also not entirely new. Again, Bekker's observations are particularly telling:

[Beethoven] used each colour as a means of symbolic expression. He personified an instrument, and this personal character remained, even when lost in the impression produced by the whole. Beethoven's orchestra is the sum of such individuals, a republic of instruments . . . [Beethoven's] additions to the orchestral palette were made without reference to the colour effect of the whole and were employed only when the colour of the individual instrument could be made to tell effectively.¹³

Bekker's position in this enterprise is central (even if not precisely seminal) in a number of ways. His general view of the *Eroica*'s first movement is close to mine

10. Regarding these performances and the reactions they provoked, see Henry-Louis de La Grange, *Mahler*, vol. 1 (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1973), pp. 486–90; see also his *Gustav Mahler*, Volume 2: *The Years of Challenge (1897–1904)* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995) (rev., enlarged, updated, and trans. from *Gustav Mahler: Chronique d'une vie* [Paris: Fayard, 1979–84]), pp. 117–24.

11. Recent important contributions include Thomas Sipe's *Beethoven: Eroica Symphony* and Scott Burnham's *Beethoven Hero*.

12. Paul Bekker, *Beethoven*, trans. and adapted M. M. Bozman (rev. edn. London: Dent; New York: Dutton, 1932) (orig. publ. Berlin: Schuster and Loeffler, 1911), p. 160.

13. Bekker, *Beethoven*, pp. 156 and 157.

as a projection of Mahler's (although with significant differences), and so is his general take on Beethoven's instrumentation. In both respects, he is at once exceptional and fairly specific, and it therefore seems scarcely coincidental that his *Beethoven* appeared in 1911, near the end of Mahler's life and at a historical moment when psychological theory and its application to art were advancing rapidly. Moreover, Bekker's writings were frequently referenced by Adorno, whose articulation of the Beethoven–Mahler symphonic trajectory has more broadly laid the groundwork for my approach.¹⁴ Yet Bekker, however suggestively and usefully he points in the direction I wish to go, generally fails to connect his claims to the particularity of musical events in the *Eroica*, which forms a critical part of the specific connection between Beethoven and Mahler I will lay out here. It is not just that the *Eroica* is oriented toward psychology—more important are Beethoven's specific musical procedures for developing this dimension of the piece, which connect readily to Mahler's, and in a way directly relevant for performance. I will, in the end, distinguish Mahler's musical and psychological orientations from those of Beethoven and the *Eroica*. But in the meantime, it is worth marveling at how specifically what has seemed most revolutionary in Mahler was prefigured in Beethoven.

Configuring Inner Heroism

The first movement of Beethoven's *Eroica* is commonly interpreted as a series of disruptive episodes through and over which the opening subject—the hero—is felt to persevere and triumph. It is not generally noted how systematically Beethoven presents this episodic series as a dual quest for equilibrium, involving not only an outer heroic struggle and triumph, but also its inner counterpart. Yet the inner dimension of heroism is what truly counts in the drama, presenting its own problematic that must be mastered through a struggle every bit as heroic as the external one; it is the inner struggle that makes the outer one possible and ultimately successful, and that provides in the end the proof and measure of outward success, since it represents what is most centrally at stake. Beethoven's *Eroica* balances older, more Aristotelian sensibilities with emergent Kantian imperatives and

14. For a useful summary of the critical literature on the *Eroica*, giving substantial play to the inner dimension of heroism, see Scott Burnham, *Beethoven Hero*, pp. 3–31; see also Brian Hyer, "Second Immediacies in the *Eroica*," in *Music Theory in the Age of Romanticism*, ed. Ian Bent (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996), pp. 77–104, esp. p. 87. Both authors address concerns similar to mine; Hyer, for example, stresses the difficulty of retaining a sense of moment within works whose every move has been learned "by heart."

projects a musical environment in which, while “human flourishing” outwardly remains the paramount standard of value, the less visible troubles of the soul ultimately prove more important, with their resolution acquiring enhanced value through a musical simulation of difficulties being overcome. Inner struggle, within this process of musical modeling, becomes the central criterion of personal worth and value. If the “deeds” of Beethoven’s hero matter—the *Eroica* is, after all, no tragedy—*who* he is matters still more (by this I do not mean its once-intended dedicatee; especially in this respect, the Symphony may be thought of as more about Beethoven himself than about Napoléon).¹⁵

Tokens of this governing dynamic are amply present in the opening thematic statement of the Symphony, which begins after two brusque tutti chords on the tonic establish, with abrupt simplicity, an external frame of reference conveying a strong sense of moment (mm. 1–2; see ex. 1). Without this specific understanding of how the two opening tonic chords function, they might be taken, as they are by Charles Rosen, as a device designed primarily to throw the following theme out of metrical alignment, placing it slightly off-center within a larger rhythmic phrase,¹⁶ and thereby shifting the emphasis from the tune itself to the larger symphonic sweep. And, in an important sense, the metrical misalignment Rosen points to has significant consequences for the recapitulation. But a Mahlerian reading of the opening would surely see this rhythmic disjuncture within a layered dynamic, helping to separate the impulse behind those two opening chords and the much different *internal* impulse that propels the continuation. The latter—unmistakably the main tune, the hero anticipated in the title—provides an early example of an important nineteenth-century timbral convention, mapping a deep masculine interiority to the melodic cello (mm. 3–11; where the cellos play without the basses). During the nineteenth century, a spatial rationale supported this mode of representing orchestral interiority, stemming from the placement of the cellos more centrally in the orchestra in Beethoven’s time (and continuing well into the twentieth century) than they are today.¹⁷ In this case, the interior projected by the cel-

15. Particularly useful discussions of the Napoléon–Beethoven heroic axis at work in the *Eroica* may be found in Maynard Solomon, *Beethoven*, pp. 173–85; and Thomas Sipe, *Beethoven: Eroica Symphony*, pp. 30–53.

16. See Charles Rosen, *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1972), p. 350.

17. See Daniel J. Koury, *Orchestral Performance Practices in the Nineteenth Century: Size, Proportions, and Seating* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1986); while there was no one standard seating pattern, some version of first and second violins flanking the stage, with cellos and violas slightly back and center, was by far the most common.

Allegro con brio

The musical score is a reduction of the first movement of Beethoven's Eroica Symphony, measures 1-15. It is in 3/4 time and E-flat major. The tempo is marked 'Allegro con brio'. The piano part (bottom system) begins with a forte (*f*) chord marked 'tutti'. It then moves to a piano (*p*) section marked 'cello'. The woodwind part (top system) enters with a piano (*p*) section marked 'hr. + ob.'. The score includes various dynamics: *f*, *p*, *cresc.*, and *sf*. The piano part features a chromatic descent in the bass line, and the woodwind part has a melodic line with a chromatic descent. The score is divided into two systems by a double bar line.

Example 1: Beethoven, *Eroica*,
movt. I, mm. 1–15, reduction.

los registers early on as particularly troubled; their secure triadic theme suddenly dips chromatically, after four measures, into a darker realm and sustains an out-of-key $C\sharp$ that for two measures converts the tonic $E\flat$ triad into a diminished sonority ($C\sharp-G-B\flat$) couched within an agitated, *Sturm-und-Drang* texture (mm. 7–8). This brooding, Hamlet-like moment gives us at once a foretaste of the psychological drama to come and a reason for caring about this otherwise blandly youthful melodic persona.

The descent to $C\sharp$ and its immediate aftermath may suggest several points of significance. First, the diminished sonority is ambiguous even as stated, suggesting either a diminished-seventh chord pointing toward D (presumably as dominant, thus representing a potential swerve to G minor) or a dominant-seventh chord on the tonic (portending a move toward the subdominant and the flat side in the circle of fifths); the uncertainty and ambivalence about this sonority are the qualities that might be associated with Hamlet specifically. Second, both options deny the reality of the established “external world” of $E\flat$, either casting it as $\flat VI$ within a G-

minor realm or relegating it to the status of a dominant, in both cases registering a profound difference between inner and outer frames of reference. And third, the resolution is achieved in stages, through both internal impulse and externally imposed order. Initially, the cellos resolve upward to a *sf* D, creating a second-inversion G-minor triad and confirming a harmonically distant inner realm (m.9), whereupon an answering half-step ascent from the first violins a measure later, also marked *sf*, achieves a clarifying harmonic profile ($V^{\sharp}/E\flat$), which is at once reassuring and urgent, and facilitates an easy continuation and cadential return to $E\flat$ (m.11). In sum, we hear in this passage a conflicted inner impulse hovering between two possible descents (either to a related minor mode or toward the subdominant side of the circle of fifths), followed by a resolute “internal” gesture upward that is answered by a harmonic “rescue” managed from above. We might also note that the latter rescue effect appears as an echoing response to the heroic resolve of the cellos’ ascent, which we experience as heroic because it moves upward, and because it chooses the more difficult of its two options, the minor mode. Thus, the rescue, while bestowed from above, is duly earned, or at least deserved; it is also to some extent preemptive, redirecting the inclinations of the inner dimension to a happier end.

The resolution of this internalized conflict brings in additional instruments, including the horns playing characteristic “horn fifths” (mm.13–15), which usher in a second thematic statement that just as clearly references a realm of externally conceived heroism (mm.15–37). In this second statement, the horn, with wind doubling, takes up the theme as a call, initiating a climbing sequential exchange between strings and winds on the same figure (mm.15–22); externality here is marked both by the ascending harmonic profile, upward along the circle of fifths, and by the dialogic instrumental exchanges themselves, which seem to escalate from argument to a state of conflict. Again, the arrival on the dominant is the central event (m.23), this time coinciding with the musical equivalent of coming to blows, through a series of metrically destabilizing *sf* gestures coordinated with harsh dissonances (mm.25–26), which briefly imposes a duple meter on the triple-meter thematic material (mm.28–32). And, again, resolution is decisive, and even more so than before: a *ff* tutti arrival with the tune played by all the instruments that had played it earlier (in both instances *p*), as well as with specifically inflected instrumental support for both inner and outer heroic dimensions: basses and bassoons reinforce the cellos, as trumpets join the horns in a brief moment of celebration that reconciles exterior and interior (mm.37–40). But this moment of equilibrium is brief. Almost immediately, the “interior” instruments pull away from the cadence, descending with precisely the same tendencies anticipated in the first

phrase, first to a related minor mode (C minor; mm.41–42) and then to the subdominant (A♭; m.43), before settling even further, on V/B♭, for a brief pastoral episode of spiritual replenishment beginning in m.45. Here, too, the harmonic setting is functionally to the point, fully in accord with how the pastoral traditionally works within heroic narratives: in the aftermath of the brief taste of victory, the spent hero descends, as if exhausted, along the circle of fifths, but the arrival into a buoyant pastoral space reorients that descent, pointing resolutely in the more heroic (if also utterly conventional) direction of the dominant.¹⁸

What is perhaps most remarkable about this series of particulate events is its time frame. While the first movement will extend famously to become the longest symphonic movement written to that date (742 mm., counting the exposition repeat), the extended passage described here—the “first thematic group” in conventional sonata-form terminology—is a mere forty-five measures long, which even a somewhat sluggish performance will manage in less than a minute (Beethoven’s own metronome indication, added many years later, is sixty measures per minute, so that the passage described should last just over forty-five seconds). Indeed, reading a relatively brief segment of a work of this size so closely may seem “plot-heavy,” fussy, or simply out of scale, especially placed against a Beethovenian performance tradition that tends to emphasize a broader sweep and an overarching unity. An argument from this traditional perspective almost writes itself: surely the passage presents only one basic “event,” the full emergence of the signature tune—phrase after a series of increasingly aggressive roadblocks or, in a more nuanced view of that event, the fully scored but only *partial* emergence of the signature tune, which even in its first culmination is not allowed a “natural” continuation and is instead diverted cadentially to V/V. This argument is compelling. Even if it seems unassailable that Beethoven sharply differentiates the nature of the two “roadblock” passages—one is grounded within the melody itself, the other within instrumental exchanges—and that these differentiations will continue to matter throughout the Symphony, there is no denying that the “larger sweep” reading can claim comparable validity, since Beethoven places considerable emphasis on the larger sphere of action and ultimately conceives the whole within a single narrative-formal gesture.

Given the arguably equal legitimacy of these quite different perspectives, it is hard to choose between them; one might be tempted to suggest that both should be acknowledged as far as possible. But performances cannot simply preserve the

18. A particularly valuable discussion of the pastoral and its significance in the nineteenth century may be found in Thomas K. Nelson, *The Fantasy of Absolute Music* (Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1998).

ambiguities of a score; they must sometimes *choose* between mutually exclusive interpretive possibilities, and they in any case take place within well-established traditions of performance in which some of those decisions come ready-made. With the *Eroica*, and with Beethoven more generally, the strong and increasing tendency has long been to absorb musical detail into a larger sweep, and by so doing to make Beethoven's musicodramatic outcomes seem all the more inevitable and his certainties all the more tautological. This monolithic performing tradition probably had its roots in an incipient German nationalism at mid-nineteenth century, as noted, and surely it also stems in part from the simple fact that we—for at least a century and a half—have known how these works “go” too well to become easily invested in their details except as mere “auditors” (and this in the accounting sense of the word); they are like familiar folk tales, in which the details matter tremendously, but are also extremely familiar and certainly never surprising. Oddly enough, within the existing historical-performance/traditional-performance spectrum, the tautologizing “larger sweep” tendency has been dominant on both sides, which have, as factions in an ongoing conflict, become especially invested in making an individual performance of a work seem as convincingly “right” as possible.

In this context, an emphasis on musical and expressive detail can introduce an unwelcome element of *doubt*, both locally and within an established understanding of what the work *is* in a quasi-metaphysical way. This kind of doubt is the crux of the matter for our understanding of Mahler's development as a conductor and composer, and for our understanding of both lines of his development grounded in the Germanic and Romantic traditions as he would have understood them, rather than representing—as was claimed with regard to both his composing and conducting—a mannered perversion of those traditions.

What I offer here may be regarded as a “thought-experiment,” an attempt to read Beethoven as a more legitimate precursor for a side of Mahler's work that has often seemed least Beethovenian: the “fussiness” of his scoring, which gives extraordinary and defamiliarizing emphasis to musical moments that might otherwise pass unnoticed because of their general adherence to topical convention. But the experiment I am proposing also has a reformist core, since my reading of the *Eroica* is not just Mahlerian; it is also plausibly close to Beethoven's own, based rigorously on consistently applied strategies of presentation easily verifiable in the score. But the more securely grounded we might find this reading—that is, the more this essay seems to be about Beethoven than about Mahler—the more we might also want to rethink our construction of Mahler as a subversive presence within the Germanic absolute-music tradition. If Mahler understood Beethoven along these lines proposed, he might well have developed his defamiliarizing strategies

specifically to serve Beethoven, or at least those significant *moments* in Beethoven's music when certainties give way to doubt—for doubt by then had been virtually erased from his music through familiarity and by his having been refashioned as a musical sloganeer for German nationalism. If Mahler's conversions of Beethoven's tautologies into the dramas that the scores indicate them to be, coupled with his application of that experience to his own work, have been traditionally seen as subversive on some level, there is at least one context, arguably the most fundamental, within which they might be seen as more restorative than subversive. Indeed, they may be regarded as an attempt to bring vitality back to the musical images Beethoven traded in, to audiences who no longer heard his music as dramatic in any real sense—as “motion and occurrence,” to use a Mahlerian formulation—but rather only as either abstract music or a familiar narrative grown somewhat stale for its frequent retellings.¹⁹

But just what could a Mahlerian reading restore to the *Eroica*? To return to the example of *Hamlet*—and remembering it was Beethoven's generation that reinvented Shakespeare as a Romantic—a Mahlerian reading could bring renewed interest in the *character* of Hamlet, and in the *particulars* Shakespeare creates for a persona we continue to care about. That this does not need to be done in the case of *Hamlet* seems clear. Everyone knows at least some of Hamlet's “To be or not to be” soliloquy, and within those crafted words we carry with us the reality of Hamlet's character. The effectiveness of an actor's portrayal of Hamlet will, for many, depend much more on how he delivers this speech than on how he performs in more active moments, however crucial they may be to the plot. Just as clearly, though, something along these lines, of reanimating character and detail, does need to be done in the case of the *Eroica*. No one sits waiting to hear what the cello section does with its early C#; rather we are encouraged, through virtually every performance, to wait for and savor the moments of culmination. It would seem ludicrous, even subversive, to claim that the value of *Hamlet* lies in its exciting culminating dual, except as that event springs from the character of its troubled hero. Should it seem ludicrous—or subversive—to suggest that the value of the *Eroica*'s opening thematic statement lies in its troubling C# and the briefly anguished aftermath to that C#, more so than in the blandly secure way the tune begins or will—eventually—be allowed to end, some 700 measures later?²⁰

19. With regard to the finale of the Second Symphony, Mahler wrote: “Whereas the first three movements are narrative, the last is altogether dramatic; here, all is motion and occurrence”; see La Grange, *Mahler*, I, 785.

20. Compare Scott Burnham's discussion in *Beethoven Hero*, p. 141.

And there are also potential *practical* results that might accrue from a Mahlerian reading of the *Eroica*, since interpretive judgment can prove most useful and persuasive through performance. Within the passage detailed here, two Mahlerian strategies come into play: an individualized emphasis on a particular presence within the symphonic landscape, and—as a typically Mahlerian consequence of that kind of emphasis—a layered presentation of musical material. To give the early C \sharp its due, a Mahlerian performance would probably give it a slightly intensified edge (perhaps through attack and intensified vibrato) and a head start on the indicated general crescendo, so that the first violin's *Sturm-und-Drang* syncopations will not simply take over the central melodic significance (although their *sf* arrival on A \flat three measures later will inevitably do just that). More difficult to accomplish, especially within the blended sounds favored by modern orchestras, is the effect of the cellos and their retinue pulling away from the general celebration after m. 37; perhaps here, a slight increase in violin tone balanced by a slight softening of the upper winds and even more softening in the brass could accomplish the requisite sense of timbral separation. In both cases, part of the payoff would be an enhanced presence for those key moments later in the exposition when the cellos emerge to expressive the “interior” dimension of the music.

In the first of these key moments, just after the pastoral interlude in mm. 45–54, their characteristic chromatic descent from the tonic provides critical counterpoint, pulling against the grain of a reemergent upward thrust that sets up the next externalized “heroic” episode (mm. 57–64: instruments are again presented in opposition within a *f* tutti, which stabilizes quickly as the brass become more assertive). In the later stages of the exposition (ex. 2), the cellos provide the subjective locus that enables and directs recovery from the greatest trauma in the movement to that point, the series of off-beat, hammerlike blows in mm. 123–27 and the metrical dissolution into an effective duple meter across the four measures that immediately follow. Thus, in m. 132, when the exhausted orchestra drops away, the cellos (with viola support) are found clinging to a fragile stability on all fronts—meter, triadic theme, and tonic (that is, B \flat , in second inversion)—from which they mount an *internally* heroic chromatic ascent from $\hat{5}$ to $\hat{1}$, to secure the final cadence of the exposition. Only if the cello establishes and maintains its presence as a carrier of this interior dimension can its key role at the exposition's conclusion register fully as the sustaining inner strength that enables recovery. At this point, the “rescue” is clearly managed through inner resolve, and only gradually achieves full external strength: even with the arrival on the tonic in m. 139, the music continues to “reel,” with the melodic voice barely managing its arrival on $\hat{3}$, retracing the cellos' first moments of doubt and resolution as it gradually regains its feet (E \flat –C \sharp –D).

(Allegro con brio)

123

ff

tutti

132

p

sfp

sfp

sfp

vi - vc

Example 2: Beethoven, *Eroica*,
movt. I, mm. 123–39, reduction.

Realizing the Symphonic Hero

While the great length of the *Eroica*'s first movement stems from major expansion in all its principal sections, the development and coda are the most extreme. Not surprisingly, these are also the two most prominent sites for further explorations of the inner dimension of heroism in this movement, and for enacting the full realization of the inner dimension within a unified heroic presence. Indeed, an often-discussed device for extending the dimensions of these two sections, the new theme in E minor that appears late in the development (mm. 284–92; see ex. 3) is clearly marked as an extended interior moment, according to all the criteria established early in the exposition, including instrumentation, thematic contour, melodic tendencies (descending chromatically from $\hat{1}$), and harmonic tendencies (toward the minor and/or subdominant side along the circle of fifths).

It has often been noted that this thematic complex is not entirely new. Specifically, in its lower dimension, the cellos, doubled by the second violins and supported by syncopations in the first violins (as in mm. 7–8; cf. exs. 1 and 3), replay the main tune's $\hat{1}-\hat{3}-\hat{1}-\hat{5}-\hat{1}$ with passing tones filled in, forging an even more precise connection to the first thematic statement in the chromatic descent from the

284

obs.

v2 - vc

fl.

vl.

pizz.

sfz

sfz

sfz

sfz

Example 3: Beethoven, *Eroica*,
movt. I, mm. 284–88, reduction.

tonic in m. 286, which retraces the original E \flat –D–C \sharp descent (reconfigured D \sharp –D \sharp –C \sharp ; see reduction, ex. 4).²¹ Moreover, the entire thematic complex repeats immediately in the subdominant (A minor; mm. 292–99). Despite this strongly stated referential dimension in the string choir, which in every noted particular registers a connection to the “interior” dimension of the movement’s opening thematic statement, and despite that it is eventually the cello figure that is “developed” in preparation for the dominant–pedal retransition (mm. 326–37), however, all this serves as background in most performances for the oboe duet that emerges at this point as a plaintive double-reed obligato to the derived cello theme.

It is especially intriguing how the two principal melodic strands interact. Beethoven has consistently plotted this kind of contrapuntal involvement throughout the movement to delineate simultaneous representations of an inner and outer dimension of heroism, as in mm. 57–64 (just before the first heroic episode of the

Example 4: Cello line of example 3, showing derivation from arpeggios and chromatic descents of main theme.

Cello

sfz

sfz

21. Alternative derivations are given in Philip G. Downs, “Beethoven’s ‘New Way’ and the *Eroica*,” in *The Creative World of Beethoven*, ed. Paul Henry Lang (New York: W.W. Norton, 1970), pp. 83–102; and Charles Rosen, *The Classical Style*, p. 393.

second thematic group), where the inner dimension pulls downward against the ascending outer heroic impulse. Here, the most extroverted gesture of the upper oboe line, its wailing leap up to $\hat{5}$ in m.286, directly balances the cellos' distinctive chromatic descent from the tonic, so the most striking moments for each line coincide as they unfold reflectively, the one a near mirror image of the other. And, as observed with mm.57–64, only a performance that has done justice to the cellos' earlier contributions will be able to sustain the balanced emphasis required here.

The new melodic complex thus represents, in at least one dimension, an achieved state of equilibrium, with inner and outer dimensions held in balance within a stable melodic context; in these respects it carries an odd sense of displaced fulfillment, a quality that has led some to identify this theme as a transplanted “feminine” theme, denied by the ongoing martial strife of the exposition from occupying its “natural” place as the second-group theme, but emerging here as respite from an even more violent sequence of events.²² The logic of this identification might seem arbitrary, based on only one of many possible sonata-form conventions, but it is scarcely surprising that the binary opposition of inner and outer heroic dimensions should at some point seem to line up with a basic binary opposition in artistic representation, that of feminine and masculine. If decisive action is understood as the province of the masculine hero, generically speaking, then indecisive drifting will inevitably seem feminine. Following this interpretive inclination, the strange remove of this event, to E minor and to a new—and newly expressive—theme would seem, given the arguably feminine cast of the oboe melody, to be a prime example of “feminine” harmonic drift, although it might easily be understood, as argued earlier, to be part of a Hamlet-like male persona. In the event, however, this removed key area is achieved not through drift, but through a sustained sequence of *action*, clearly originating in a heroic inner impulse and culminating in externalized heroic engagement, in a process spanning the length of the development up to this point. Moreover, the return from this place of removal is achieved through a process of reintegration, in which inner and outer elements gradually align within a well-ordered harmonic sequence that holds both impulses in balance.

The development opens with a characteristic moment of “inner” drift as the cellos' tonic B \flat descends chromatically (A \sharp –A \flat –G), establishing C major for the first

22. Those who make this claim (e.g., August Halm and Hermann Kretzschmar) paradoxically tend not to be strict formalists, but more interested in interpretive readings; thus, Adorno: “The new theme is the song theme which had been omitted, circumvented. As a *thesis* it had been suppressed—now, as a *result*, it is *demanded*—and at the same time recovered” (*Beethoven*, p.103). For a useful discussion of the critical literature on both this famous “exception” to sonata-form procedures and the violent passage that precedes it, see Burnham, *Beethoven Hero*, pp.9–13 and 171–72.

of two pastoral interludes in the development, each modeled on mm.45–54 of the exposition (mm.152–77). Abruptly, in m.178, as the cello resumes melodic prominence and takes up the signature tune in the parallel minor, this extended moment of pastoral renewal is resolutely put aside for an extended passage of heroic striving. The tune's presentations ascend sequentially, first through chromatic steps (from C minor to C# minor and D minor) and then by a fourth (from D minor to G minor); these two phases mark a shift from inner to outer realms of heroic impulse, switching abruptly at the pivotal moment to *ff*, *Sturm-und-Drang* syncopations, and a stormlike countermelody (m.186).²³ Importantly, though, the shift does not leave behind the inner dimension, which continues to manifest itself in regular nonmodulatory sequential ascents by step within each key area (from D to E and from G to A, respectively), as well as through the cellos' continued presence as the driving force of the ascending sequence. The coda will take over the device of sequencing the signature tune without modulating, introduced here as a coordination between inner and outer impulses, but later serving as the core component of the coda's "solution" to the wandering tendencies of the main tune, finally enabling a stable version of the tune to emerge (cf. mm.631–62).

With this heroic striving directly preceding it, the reemergence of the pastoral element, appearing appropriately enough in the subdominant (Ab; m.220), registers as achievement and offers the promise of deserved respite as in the exposition. But a driving inner impulse again takes over as the cellos reenter in m.230 for the cadence to Ab, immediately thereafter pulling harmonically to the related minor-mode realms of C and F and launching a disastrous fugue (m.236), beginning in F minor. To clarify how and why this fugue may be characterized as disastrous, besides the evidence that it seems to have disastrous consequences, we must briefly widen our focus.

In a typical fugal exposition, the tonic subject will be answered on the dominant, but either reconfigured as a "tonal answer," or leading (after a "real answer") to a restabilization of the original harmonic center, resulting in an oscillation between tonic and dominant conventionally understood as nonmodulatory. On many occasions, however, Beethoven works within this structure to highlight the tension between the two oscillating poles, creating what seems almost a tug-of-war between them. For example, in the central fugue of the funeral march movement in the *Eroica* (mm.114–45), he maintains and intensifies this kind of tension specifically by *not* moving harmonically beyond an oscillation between the fugue's tonic

23. The sequential move upward by fourth is, of course, a *descent* along the circle of fifths, but is marked here as an ascent through the melodic movement upward in the melodic bass, D–E–F#–G.

F minor and its minor dominant for several fugal entries, despite the strong centrifugal force it accumulates. In the end, after five entries of the three-measure subject, each time with its melodramatic countersubject, the funeral march fugue breaks out of this straightjacket, moving decisively to E \flat in m.135 as part of a larger progression back to the overall tonic C minor. This decisive move seems, significantly, to be in large part a consequence of the pent-up tension that has by then accrued from a steady growth in volume, registral space, and instrumentarium artificially held in check by the harmonic imperatives of conventional fugal processes. It is telling how the breakthrough to E \flat is configured, for at this point the countersubject with its culminating trill disappears, and the phrase structure becomes more conventional, briefly regularized into two-measure sequential units ascending by step. In terms of the dynamic being considered here, in which a movement to the dominant is part of an established vocabulary of externalizing gestures, the balance demanded in fugal expositions represents a continued denial of that outward impulse. Accordingly, the expressive effect of the funeral march fugue is of grief turned inward, held under strict control until the moment of breakthrough to E \flat and to the more public display of powerfully felt grief that ensues. Yet this moment of great release is nevertheless dignified, as the passage is given to the heroic horn, which, unencumbered by internal conflict (e.g., without countersubject), proceeds in measured two-measure ascents.

In the developmental fugue of the first movement (ex.5), however, there is initially no check placed on the fugue's propensity for centrifugal motion upward along the circle of fifths, and the fugue lurches with alarming speed from F minor (m.236) to C minor (m.239), G minor (m.242), and D minor (m.245) while clinging to a semblance of fugal order. But that order is fragile from the beginning, as the two-measure fugal units are quite at odds with the three-measure modulatory rhythm, so that with the third unit's transgressive move to G minor the subject begins audibly to disintegrate. Specifically, the cello, which helps launch the fugue with an aggressive countersubject, reenters in an apparent attempt to complete the bass's truncated version of the subject, creating a composite of subject and countersubject and thereby enforcing an alignment between the disparate fugal and harmonic rhythms. While the cello's attempted fusion actually "works," managing the move from G minor to D minor precisely within a single fugal entry, its voice is quickly lost in a crescendo of stretto entries, and the fugue spins rapidly out of control. Even as the brakes are at that point slammed down hard, however, the force of the ascending modulatory pattern continues to be felt, driving an ascent through A minor (m.254) and on toward E minor (m.260) before grinding to a painful dissolution topped by a minor-second dissonance (mm.276–79), poised on the

threshold of a delayed cadence to E minor. Is this fugue, as has been often supposed, a musical depiction of battle? If so, we may well imagine a glimpse of the heroic cello, in mm.244–45, attempting to restore order before all individuality is lost in the confusion, and being left afterward, in the clearing smoke of the battlefield, with the lamenting oboe duet. And surely, if it is not a battle, it is its metaphorical equivalent: a struggle that lurches out of control, occasioning an extended passage of violent suppression (mm.248–79, with the “smoke” clearing from mm.280–84 to set up the lamenting new theme).

This is the immediate context for the new theme in E minor. The passage that precedes it—the “centrifugal” fugue and its suppression—presents implicitly a strong argument for containment, which for this movement must be interpreted as *self*-containment, a *self* in which inner and outer impulses are held in balance. More outwardly, the passage simulates a process of external containment through the imposition of great force, bringing the fugal juggernaut to a grinding halt through an audible curtailment of its out-of-control harmonic ascent.²⁴ The element of violent suppression that brings about this curtailment has led to another interpretive trope for this movement—the death of its hero, an interpretation designed to help explain in part the presence of a funeral march in the Symphony and in part the lamenting quality of the new oboe theme that appears in response. While this interpretation presents a number of problems in the context of a full reading of the movement (in which countless musical tokens of the hero in question seem to return, without irony), this projection of violent death accords well with the savagery of the passage, an extended moment of musical ugliness without historical precedent. The new theme, through its various stabilizing elements, marks the beginning of a process of recovery, while also expressing something important about what has just occurred; through that very act of gestural commentary—and even if we might disagree about the precise content of the “important something” it expresses—the new theme establishes a perspective on the preceding trajectory of lost control and violent suppression. What the E-minor theme tells us, most fundamentally, is that the trauma has run its course and stability has been regained.

The subsequent recovery takes place within a systematically arranged grid of alternating major and minor, with each key relating to its neighbors as either par-

24. I have argued elsewhere that the suppression of the fugue in this passage is an early demonstration of the coercive power of “absolute” musical processes, which can achieve a sense of oblivious, self-absorbed autonomy and thus seem to become threatening, either to a larger sense of order or to another articulated perspective presented in the music. See my *Symphonic Metamorphoses: Subjectivity and Alienation in Mahler's Re-Cycled Songs* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan UP, 2003), pp.102–03.

allel or relative, starting from the new theme's A-minor statement and rationalized as an ascending sequence reined in at the appropriate moment:

keys:	a	/	C	–	c	trans.	E♭	–	e♭	G♭	–	e♭			
m. #s:	292		300		308		312		316		322		330		337

In most respects, however, this extended section between the new thematic complex (mm.284–99) and the retransition (mm.338–97) does not present itself as a sequence so much as a repeated series of gestures, in which an initial heroic thrust in the major mode leads first to a setback in the parallel minor and then to an inner retreat from which a new advance is quickly generated in the relative major (*trans.* in the above grid). The larger frame is defined thematically: the reentry of the signature tune in C major marks the first ascent (m.300), and the return of the development's new thematic complex in E♭ minor (m.322) briefly stabilizes that key in preparation for what will prove to be a successful approach to the recapitulation. Between these two events, arrivals in the major mode repeat in the parallel minor, moving from C major to C minor in mm.304–12 and from E♭ major to E♭ minor in mm.316–22—anticipating the distinctively Mahlerian device of displacing the major mode with its parallel minor in a brutally direct act of suppression (Mahler will often short-circuit the progression even further by leaving out the intervening dominant, most famously against the “fate” tympani rhythms in the Sixth Symphony).

The second transitional episode (mm.322–30) is the more stable of the two, bringing the recently introduced new theme home to the tonic minor, and making the briefly tonicized G♭ major that follows seem more a parenthetical digression than the continuation of a harmonic pattern. This time, the lower component of the new thematic complex emerges to displace the upper; then, as the theme continues with only its lower component (that is, the part deriving from the signature tune), it turns toward G♭ major precisely when the second wailing ascent to the dominant should occur (m.328), providing a brief respite that dissolves immediately after the cello takes up the figure in this major-mode form.

The brief digression in G♭ major is significant in a number of ways. First, as noted, it provides a less edgy counterpart for the earlier move from C minor to its relative, giving agency once again to the interior dimension of the heroic impulse. Second, it rewards that earlier ascent to E♭ with a brief point of relaxation into a more pastoral realm—one of many such gestures in the movement, to be echoed with even more dramatic import just after the beginning of the recapitulation itself. And, third, it articulates, clearly and by stages, the relationship between the lower

component of the new thematic complex and the head of the signature tune, by isolating it, presenting it in the major mode, and then restoring it to the solo cello. At this point, the *interior* groundwork has been well prepared for the theme's return, and the remainder of the development (conventionally called the retransition) presents itself as an *external* drama, first through a series of overlapping presentations of the signature tune in the guise of a call (given solely in the winds and horns; mm. 338–61) and then through a prolonged interval of waiting in increasingly hushed tones for a clarifying response to that call (mm. 366–93). This finally comes in the form of a quiet (distant?) horn call famously out of alignment with the harmonic rhythm of the rest of the orchestra (mm. 394–95).

One important consequence of the “premature” entrance of the horn after this prolonged waiting is that it foregrounds, as a point more of dramatic than of musical logic, a realignment of the opening exterior and interior frames of reference for the beginning of the recapitulation. If most nonmusicians (and many musicians) tend not even to notice that the horn entrance violates the laws of musical syntax, since its tonic triad clashes with the “waiting” dominant harmony in the violins, it is because that entrance amply satisfies the demands of dramatic gesture; indeed, it would seem that a large part of the point of the *musical* violation is to clarify the precedence of the *dramatic* element, so that we might hear the entrance—to the extent possible within a piece of thoroughly tonal music—as a purely dramatic event. But of course, the consequences of this event are also musical, if derived from the dramatic logic of expectation and arrival; the entrance of the horn—clearly the event waited for—preemptively defines itself as the starting point for all that follows. This immediate effect is surely more strongly felt than the broader, largely subliminally registered analytical “fact” (at least according to one frame of reference) that the horn is actually entering correctly according to the broader four-square rhythmic structure of the retransition (alternatively, one may perhaps understand this as the “waiting” string choir losing touch with that broader structure, so that the horn call is more restorative than preemptive).²⁵ In any case, as a direct consequence of this device, the two tutti chords that immediately precede the cello theme are configured here in a way quite different from the beginning of the movement, serving both harmonically and rhythmically as the second, upbeat half of a four-measure phrase initiated by the tonic horn call.²⁶

25. See the related discussion in Burnham, *Beethoven Hero*, pp. 15 and 173–74.

26. Beethoven only relatively late in composition decided to change the opening two chords of the Symphony to simple tonic triads; earlier versions carried a cadential function analogous to the recapitulation's tutti upbeat. One effect of this change is to make the tutti chords at the beginning more obviously an initializing downbeat against which the cello melody will be set in relief; see Rosen's discussion referred to above (n. 16).

Perhaps the most remarkable—and incipiently Mahlerian—aspect of the first group in the recapitulation is the manner in which the horn figures contribute to a reconfigured dynamic between internal and external heroism. The reworked harmonic profile, which has been much discussed in the literature, again moves away from the tonic by step, successively in each direction—here, however, managed within one continuous span rather than as a series of separate “overcomings.” Balanced within this larger span are several sets of reciprocating gestures pointing decisively in opposing directions (that is, up and down, registering as outward and inward), so closely allied and affectively coordinated, however, that interior and exterior seem almost commingled, bringing the two into closer integration than before in the movement. Thus, for example, a slightly extended opening *descent* in the cellos (mm.401–04) sets up a horn statement a step *above* the tonic, in F (mm.408–11), which leads directly to yet another statement a full step *below* the tonic, in D \flat (mm.416–19); later, an *ascending* sequence based on the head of the signature tune (this time within one instrumental line; mm.430–39) gives way directly to a *descending* sequence in the lower instruments, from E \flat through C to A \flat (mm.440–46; cf. mm.40–44, discussed above), concluding in a chromatic nudge upward (mm.447–48) to reorient the larger progression back toward the tonic. All of this happens without either the “correction” of wayward harmonic motion or the kind of rhythmic and dissonant violence that broke down the first group of the exposition into separate spans. (In mm.402–05, for example, the syncopated violins follow the cellos’ descent rather than direct them back to the tonic by ascending forcefully to A \flat ; cf. ex.1, mm.7–12.)

Each moment of difference between this first group and the parallel section of the exposition is made to tell. As the cellos continue their initial chromatic descent (mm.401–04), they point, surprisingly, not further inward, but directly outward: their arrival on C elicits the first ascending gesture, the entrance of the first horn in F, playing *dolce*. This, of course, is another famous moment, for with it Beethoven takes advantage of technological advances by requiring his hornist to change crooks “on the fly,” in the middle of a movement.²⁷ Indeed, the deliberately estranging effect of requiring the horn to play outside the tonic, thus upsetting a basic pillar of symphonic practice to that date, marks Beethoven’s device as akin to Mahler’s instrumental practice more generally, even if Beethoven’s effect has been virtually lost in the wake of standardized valved horns shortly after the

27. This is a device he seems to have conveniently forgotten when writing the first movement of the Fifth Symphony, in which the heroic horns, with their E \flat crooks, cannot play the breakthrough motto in C major for the recapitulation; see my discussion in “Passing—and Failing—in Late-Nineteenth-Century Russia; or Why We Should Care about the Cuts in Tchaikovsky’s Violin Concerto” (19CM 26 [2003], 216 [195–234]).

mid-nineteenth century.²⁸ That the moment still retains its sense of magic even today, long after the commonplace sound of fully chromatic horns, derives from the exquisite reciprocating balance Beethoven maintains throughout the first group of the recapitulation between inward and outward gestures. Clearly, when the horn plays the main tune in this movement, it is invariably a horn *call*, but since it is answering the dominant arrival of the “inner” cello voice (and is in turn answered by the pizzicato basses; mm.410–12), it acquires a sense of intimate connection with that inside dimension, all the more for coming soon after the “distant” horn call in E \flat just fourteen measures earlier. Moreover, the follow-up to this gesture, which we might term “intimately exterior,” is yet another delicate balance, in that the D \flat version of the tune in the “exterior” flute is triply configured as directionally “interior,” since the flute also plays *dolce* and in a key that is at once \flat VI/F and \flat VII/E \flat (the flute also elicits a pizzicato “interior” echo from the strings; mm.418–20).

Besides adroitly manipulating his instruments to achieve this balance between inner and outer dimensions, Beethoven also takes advantage here of the potentially different charges a move to the supertonic can have within his scheme of internally and externally mapped harmonic tendencies. Because an ascent by step implies sequential movement upward along the circle of fifths (to v/V), and may either initiate or figure into a strong move to the dominant (either as V/V or as the first step in a scalar ascent), a move to the supertonic for much of this movement has almost routinely served to project a strong sense of either externality or an interior dimension struggling to realize itself and so achieve externality. But the supertonic also has strong ties to the subdominant side of the circle of fifths, since it may be approached as vi/IV and frequently serves as a substitute for IV in cadential progressions. In plotting the balanced dynamic in the first section of the reconfigured first group, Beethoven is thereby able to use F as a harmonic pivot; the early chromatic descent to C pivots outward to E, which then pivots back inward to D \flat . In the second half of the first group (mm.430–48), F will function even more pointedly as a pivot. Here, as in the parallel section in the exposition, an ascending sequence completes a strong scalar ascent to the dominant, now contained within a single instrumental line (the violins), and thus not engendering the conflicted exchanges among instruments that had disrupted the original first group. In the next stage (mm.440–48), as in the exposition, the “interior” sequential movement

28. An analogous effect occurs in the funeral-march movement of Mahler's First Symphony, when the tympani return in E \flat instead of D after the pastorale interlude based on Mahler's *Gesellen* song “Die zwei blaue Augen.” As here, other elements reinforce the strangeness of the event even for those who may not be alert to how the device itself undermines conventional practice regarding the orchestral standard-bearers of tonic stability.

is downward from the tonic by thirds, but this time it extends more quickly beyond the original C minor and A♭ major to F, the next sequential step. In the exposition, F had been approached through an intervening G♭, so that its status as a dominant (of B♭) was a given. Here, however, it substitutes for IV in the melodic arrival on A♭ (m.446), and when it does take on a dominant function—as V/V—it continues to carry a subdominant (or, more precisely, a pre-dominant) function.

In the coda, this established dual capacity of the supertonic becomes essential background for the thematic-harmonic plotting. After an alarmingly stark descent of block chords—E♭ to D♭ to C, each step carrying the head of the signature tune and then pausing expectantly (mm.551–64)—the first fully articulated harmonic arrival in the coda is to F minor, launching a double statement of the development's lamenting theme. (The initial precipitous stepwise descents and the subsequent arrival in F minor also figure within the tradition for establishing a subdominant orientation within codas.) As in its initial presentation, the double statement of the new thematic complex moves to a new key for the second statement, but what had originally been a move to the subdominant is here doubled in extent so as to enable an easy return to the tonic. Beethoven reinforces the enhanced sense of comfort this harmonic shift carries through both thematic and instrumental means, foregoing the repeat of the mournful "wailing" gesture in order to prepare the change of key (mm.587–88), and giving that gesture a less disturbing profile in the second presentation, where it seemingly drops down to the dominant instead of leaping upward (since the flutes briefly fall silent, leaving the clarinets alone for this phrase; mm.591–92). More broadly, some degree of softening also stems from the substitution of clarinets for oboes, in parallel with the tonic-minor version of the theme heard late in the development. Then, within the culminating version of the signature tune (beginning m.631), the melodic ascent to the supertonic is stabilized within the dominant harmony that supports it and by its orientation to the dominant as melodic pitch, which frames the entire complex.

Throughout the movement, however, the controlling element for negotiations between the inner and outer dimensions is instrumentation, and this element is as prominent in the coda as it was at the beginning of the recapitulation. Already late in the recapitulation, Beethoven uses octave horns instead of lower strings (as in the exposition) to serve as the stabilizing voice after the rhythmically disruptive passage of hammer-chords (mm.526–37). As if to clarify that the substitution externalizes what had earlier been presented as internal, he gives the horns a more distinctive derivation from the original call-figure than in the exposition's version ($\hat{1}-\hat{3}-\hat{5}-\hat{1}$, instead of $\hat{5}-\hat{1}-\hat{3}-\hat{6}-\hat{5}$; cf. exs.2 and 6). At the beginning of the coda, the more neutral violins carry the disruptive thematic stepwise descents, but the descent it-

Example 6: Beethoven, *Eroica*,
movt. I, mm. 535–38, reduction.

self is enforced with increasing orchestral force, first by the horns and winds (mm. 557–58), and then, in heavily weighted eighth notes, with trumpets added. Given the driving force behind this descent, the return of the development theme slightly later seems to mark a recovery from this last in a long series of onslaughts, especially since it follows immediately on yet another ascending sequence based on the head of the signature tune. It is not particularly surprising that the cellos reemerge within this return of the development thematic complex, after the original presentation in the oboes. What *is* surprising, however—indeed truly remarkable—is that the third horn doubles the chromatic line, which in Beethoven’s time would have required the hornist to stop the air flow to achieve many of the required pitches. The clearly intended result, more or less lost within modern orchestral practice, is a muffled tone that would have additionally inflected the horn’s reorientation inward, especially striking given its default signification as an “outdoor” instrument, strictly adhered to until this point in the movement. Particularly since this chromatic descent from the tonic launches the long chromatic descent in the cellos/bassoons, extending the second half of the thematic complex an additional eight measures (mm. 595–602), this highly unusual treatment of the orchestral horn—in its way even more of a departure than the crook changes earlier in the movement—fittingly culminates the shaped contribution of the new development theme to the movement’s inner dimension.

A fairly straightforward recollection of the development’s retransition (mm. 603–30) proceeds—with considerably less drama than its model—to a series of restatements of the main theme, now “normalized” into an eight-measure tune, providing the vehicle for the main task left to the coda: a quasi-ceremonial rehearsal of the instrumental markers of the movement’s inner and outer dimensions. Thus, we hear the reconstituted theme played first as a call in the horn with echoing responses (mm. 631–38), next “normalized” by the violins with echoes from the full horn choir (mm. 639–46), then by the cellos (doubled by the violas) *without* an

answering echo (thus wholly “inner”; mm.647–54), and finally, in full celebratory mode, by the full wind and brass choirs, including trumpets (mm.655–62).

Defamiliarizing the Familiar

In our usefully imagining that Mahler’s engagement with a score as familiar as the *Eroica* relates to his own approach to instrumentation, the common ground for the two activities appears to be his desire to set particular gestures into high relief. In performing a Beethoven symphony, in which the process of thematic integration has a particularly strong profile, the challenge would have been (and still might be construed to be) to ensure that individual musical passages stand apart from their larger environment, rather than simply or mainly connect to that environment through thematic or other similarities. To some extent, the relevant “larger environment” is defined by and within the piece itself, so the challenge becomes differentiating among different thematic statements of the same material, principally following Beethoven’s strategies of instrumentation and in some cases extending them. But with a work as familiar as the *Eroica*, the challenge is also differentiating a passage in performance from *other performances* of that passage that an audience might have heard in the past, in order to reawaken a sense of its individuality. Familiarity converts the individual into the generic, so that the *Eroica* becomes more generally “the heroic.” It is this tendency we must imagine Mahler to have been fighting against, both in performance and orchestrating his own works.

Mahler’s approach to instrumentation may be seen as part of a larger strategy of defamiliarizing the familiar,²⁹ which introduces a dimension to his orchestral style that seems primarily to offer distraction for its own sake. But these distractions are deliberately and carefully balanced, designed not to obscure what would register as the music’s “content,” but rather to cast that content in a new light, that it might be considered afresh. Put another way, Mahler’s instrumental strategy pulls our awareness level to a point somewhat outside our inclination to accept his music at face value—that is, as what its more conventional features project it to be—while also intensifying aspects of the more normalized experience being denied. This effect of being pulled us in two directions at once, the one abstract, the other particular-

29. Adorno is particularly eloquent in describing this aspect of Mahler’s music. Regarding the opening of the First Symphony (see below), he writes: “The tormenting pedal point . . . presupposes the official ideal of good instrumentation in order to reject it” (Theodor W. Adorno, *Mahler, A Musical Physiognomy*, trans. Edmund Jephcott [Chicago: U Chicago P, 1992] [orig. publ. Frankfurt am Main, 1971], p. 15); and, similarly, “Mahler’s atmosphere is the illusion of familiarity in which the Other is clothed” (p. 20).

ized, leads us to question the straightforward communicative power of music, its capacity to present in immediately felt, “absolute” terms. Moreover, we have this experience of being pulled in two directions at once whether we are more heavily invested in “absolute” or “programmatic” explanations of what music actually communicates, since the literalness of programmatic explanations becomes, through Mahler’s procedures, as problematic as the premise that the meaning of music is basically abstract and self-referential. Indeed, Mahler’s own growing ambivalence about programmatic explanations, which culminates around the turn of the century in his withdrawal of programmatic explanations entirely, should probably be understood as his desire, not to have his cake and eat it too, but to deny outright the possibility of indulging either “having” or “eating” to any level of satisfaction.

The paths by which Mahler arrived at some of his more unusual orchestrations reveal an interplay of tensions involving, on the one hand, an apparent desire to mask somewhat the clarity of a basic, often generic gesture and, on the other, a desire to underscore (through exaggeration) a specific attribute of that gesture. While these desires conflict on one level—one seeks to obfuscate associative meaning, the other to heighten it—their coordination is often close, since the latter provides an eminently practical means to accomplish the former. But substantial risk remains. Because exaggeration calls into question the ready comprehension of the basic gesture, the strategy must not wholly mask that gesture. In a typical application, Mahler starts with a fairly straightforward setting and layers a disorienting effect on his original conception; thus, in a particularly well-documented case, the introduction to the first movement of the First Symphony, the opening string harmonics were a later inspiration, and the substitution of clarinets for muted horns in the first fanfare a still later one.

The latter example illustrates Mahler’s management of the conflict particularly well. In his original setting, this fanfare was part of a series of events concerned primarily with the idea of emergence, as the muted horns (in B \flat , mm.9–12) were first answered by an A-major fanfare mixing muted horns and trumpets (r1.5–9),³⁰ with the subsequent arrival on D major marked by the muted horns in a more lyrical profile (r1.15–r2.1 and r2.4–r3.1), immediately followed by a muted trumpet fanfare (r2.1–2 and r3.1–3). Without abandoning this pattern, Mahler’s revisions highlight the dialogic component otherwise concealed within the strong sense that there is essentially *one* thing taking shape. Already in the original version, each

30. I will adopt the following notational shorthand for identifying passages in the First Symphony unless the passage in question lies near the beginning of its movement: “r4.1–4” (rehearsal “4,” mm.1–4) and “r5.6–r6” (the sixth measure of rehearsal “5” to rehearsal “6”). All measure numbers reference the final version of the score.

fanfare divides into two interacting profiles, a division that provides a ready vehicle for the introduction of trumpets in the second fanfare. In his revisions, Mahler dramatizes this aspect primarily by echoing its structure across the full trajectory of the first three fanfares, so that *pp* low-lying clarinets climbing into their weaker midrange are answered by offstage trumpets (“in the far distance”), with horns withheld until they can assume their distinctive lyrical identity. Within the individual fanfares, as well, the dialogic aspect is heightened, with the distinctive sound of the bass clarinet responding to the clarinets in the first fanfare and, in the second, an onstage, deeper-voiced trumpet (in B♭, rather than F) responding to the offstage trumpets. From a fairly insignificant supporting element within a more homogenous development, instrumental exchanges are thus brought into the foreground and layered more distinctively, so that they largely eclipse the clarifying harmonic profile of ♭VI–V–I. Moreover, allowing the first fanfare to emerge from instruments already introduced heightens the effect of the trumpets’ later intrusive addition to those instruments (with the second fanfare; r1. 5–9) and gives their entrance the added clarifying function that we are meant to understand the clarinet figure as a precursor of the brass fanfare, a more primitive or elemental—perhaps even fetal—version of the familiar topic.

Fanfare itself acquires an added significance in Mahler’s revised instrumentation, developing from a fairly generic vehicle for formal articulation and the introduction of new instruments—that is, from a well-worn topic—into a gesture that vividly recalls its roots as a practical device for communicating over distance. From the first measures of his First Symphony, Mahler already uses his instruments regressively, to suggest the ancestral meanings of more conventional topics, a temporal regression that serves him well here as later (e.g., in his use of sleigh bells in the Fourth Symphony and cow bells in the Sixth and Seventh, or his evocation of gong and shawm in the finale of *Das Lied von der Erde*), suggesting temporal distance, even timelessness, in addition to the physical distance he specifies here in the score.

The conventional view that Mahler’s orchestration is primarily one of refinement,³¹ so that he arrives gradually at an instrumental realization of his initial conception, seems inadequate to describe this process. Rather, there seem to be two distinct phases: one in which Mahler creates a coherent musical environment, the other in which he responds creatively to that environment, making explicit some

31. See, for example, Donald Mitchell’s discussion of the introduction to the first movement of the First Symphony in *Gustav Mahler: The Wunderhorn Years; Chronicles and Commentaries* (London: Faber and Faber, 1975), pp.212–17, where he details Mahler’s struggles, as he conceives them, “to get this passage to sound exactly as he wanted it” (p.217).

of its implications and masking its derivation from the conventional. It may well be this two-part process that he indirectly refers to in his oft-quoted remark to Natalie Bauer-Lechner: “The inception and creation of a work are mystical from beginning to end; unconsciously, as if in the grip of command from outside one—self one is compelled to create something whose origin one can scarcely comprehend afterwards.”³² While there is much to ponder in this quotation, in part he is describing an odd sense of estrangement from a completed musical structure, such that his later orchestral manipulations of these structures would inevitably seem a matter of composing anew with found objects rather than of extending the original process.

How different is this situation from Mahler approaching the “found object” of a Beethoven score with a desire to bring out the individual profile of each musical gesture, a desire that might be fulfilled by either revising the score itself or developing a nuanced performance of the existing score (or some combination of the two)? In all sorts of ways, of course, there is considerable difference between the two; certainly many will *feel* quite differently about Mahler’s fine-tuning his own score as opposed to tampering with the sanctified scores of Beethoven. But a case can and should be made that such tampering is an integral part of *any* carefully rehearsed performance of a score, a part of the process of “realization.” No score in itself *is* music; it is, rather, merely the basis for a musical performance. To achieve the best possible performance of a score, a performer/conductor typically tries to accomplish two things: to determine as closely as possible what the composer’s intentions and objectives were (through some combination of reading the score, conducting research, or relying on intuition), so that they might be applied to the performing situation at hand; and to achieve a degree of accommodation between those perceived intentions and objectives and his or her own intentions and objectives as a performer/conductor, since a performance is above all an *embodiment* of a piece. The performing tradition for Beethoven has tended to attempt a seamless embodiment, so that the performance will approach an idealized sense of the work, often aspiring to be “definitive.” But it has also often made room for a double-image between that ideal and an individual performance when the latter compensates sufficiently for its departures from tradition—for example, when an aspect of the piece emerges with greater clarity. In this respect—and particularly regarding the narrowed focus on aspects that emerge in greater relief through an idiosyncratic performance—Mahler’s approach to performing Beethoven and orchestrating his own works would seem to have a lot in common.

32. Natalie Bauer-Lechner, *Recollections of Gustav Mahler*, pp.30–31.

Yet, it is considerably less likely that Beethoven himself would have moved through the stages of composing in quite this way. Surely, even in the fashioning of the main tune for the *Eroica*'s first movement, he was aware that the tune would need to serve as both an externalizing call and as a melodic incipit of uncertain continuation, so as to enable a more chromatically mobile, internalized presentation, as well. The inner-outer dynamic and its instrumental profile would probably have been in place early on, with only minor adjustments to the instrumentation needed in the later stages. In this respect, Mahler's orchestral manner emphatically does *not* resemble Beethoven's, however fruitfully they intersect in performance and however closely one might align Mahler's instrumentation with his concerns as a performer of a Beethoven he understood well and somewhat differently from his contemporaries. Nevertheless, one may easily read back from this early example of Mahler revising his orchestration according to a strategy of defamiliarization, to Beethoven's procedures in the *Eroica*, in which the horn/trumpet call originates more deeply embedded, figuratively (that is, as configured through instrumental associations)—whether in nature for Mahler, or in the soul of the hero for Beethoven—before it emerges in its more typical profile. While Mahler's final version of his early fanfare exchanges shows allegiance to sources other than Beethoven—notably to Weber's frequent use of horn choirs to evoke the deep forest—his basic model remains Beethoven, whose practice he extends in a variety of ways. Thus, for example, Mahler adopts Beethoven's occasional dramatic strategy of composing in orchestral layers as one of the cornerstones of his own orchestral art, almost routinely building his instrumental fabric around a sense of dramatic interaction between foreground and background, or between inner and outer psychic dimensions.

Anguish and Redemption

The wrenching outcry that opens Mahler's Ninth Symphony finale (ex.7) has many highly profiled precedents in Mahler's early symphonies, instances of what we might call Mahler's "anguish" topic, in which a subjectively configured presence seems to recoil in spiritual agony and protest.³³ The most famous of these occur in the

33. Adorno identifies a more specific point of reference for one of the phrases in the chorale that follows (m.8), in the melody that carries the words "Himmel sein" in "Urlicht," the song that precedes the resurrection finale of Mahler's Second Symphony (Adorno, *Mahler*, p.165). In "Urlicht" also in D \flat , the octave figure occurs on the tonic rather than the dominant or leading tone, as here, but the text in "Urlicht" aligns well with the resurrection-based interpretive tradition for this movement: "Je lieber möcht' ich in Himmel sein!" (How much rather would I be in heaven!). Moreover, when

Sehr langsam und noch zurückhaltend a tempo (Molto adagio)

1. Violine *G-Saite* *großer Ton* *stets großer Ton*

2. Violine *f* *lang gezogen* *dim.* *p* *molto espress.*

Viola *f* *G-Saite* *lang gezogen* *dim.* *p* *molto espress.*

Violoncell (get.) *p* *molto espress.*

Kontrabaß *p* *molto espress.*

6

1. VI. *f*

2. VI. *f*

Vla. *f*

Vlc. (get.) *f*

Kb. *f*

11

1. VI. *p subito*

Example 7: Mahler, Symphony
No.9, finale, mm. 1–11.

Second Symphony, just before the recapitulation in the first movement and with the dissonant “cry of disgust” near the end of the *Fischpredigt* scherzo in the same work, but similar events occur at the opening of the finale in the First and near the end of the *Posthorn* scherzo in the Third. And Mahler’s “anguish” topic will again emerge—in its most extreme form—in each of the outer movements of his incomplete Tenth Symphony, where it again takes the form of a sustained, overpowering dissonance. But the opening of the finale in the Ninth stands apart, both for how the topic is configured—as a solitary and slow-moving voice opening a movement, without a secure sense of meter—and in the extraordinarily redemptive response it evokes from the string orchestra in the continuation, which has no direct parallel elsewhere in Mahler. In many ways, this passage is the quintessential example of Mahler’s “anguish” topic, a passage no other composer could have imagined or written in just this way, providing culmination and a sense of absolution within both this symphony and a larger body of work that returns again and again to the protesting voice of the alienated soul. But its roots, in practical and, to a large extent, expressive terms, lie securely within Beethoven’s modes of heroic symphonic discourse, and in particular within the first movement of the *Eroica*.

The profile of Mahler’s outcry in the Ninth Symphony is remarkably similar to the “wailing” gesture midway through the new theme in the *Eroica*’s first-movement development, as both melodic figures leap up to the dominant, waver briefly there, and then descend by step toward the tonic (cf. exs. 3 and 7). Moreover, Mahler extends his “wavering” gesture by borrowing from another famous oboe lament from a nearly parallel moment in another of Beethoven’s “heroic” symphonies, the Fifth. Like the new theme in the *Eroica*, the oboe cadenza in the Fifth reacts to a dramatic setback about two thirds of the way through the first movement (m. 268; see ex. 8), where it protests the (inevitable) return to C minor for the recapitulation. And, like Beethoven’s oboe cadenza, Mahler’s figure, launched from the first arrival pitch by a chromatically ascending melodic turn, surges upward a minor

the musical gesture returns in a more fully realized way at the end of “Urlicht,” it launches the phrase “wird leuchten mir bis in das ewig selig Leben!” (will light my way into eternally blessed life!). In the finale of the Ninth, both the octave leap and the descent are foreshadowed in the opening outcry, so that the latter, understood in relation to “Urlicht,” may be understood to layer anguish—by means of the dotted anacrusis and ensuing turn figure—onto the look to heaven implied by the allusion. Also with relevance to the Ninth, with its many deceptive resolutions to $\flat VI$, is the cadence that precedes the final line of “Urlicht,” a nearly literal allusion to the first deceptive cadence in *Tristan und Isolde*, complete with an expressive major-seventh appoggiatura that is echoed in a slightly milder form in the final vocal cadence of the song.

Example 8: Beethoven, Symphony No. 5, movt. I, m. 268 (oboe).



third and then descends slowly by step, with harmonic arrival articulated by the entrance of the full string group.³⁴

Formal placement also supports the referential dimension of these figurational details. Because the four-movement symphony had, by Mahler's day, often adopted some aspects of the single-movement sonata form (and *vice versa*), the opening of a symphonic finale may appear as a moment of dramatic crux analogous to the transition from development to recapitulation in sonata form, which was often a fraught negotiation for Beethoven. According to this paradigm, but within a more broadly scaled drama, Mahler's gesture also responds to a catastrophic event heard earlier: the protracted and unholy triumph of the grotesque A-minor *Rondo-Burleske* subject over the visionary D-major interlude late in the previous movement, which the former seems to torture and gloat over before putting it down, seemingly for good.

But the interactive dynamic of Mahler's opening seems modeled even more directly on the first thematic measures of the *Eroica* (mm. 3–12; cf. exs. 1 and 7), which also involve only the string choir and feature an individuated voice seeming to lose its harmonic way but then “rescued” through the intervention of the remaining string group, through a turn to the major mode accomplished with a half-step ascent at the other end of the registral space (the first violins' ascent to A \flat in m. 10 of the *Eroica*; at the first of Mahler's deceptive cadences, in the middle of m. 3, and later). In Mahler, as in Beethoven, an important spatial dimension contributes to the dynamic of “rescue” that governs this registral interplay. In the Beethoven passage, the “interior” cello section—center stage and slightly back from the violins—is gradually embraced by the rest of the string choir, which flanks it on either side, sympathetically taking control and guiding it back to the tonic. In Mahler, the violins, spread across the front of the stage (as they would have been still in Mahler's day)³⁵ and laying out an empty octave space below them with their

34. This configuration also recalls a key moment in “Urlicht” from Mahler's Second Symphony, in the oboe lament (r2.6–8) that completes the vocal line “Je lieber möcht' ich im Himmel sein!” discussed in the previous note. The phrase in “Urlicht” is itself an apparent reference to the oboe lament in Beethoven's Fifth, gently underscoring the subjunctive cast of the projected heavenly ascent.

35. See Daniel Koury, *Orchestral Performance Practices in the Nineteenth Century*.

opening leap, seem oddly hollow and vulnerable until their uncertain descent is cushioned by the steady pulse and deeper tones of the lower string group lying centrally behind them, entering—*Molto Adagio* and *molto espressivo*—to fill the seemingly bottomless abyss yawning below.

The differences between this Mahler passage and the opening of the *Eroica* are also profound. Beethoven's crucial moment of harmonic uncertainty comes after six measures of resolute tonic, whereas Mahler's opening has no such stability to push off from (at least internal to the movement) and thereby suggests an initially, somewhat bewildering number of harmonic alternatives (detailed below). And, unusual as Beethoven's instrumentation is, Mahler's is yet more extreme, as he requires his unison violins to leap upward a full octave on their lowest string, manage a tight chromatic turn in that high position, and negotiate an uncertain terrain of flats and double flats after three movements in the more violin-friendly keys of D major, C major, and A minor, all without an established, secure sense of metered pulse (notwithstanding two strong anacrusis-thesis gestures). However cleanly the violins manage to perform this gesture, Mahler effectively mandates a quality of dramatic flailing, resulting from the two sections of violins being spread out so they cannot easily hear each other, but also because Mahler directs them to play the entire passage on the G string, "lang gezogen" and "Sehr langsam und noch zurückhaltend" (long bows; Very slowly and still holding back) with a specifically indicated bowing that cannot be managed as written. Mahler's direction to play the entire passage on the G string is much more than an additional element of estrangement: it also contributes to the sense of struggle the passage enacts by hampering clarity of ensemble. Moreover, despite that the entire gesture lies relatively low within the violins' usual orchestral ambit (especially in Mahler), the warm but pinched quality of the tone demands the release that only a descent to a more congenial string register can provide, and seems also to long for the tone of the lower strings that it evokes but can only approximate.

Despite the direct gestural simplicity of this opening, its harmonic profile is quite complex, which has much to do with the dramatic moment itself. One reason the transition to the recapitulation is often a fraught moment in Beethoven's sonata forms is the sense of protest he projects in the necessity of returning to the original tonic, particularly when the tonic is minor mode (as, for example, in the first movements of the Fifth and Ninth Symphonies; this is occasionally true as well in major-mode movements, such as the "Waldstein" Sonata).³⁶ To the extent that the

36. For a particularly eloquent account of this aspect of Beethoven's recapitulations, see Adorno, *Beethoven*, esp. pp. 16–17 and 77.

finale of a symphonic work is bound by this convention of harmonic return, its opening may be similarly fraught, presenting itself as a moment of decision that has large consequences for the dramatic shape of the whole. This is particularly true within the tonal environment Mahler helped create, in which harmonic return becomes less and less the default option; indeed, with the Ninth Symphony it is the seeming *impossibility* of return that seems to prompt the anguished opening of the finale. Within a revamped traditional four-movement shape, Mahler prepares for harmonic return (to D major) within the extended triolike episode late in the A-minor *Rondo-Burleske*, when many extended pedals on A within a D-major context seem to project A as an overarching dominant for the piece. But the protracted defeat of this reemergence devastates the possibilities for straightforward harmonic restoration, which helps account for the peculiar poignancy when Mahler recalls the turn-figures of the trio precisely as a return to D major is irrevocably put aside, as one of the principal motives of the D \flat -major chorale in the finale. More immediately, the shift at the beginning of the finale, down a half step from the final cadence of the *Rondo-Burleske*, suggests that A \flat (G \sharp) might function as a leading tone, which the “wavering” gesture that follows does nothing to deny; in the shadow of the previous movement, the opening melodic profile of the finale sounds like G \sharp –A–B–A–G \sharp (see ex.9), pointing back toward the previous tonic A or, perhaps (with the melodic continuation to F \sharp), toward E, its dominant. All of this distances the possibility of achieving D, since D lies behind A, which in turn lies behind E, within a cycle of potential resolutions that become increasingly remote as the melodic gesture unfolds.

With A minor and E major as the most immediate harmonic environments for grounding the opening gesture, there remain two other strong possibilities, each reinforced by one of the two Beethovenian gestural models. Mahler’s borrowing from the ascending turn-figure in the first movement of the Fifth Symphony points, if subtly, to the possibility that the starting pitch—A \flat /G \sharp —might function as $\hat{2}$, with

Example 9: Harmonic alternatives suggested by Mahler, Symphony No.9, finale, mm.1–2.

A minor - E major

C \sharp minor

F \sharp minor

F \sharp as the implied tonic. A much more conventional possibility, however, is that the opening leap defines the space between dominants and provides a way of hearing the opening gesture grounded both within the piece and through reference to the “wailing” gesture from the *Eroica*. Within this orientation, the key is C \sharp minor, and the ascent to B (written C \flat) is a failed attempt to reach the upper tonic, from which the melodic line falls back in seeming dejection. Specific grounding in the first movement for this interpretation of the opening dotted-rhythm leap is itself conflicted; similar gestures occur on the dominant in m.99 (in B \flat) and m.186 (in G). A more extreme, two-octave leap occurs just a bit later—on A \flat , as in the finale—but within an ambiguous diminished sonority, a centerpiece of one of the most harmonically unsettled passages in the movement. The gesture thus converts at this point from an assured clarifying gesture into a seemingly desperate and ultimately unsuccessful attempt to hold on to something that is slipping away.

The harmonic confusion Mahler projects at the opening of the finale has a doubly bifurcated profile, between two strong functional options for the opening pitch ($\hat{5}$ and $\hat{2}$) and two weaker—if more urgent—options accruing from the immediately preceding cadence to A minor ($\hat{7}$ and $\hat{3}$). The gesture seems to hover between strength and desire, expressed here cogently as a choice between dominant and leading tone (or their closely related alternatives, supertonic and mediant). But the ambivalence of the gesture also has a temporal dimension, poised between an unrecoverable past and an uncertain future, its “strength” component pointing resolutely ahead while its “desire” component points back toward the previous movement and to the world of D major that movement has eclipsed. As the violins continue their descent to F, the lower strings enter to provide clarity; without them that descent might have either led back to A minor or confirmed the less likely option of F \sharp minor, but would in each case have denied the strongest of the four options, C \sharp minor. In harmonic terms, the rescue the strings provide represents a restoration of that strongest option, but transmuted into a surprisingly warm major mode (D \flat), with a heightened effect of escape into the “flat-sixth” realm, since D \flat is the \flat VI of the melodic arrival to F, which is in turn the audibly flattened sixth of A.³⁷ Harmonic clarification thus simultaneously achieves a sense of remove to a doubly inaccessible realm and an equally strong sense of inevitability, the only option that truly makes sense. The paradoxical arrival carries an almost electrical charge with an extraordinary sense of embracing

37. The use of the \flat VI as a realm of harmonic escape, usually marked as unreal, has been only relatively recently identified as a frequently recurring trope in the nineteenth century; see Susan McClary, “Pitches, Expression, Ideology: An Exercise in Mediation,” *Enclitic* 7 (1983), 76–86; and Thomas Nelson, *The Fantasy of Absolute Music*.

comfort, as if the anguished opening voice has merged with something both foreign and very *right*. Moreover, the high charge of this arrival helps to frame and stabilize the long series of *singly* removed arrivals to follow—that is, the series of deceptive cadences to local \flat VI \flat s—in such a way that the stability of the original arrival in $D\flat$ is not undercut.

A more paradoxical reason that the arrival in $D\flat$ carries a strong measure of conviction has to do with the peculiar cadential structures of the *Rondo-Burleske*, which provides the immediate context for the first of two related affective inversions that will color the opening section of the finale, through which mockery is converted into embrace and solace. In a grotesque anticipation of the opening to the finale, the *Rondo-Burleske* opens with a series of unharmonized melodic fragments that careen wildly through a number of harmonic nodes, tracing an augmented triad (G–E \flat –B) and giving special emphasis to the tritone (within the trumpet and horn exchanges), while adding a hint of a diminished-chord underpinning as well (unison strings)—all of which sets up a nonstandard chord progression leading to the first arrival in A minor (mm. 1–7; see ex. 10). Within the latter two-part progression, a skewed voice exchange between the outer voices in the first half points resolutely toward $D\flat$, which the second half takes up as a substitute subdominant in a raucous parody of an authentic iv–V⁷–i cadence (thus, $D\flat$ substitutes for d, and the German augmented-sixth chord on B \flat for V⁷/a): V⁷/B \flat –B–V⁷/ $D\flat$ /($\hat{5}$ /a)– $D\flat$ –G+6/D/(a). This bizarre replica of the most traditional of cadences will eventually serve as the central cadential progression for the movement’s final section. As it insists with increasing stridency on making $D\flat$ function cadentially as subdominant, the progression also advances the possibility that $D\flat$ might substitute for D on a larger scale, especially given the resurgence of the progression in the wake of the hapless D-major trio.³⁸

The opening “anguish” topic in the finale stands on the harmonic threshold between the two possibilities; as the violin line falls resignedly, the shock of the warm arrival in $D\flat$ stems in part from the affective transformation of the key itself, enormously positive instead of mocking, and with a sense of reality deeper and

38. The progression occurs at the beginning (mm. 6–7), slightly varied at the brief return to the tonic after the first extended episode (mm. 198–99), in modulatory versions slightly later (mm. 206–09), and in a variety of forms thereafter. When it finally returns in its original form, it serves to launch the *Più stretto* coda (mm. 615–17), after which it appears three more times in this form, each time more emphatically than the last, with its final recurrence saved for the very end (mm. 627–29, 639–41, and 665–67). This progression figures centrally in the system of double tonics that Christopher Lewis proposes as an explanation for the overall move in the Ninth Symphony from D to $D\flat$; see his *Tonal Coherence in Mahler’s Ninth Symphony* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1984), esp. pp. 65–99.

Allegro assai. Sehr trotzig. vl. 1 + 2

The musical score reduction shows the first seven measures of the third movement of Mahler's Symphony No. 9. The tempo is 'Allegro assai' and the mood is 'Sehr trotzig'. The score is for violin 1 and 2 (vl. 1 + 2) and piano. The piano part includes strings, horns (hrns.), strings + winds, and winds + brass. Dynamics include fortissimo (ff), sforzando (sf), and piano (p). The tempo is 'Allegro assai' and the mood is 'Sehr trotzig'.

Example 10: Mahler, Symphony No. 9, movt. III, mm. 1–7 (reduction).

more compelling than the tentative profile that D major had increasingly presented within the first three movements. Once again, this added depth—especially when measured against the D-major trio of the *Rondo-Burleske*, which it recalls explicitly—is doubly visceral, as close to literal depth as the medium of music permits. Thus, the arrival provides a *registral* depth that was lacking in the ethereal textures of the D-major trio, and a responsive, *textural* depth through its web of imitative counterpoint, which is based mainly on the turn-figure recalled from the trio.

Within the extended choralelike section, the descending violin line seems to merge into a mutually supportive and continually regenerating collective, an impression initially supported in three principal ways (to which variation and extension will accrue as the movement continues). Providing background support for this interactive dynamic is the quasi-hymnic style itself, in which, generically, discrete voices commingle as more or less equal participants, seeking connection to each other and to something beyond themselves through a shared religious feeling. But through the specific ways the individual voices interact within the chorale texture Mahler establishes a fulfilling sense of connection to the past (the earlier movements of the Symphony), to the present moment (voices interacting within the collective), and to a projected, blissfully indefinite future (through the delicious cycle of deceptive cadences—generated in part, it would seem, to forestall final arrival). The turn-figure (the second means of support) not only recalls the vivid phantasmal D major from the *Rondo-Burleske*, but also provides a vehicle for interactive individuality among the voices of the chorale, furnishing the “language” through which each voice asserts itself and contributes to the sustaining forward momentum of the extended phrase. Most unusual, however, is the third means of support, the series of deceptive arrivals; these are also the most complexly figured, both texturally and referentially, forming the second of the two affective reversals.

Each of the middle movements of the Ninth presents striking, often parodistic passages that combine a descending whole-tone scale with a series of deceptive arrivals to $\flat VI$ (these passages replay in varied form across each movement; ex. 11 shows one instance from each). The element of parody is particularly strong in the second movement (see ex. 11a), which alternates overall among the opening Ländler, a somewhat faster waltz, and a much slower Ländler. Francesca Draughon has shown how the interaction of these dance types articulates a conflicted narrative involving cultural binaries operative in Mahler's Vienna, including rural-urban, masculine-feminine, and healthy-sickly.³⁹ At the moment shown in ex. 11a, the waltz, interrupting the Ländler, seems to mock the latter's simplistic penchant for $\hat{3}-\hat{2}-\hat{1}$ cadential formulas, sometimes clumsily rendered, by extending the formula into a whole-tone descent; if the mockery seems especially brutal, this is partly because it seems also to target the first movement, which appeared genetically incapable of completing this simple cadential formula (thus, unable to proceed beyond $\hat{3}-\hat{2}$ to $\hat{1}$). Although the most obvious connective between this passage and the finale is its linked series of deceptive cadences to $\flat VI$, equally pointed are its grounding in string textures and its inclusion of a turn-figure and ascent directly parallel to the allusion to Beethoven's Fifth discussed above (mm. 267–68). The passage is, in ef-

Example 11a: Mahler, Symphony No. 9, movt. II, mm. 261–68, reduction with enharmonic adjustments.

39. See Francesca Draughon, "Dance of Decadence: Class, Gender, and Modernity in the Scherzo of Mahler's Ninth Symphony," *JM* (forthcoming).

109

p leggiero

ff

f

p pizz.

Example 11b: Mahler, Symphony No. 9, movt. III, mm. 109–17, reduction.

fect, a parody of something not yet heard, offered in mockery of something already heard but severely flawed, even if presented sympathetically (the D major of the first movement and the clumsy Ländler of the second).

When this progression returns in the *Rondo-Burleske* (ex. 11b), each element of this aggressively parodistic profile is at least partly curtailed. The whole-tone descent does not trace a full cycle, but gives way instead to more normalized presentations of the same material (e.g., mm. 113–16); string timbres again dominate, but not completely; the turn-figure is downplayed; and, most centrally, the element of mockery is significantly subdued. The latter is accomplished mainly through strategic placement, although each of these other elements also contributes; while the mocking waltz in the second movement enters in opposition to a sympathetic (if somewhat inept) Ländler, the *leggiero* second subject in the *Rondo-Burleske* has a considerably softer edge than the strident, aggressively unstable opening material that it follows. To a much higher degree, this kind of placement strategy, especially in relation to tempo, allows the reappearance of this progression in the finale to complete its conversion from mocking to sympathetic. In the second movement, the parodistic element arises largely from the increase in tempo, from Ländler to waltz. In the *Rondo-Burleske*, a sudden, hushed dynamic, the indication *leggiero*, and the derivation of the basic melodic figure through augmentation dictate a certain relaxation even if the pulse remains the same.⁴⁰ In the finale, the progression enters to stabilize the unmeasured free fall of the violins within a steady, solemn tempo.

But the most important factor contributing to the affective change concerns the progression's essence, the half-step lift in the bass against the whole-step de-

40. Adorno identifies in the *leggiero* theme an allusion to Lehár's *Merry Widow* (Mahler, pp. 162–63).

scent in the melodic voice, which produces quite different effects in the three passages. Within the dance idiom and slurred articulation of the second movement, the contrasting gestures seem to kick back at each other, so that the interaction between the outer voices is aggressively antagonistic; this emphasis seems doubly mocking, along the lines suggested above, of not only the Ländler's bumbling naïveté but also the inability of the first movement to cadence. In the *Rondo-Burleske*, this dynamic between the outer voices is initially muted along with the dynamic level. Although a more aggressive parodistic element will resurface (after m. 131), the lower dimension remains largely in the background throughout, giving the foreground to the augmented triad that the melodic material outlines in its more relaxed version of the movement's opening brass figures. But in the finale (ex. 7), the bass motion above all is made to count, with each ascending half step—in this and all later cases performed with a decisive change of bow—seeming to buoy the falling melodic voice, both cushioning its fall and, through the mechanism of the deceptive cadence, propelling the progression. Perhaps, as has often been noted, the connection between the deceptive arrival and a similar cadence in the introduction to Beethoven's "Das Lebewohl" Sonata emerges more palpably in this slower version of the progression, reinforcing the "farewell" interpretation of the Ninth.⁴¹ But the effect here seems more immediate than referential, as the outer voices interact in especially intimate ways. Already in the first measure of the chorale, the bass allows for a more conventional outcome in its second descent and half-step lift, converting the augmented sequential movement into a more tonally centered arpeggiation of the minor subdominant (descending D \flat –A–G \flat) to set up the full cadence in the middle of the second measure.

The following four measures (mm. 5–8) replay the opening four measures, but reconfigured so that the upper voice traces an increasingly confident arch shape, whose concluding descent will itself replay across the remainder of the opening statement in descending chromatic sequence. During the first half of the arch (mm. 5–6), interlocking minor-third ascents in the first violin (E \flat to G \flat ; F to A \flat) convert the allusive turn-ascent of the opening gesture into a sequential unit of upward striving reminiscent of the *Eroica*, this time continuing and reaching its apparent goal. This ascent now plays off a chromatically descending bass, precisely inverting the gestural direction of each while retaining their essential complemen-

41. Adorno has been central to the "farewell" tradition of the Ninth, though not its origin (*Mahler*, pp. 145–51); most prominent among those who have argued against this reading is Anthony Newcomb ("Narrative Archetypes and Mahler's Ninth Symphony," in *Music and Text: Critical Inquiries*, ed. Steven Paul Scher [Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992], pp. 118–36). For an attempt to reconcile these positions, see my *Symphonic Metamorphoses*, pp. 295–96.

tarity. For the first step in this rising sequential pattern, a resolute dotted-figure substitutes for the upward turn, establishing a parallel rhythm with the preceding two measures. When the original turn configuration returns for the second step—at the slower pace dictated by the parallel rhythmic structure—it is by then responding to a supporting turn in the second violins and violas heard just before, and spawns faster turn-figures in an accumulation of reciprocating responses. These figural exchanges, along with the sequential extension of the turn-ascent figure in the first violin, fuel an upward surge that culminates in a more extended version of the linked-deceptive-cadence formula across m.7, in which the upper voice now traces a full whole-tone scale. In seeming response to the buildup, everything else is also heightened, starting with a crescendo to the B \flat appoggiatura that launches the second descent. Since the upper voice this time occupies the upper position in each triad—itsself an intensification—an added intensity accrues to the parallel voice-leading, adding warmth to the parallel thirds that shadow both the lower voice, with its buoyant chromatic ascents, and the descending voice (in the second half of the measure). Moreover, a more rigorous application of the whole-tone/augmented logic adds additional intensity, echoing closely the progression's antecedents in the previous two movements; as the bass loops down by major thirds to land on F (descending D \flat –A–F), the harmonic trajectory is also widened, pushing the phrase into its sequential drive to the cadence.

The chorale is most remarkable, however, in the way it concludes. After an extended and nearly continuous buildup, as the upper voice resolutely descends toward the tonic, and the cellos and basses offer a cadential version of the turn-figure (m.10), the supporting choir of lower strings abruptly breaks off, leaving the violin line suddenly isolated on the tonic, *p subito* and, from there, *morendo*. Local justification for this outcome must rest with the conflicting impulses of continued unfolding and the need for a clarifying cadence, which are here in heightened conflict, since the pattern of deceptive resolutions drives the former and categorically denies the latter. With the bare tonic arrival, then, we get our clarifying cadence and are denied it. Expressively, two things happen in this moment. First, we are made all the more aware of the functional relationship between the protagonist (the violin line) and the supportive environment that has sustained it after the opening outcry; without that support, the arrival seems bereft of meaning. Second, we are removed suddenly from an intense awareness of a close, comforting immediate environment to the vast emptiness of the universe that lies just outside; the effect is analogous to a cinematic “jump cut” to a distant perspective from which the individual soul of the protagonist registers as infinitesimally small and without substance. A sense of extreme fragility substitutes for what promises to be extreme

fulfillment, setting the dynamic terms for the remainder of the Symphony, which will seek somehow to reconcile these two extremes.

Remarkably, even this moment of Mahlerian extremity has its correlative in the *Eroica*, a moment when the emphatic presence of the larger group evaporates, leaving the protagonist's instrumental representation clinging to the tonic. In m.132 of the *Eroica* first movement (see discussion of ex.2), the full *ff* orchestra evaporates, leaving the *p* cellos and violas to inaugurate the final progression to the cadence. As with many of the parallels noted here between Mahler's procedures and Beethoven's, there is an important reversal operating with the parallel in the instrumental profile, which serves as an appropriate pivot on which to turn the present discussion to a fuller consideration of the cultural-historical dimension.

Beethoven and Mahler; Kant and Freud

When Beethoven and Mahler in these passages isolate the individual instrumental voice identified with their respective protagonists, each prepares the event by first enhancing the presence of the orchestra, presenting it as an agent of great power; they then render the isolated voice especially vulnerable by falling to *p* at precisely the moment when, with no warning, the rest of the orchestra drops out. Despite these prominent parallels between the two passages, their differences are equally striking and may perhaps best be understood in terms of either the nature of the individuated protagonist in question, or of the relationship between that protagonist and the world he inhabits (or that *she* inhabits, although an unlikely projection for either of these composers). In fashioning individual personae within their respective symphonic worlds, both Beethoven and Mahler have long been understood to be fashioning versions of themselves—an interpretive tradition that is especially strong for these particular works. What is less frequently acknowledged is that each composer fashions both that symphonic “self” and the world around it within and against a specific musical tradition, and in response to changing notions of how a self functions within the world. These musical and cultural contexts include complex issues of musical representation, aesthetic representation more generally, philosophy, and psychology. Yet, by considering them together (if somewhat reductively), and by foregrounding the musical traditions involved, we might usefully sketch here at least the broad musicocultural context for each composer.

The inherited musical “selves” that seem to have been most relevant to Beethoven are those Mozart created for the opera stage and within the context of his mature keyboard concertos. In all of these, Mozart's “hero” is given considerable

agency, but is in the end accountable to an existing order, whether understood in terms of deities or humankind, or (subdividing the latter and thus returning implicitly to the former) of society or the natural limitations of human autonomy. That negotiations involving individuals and these more permanent orders are the dramatic substance of Mozart's operas is obvious enough. In the concertos, where the precise configuration of the governing system is less clearly stated, we at least have a clear generic sense of who the players are, with the soloist and orchestra typecast in their respective roles as "individual" and "existing order." And each concerto maps out the relationship between these players within a standard form that all but disappears shortly after Mozart's death, in which opening and closing tutti sections assert the preeminence of whatever order they may be taken to represent.⁴²

Beethoven's response to this aspect of Mozart's musical representations may be fairly easily traced in both his later concertos and his opera *Fidelio*, but the central work that redefines the place and autonomous power of the individual is his *Eroica*, in which agency clearly resides within the individual, within an inner self. Beethoven repeatedly draws our gaze inward to the soul of his hero, and we are made to understand that outward success and whatever meaning may be found in the "world" around that soul must ultimately arise from within. The passage in question shows with particular clarity how this dynamic works. As discussed earlier, it is not the loud, conflicted full orchestra that drives the approach to the final cadence of the exposition, but rather the image of clarity maintained by the heroic soul against the orchestra's tumult, and the struggle undertaken by that soul to achieve the retained image; in Beethoven's "heroic" universe, these are what lead to achievement and success. The philosophical orientation for this dynamic principle, based on notions of perseverance and validating personal struggle, derive directly from Kant, and the extent to which Beethoven absorbed these Kantian tenets of personal worth may be easily confirmed by rereading his Heiligenstadt Testament (written just before he began to compose the *Eroica*), or by observing the more explicit situation at the beginning of the second act of *Fidelio* (begun

42. I discuss this aspect of Mozart's music at greater length in "Passing—and Failing—in Late-Nineteenth-Century Russia," pp.208–12. For related discussions, see Richard Kramer, "Cadenza Contra Text: Mozart in Beethoven's Hands," *19CM* 15 (1991), 116–31; Susan McClary, "A Musical Dialectic from the Enlightenment: Mozart's Piano Concerto in G Major, K.453, Movement 2," *Cultural Critique* 4 (1986), 129–69; and Susan McClary, "The Blasphemy of Talking Politics during the Bach Year," in *Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance, and Reception*, ed. Richard D. Lepert and Susan McClary (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987), pp.13–62.

just after), in which Florestan's maintained inner life, the knowledge that he has done his duty, sustains him, whatever his status in the real world.⁴³ Operative here are two possible dynamic principles between inner soul and outer world that define the soul as separate, as dramatically central, and as what is at stake: oppression and benevolent intervention. *Fidelio* gives these two faces of the outer world dramatic presence within the other characters, notably within Pizarro and Leonora (and, when the latter proves inadequate, Don Fernando). From the outset in the *Eroica*, they present themselves more fluidly as competing versions of the world, the one representing what is to be endured and struggled against, the other guiding the hero to, or perhaps bestowing upon him, whatever success his perseverance will earn.

Because Beethoven's principal concern is to project the inner world of his hero within a Mozartean musical tradition that had been concerned foremost with demonstrating the viability and preeminence of the existing order as a governing context, what becomes most obvious in his musical representations—and to our ears most Beethovenian—is the violence and oppression that define, through their opposition, the value and worth of the interior world. Taking the Mozartean traditions he inherited as a starting point, Beethoven had first to drive the individual inward, to define him through imposed violence as essentially separate and autonomous, as a *self* in the modern sense. (We may wish to note, parenthetically, that both Beethoven and Mahler project their musical selves as at least aspirationally masculine—that *Leonora* becomes *Fidelio* is telling in this regard.) Within Mozart's actual works, Beethoven's most useful models seem to have been the two minor-mode concertos (in D and C, K. 466 and K. 491), generally acknowledged as important influences. By Mahler's day, after a century that saw the entrenchment of German Idealism, what survives most vividly from Beethoven's construction of a Kantian musical world is the projected sense of *self* as the generative center of experience, and of a world beyond that self experienced as separate and of secondary importance.⁴⁴ Central to Beethoven, but much less to Mahler (thanks in part to Nietzsche), is the ethical dimension of heroism, the imperative to duty. Although this dimension also matters to Mahler—more so than to his contempo-

43. For insightful discussions of Beethoven's relationship with Kantian ideas, see Adorno, *Beethoven*, pp.17–18 (Adorno finds a closer relationship between Beethoven and his more exact contemporary Hegel, although less as an influence than as a parallel development); and Scott Burnham, "Cultural Values: Beethoven, the *Goethezeit*, and the Heroic Concept of Self," chap.4 of *Beethoven Hero*, pp.112–46; see also pp.161–62.

44. For a much different understanding of Beethoven's projection of selfhood in musical terms, see Scott Burnham, "Beethoven Hero," chap.5 of *Beethoven Hero*, pp.147–68.

rary Richard Strauss, it would seem, given the latter's perplexed reaction to the "double-breakthrough" in the finale of Mahler's First Symphony⁴⁵—more central to his work is the *sense* of the self, of the subjective experience of alienated selfhood. In this regard, Mahler displaces Beethoven's central ethical concerns with psychological ones, so that in terms of what the figures have come to mean in broad cultural terms, we might find the shift from Beethoven to Mahler analogous to the shift from Kant to Freud. Some aspects of this formulation may seem reductive or clichéd, yet it provides a useful framework for understanding how Mahler might have understood and performed Beethoven, and how that mattered for his own work.

Beethoven and Mahler shared a preoccupation with the negotiations between self and the exterior world, and both composers used the individuated voice within an orchestral landscape as the most powerful musical means available to them for representing these negotiations. But in responding to Beethoven's music as a conductor, Mahler would inevitably have been more concerned with heightening the sense of the individual, and of the individual's antagonistic engagement with the world, than with any other aspect, especially given the tautologizing, normalizing tradition of performing Beethoven discussed at the beginning of this essay. This helps explain the careful attention to the nuances of instrumental individuation discussed here, as well as Mahler's tendency to enhance the larger instrumental ensemble and thereby increase its power and presence (most famously, with the addition of brass to Beethoven's Ninth). A telling consequence of this heightened focus on the individual self in Mahler's own music is the sense of alienated estrangement he almost routinely evokes between a projected subjectivity and the surrounding world, which may be understood as Mahler's extension of the often oppressive and violent demeanor of Beethoven's orchestra, against which the individual is defined.⁴⁶ But the other Beethovenian orchestral face, associated with rescue, redemption, solace, and earned reward, is also heightened in Mahler—necessarily so, for the sake of balance.

By the early twentieth century, and for Mahler in particular, this other Beethovenian orchestral face had become increasingly unconvincing; hence Adorno's response to the finale of Mahler's Seventh, that "Mahler was a poor yea-sayer."⁴⁷ If for Beethoven the first task was to create a more hostile symphonic representa-

45. Regarding Strauss's reaction to the finale, see esp. James Buhler, "'Breakthrough' as Critique of Form: The Finale of Mahler's First Symphony," *19CM* 20 (1996), 125–43.

46. To some extent, of course, such projections are more immediate references to contemporary culture, and of Mahler's tenuous position in that culture as a converted Jew; see Draughon and Knapp, "Mahler and the Crisis of Jewish Identity."

47. Adorno, *Mahler*, p. 137.

tion of the world in the wake of Mozart's affirmations of existing order, Mahler's pressing task was to restore convincingly the benign face, so that his orchestral landscape—his symphonic “world”—would project a balanced perspective, a believable possibility for redemption. It is thus precisely to the point that whereas Beethoven chooses a moment of extreme orchestral hostility to expose most nakedly the weakened but persevering soul of his protagonist, Mahler chooses a moment of extreme orchestral bliss. The fundamental task for Beethoven is to create musical situations that will depict his hero maintaining valuable identity through struggle. For Mahler, where identity seems a given, imposed by an inhospitable world and maintained as a last refuge against that world, it is to project a palatable and credible endgame, a positive outcome that provides genuine solace by acknowledging the full scope of human suffering. This is precisely what the chorale passage in the finale of Mahler's Ninth does so persuasively; the comfort it offers seems genuine because it acknowledges, soothes, and reorders the specific past of the previous three movements. It is also why, at the moment of arrival, Mahler must dramatize fully how utterly that comfort matters. Exposing the weakened, needy soul of his protagonist, no less nakedly than Beethoven's but with considerably less agency, is essential acknowledgment of the human condition.⁴⁸

As already noted, a long-standing interpretive trope of Mahler's Ninth is that it represents his “farewell,” somehow foretelling his own death (see n.41). Yet if one were to provide a program for the work to account for the musical events under consideration here, its culmination would not be so different from what one finds in his early symphonies, for which he once provided programs and with which the dénouement of the Ninth shares many elements: the bestowed, yet earned victory of the First, the forgiving grace of the Second, the embracing love of the Third, the sweetly innocent, heavenly sleep of the Fourth. The Ninth is nevertheless a “farewell” symphony in at least one sense; it is the “last” symphony in the way Beethoven's Ninth was for Wagner: it is the end of the great arc launched by the *Eroica*, the last symphony in the Germanic tradition to maintain a convincing balance between suffering and solace. Providing a recognizable map of human experience, it offers extraordinary comfort without ignoring the unbearable pain that must precede and inform it.

48. Given the recurring preoccupations in his music, one must imagine that it was specifically Christianity's vision of resurrection that attracted Mahler (beyond the rich legacy of music tied both directly and indirectly to Christian belief), lending credibility to the genuineness of his conversion. But Mahler used this fundamental tenet of Christian belief as yet another “found object” to elaborate and extend further, with the result that his use of the “resurrection” trope in musical terms has a consistently more forgiving profile than can be supported by traditional Christian teachings.

Acknowledgements

This essay has been informed by an extraordinary array of local influences, including my thousands of undergraduate Beethoven students over the years, and my seminar and Ph.D. students who were often directly involved in helping develop its ideas, especially Gwyneth Bravo, Francesca Draughon, Jonathan Greenberg, James Kenaway, Mark Martin, Lisa Musca, Caroline O'Meara, Erica Scheinberg, Eva Sobolevski, and Griffin Woodworth. Among my more officially established colleagues, I wish to thank especially Tom Beghin for his highly particularized performances of Beethoven, Elisabeth LeGuin, who helped awaken me to the performative dimension of interpretive analysis, and Mitchell Morris and Susan McClary, whose own work, encouragement, and constructive interactions have profoundly shaped my work in recent years.

REVIEWS

Observations Held in Check

William Kinderman

Charles Rosen. *Beethoven's Piano Sonatas: A Short Companion*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002. xii, 256pp. Contains CD with musical illustrations at the piano.

In approaching Charles Rosen's new book *Beethoven's Piano Sonatas: A Short Companion*, it makes sense to begin at the end, with the very last sentence. In his comments on Beethoven's last sonata, op.111, Rosen concludes that "the modesty of the final chord is significant" (p.249). The ending of this sonata is understated and suggestive, and the rapport of sound with silence is tantamount, as various commentators have observed. In Rosen's view, however, a notion of modesty or restraint extends as well to the kind of discourse about the music that he finds appropriate. In his preface he writes that

I have always despised the writing about music that tries to substitute for the music a kind of pseudo-poetry or, even worse, the sort of facile philosophical speculation that leads readers to believe that they will be engaged in an exalted activity when listening to Beethoven—or are already so exalted merely by reading about it. There is no question, of course, that the music of Beethoven often made a claim to reach the sublime, and that he believed that the experience of great music transcended the day-to-day experience of our ordinary lives. Translating this transcendence into words does not, however, make it more accessible, only more commonplace. The ecstasy provided by music arrives above all through the kind of unselfconscious attention to listening and playing that makes us, for a moment, lose ourselves in the work (pp.xi–xii).

The warning against “pseudo-poetry” or “philosophical speculation,” so strongly put, takes on a kind of Wittgensteinian aura. “What we cannot speak about we must pass over in silence”—with that sentence Ludwig Wittgenstein concluded his famous *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, the influential book from 1921 that captivated the Logical Positivists of the 1920s and 1930s. In this sense, Rosen’s “Short Companion” or “Practical Guide” to the Beethoven sonatas, which is not so short in its sheer length, does seem consciously delimited in its concern to draw boundaries, as if to avoid at all costs any such misguided “translation” of the transcendent into the commonplace.

The book is organized into two halves. Much of Part I deals with general stylistic matters such as phrasing and tempo, whereas Part II is devoted to commentary on each of the thirty-two sonatas. It is a practical and traditional approach to this large body of music. The very first monograph on the sonatas, *Beethoven’s Clavier-Sonaten* by Ernst von Elterlein,¹ adopts a similar organization, with a more general contextual discussion followed by detailed discussions of each of the pieces, and many subsequent books on the sonatas have followed this approach.

No other body of piano music has received such close attention as the Beethoven sonatas. In his overview of earlier writings on these works in *The Sonata in the Classic Era*, William S. Newman counted no less than fifty books devoted to the sonatas alone. This long line of publications includes Adolf Bernhard Marx, *Anleitung zum Vortrag Beethovenscher Werke* (1863), Wilibald Nagel’s two-volume *Beethoven und seine Klaviersonaten* (1903), Hugo Riemann, *Ludwig van Beethovens sämtliche Klavier-Solosonaten* (1919), Donald Francis Tovey, *A Companion to Beethoven’s Pianoforte Sonatas* (1931), Jacques-Gabriel Prod’homme, *Les sonates pour piano de Beethoven* (1937), Richard Rosenberg, *Die Klaviersonaten Ludwig van Beethovens* (1957), and more recent works like Jürgen Uhde’s three-volume *Beethovens Klaviermusik* (1974), and Kenneth Drake’s *Beethoven Sonatas and the Creative Experience* (1994), among many others. In addition, Heinrich Schenker contributed *Erläuterungsausgabe* of four of the last five sonatas, and various authors, including Wilfrid Mellers in *Beethoven and the Voice of God* and Lawrence Kramer in *Music as Cultural Practice 1800–1900*, have offered commentary on some or many of the sonatas within studies of broader scope. The analytical literature on these works is also rich and varied, and entire monographs devoted to individual sonatas include Martha Frohlich’s book on op. 57 and Nicholas Marston’s study of op. 109.²

1. (Leipzig: Heinrich Matthes, 1856).

2. Martha Frohlich, *Beethoven’s “Appassionata” Sonata* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991); Nicholas Marston, *Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in E, Op. 109* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995). Yet another recent book on this subject is Timothy Jones, *Beethoven: The “Moonlight” and Other Sonatas, Op. 27 and Op. 31* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999).

The reader of Rosen's *Short Companion* will find scant engagement with these writings, apart from a few references to Tovey's *Companion* and his edition of the sonatas, and a single prominent reference to Newman's later book *Beethoven on Beethoven*.³ This paucity may seem somewhat surprising for a book published by a major university press; but the *Short Companion* is less a work of cumulative scholarship as such than a contribution in which an experienced performer makes available his personal knowledge of works he knows in great depth. There are a number of earlier studies of this kind, including Edwin Fischer's book *Beethoven's Pianoforte Sonatas* (1959) and various essays by Alfred Brendel contained in his books *Musical Thoughts and Afterthoughts* and *Music Sounded Out*.

Thirty years ago, in his influential study *The Classical Style*, Rosen offered a detailed analysis of the biggest of the Beethoven sonatas, the "Hammerklavier" in B \flat Major, op. 106. He explores the structural role of Beethoven's use of descending chains of thirds, which are exposed most nakedly in the transition to the "Hammerklavier" finale. The elaboration of these chains of falling thirds on different levels of structure, whether as motivic and harmonic detail or as a framework for the changes of key, is charted with insight. Moreover, the tension and dramatic power of the semitone conflict between B \flat and B—which in the recapitulation opens a rift into a polar tonality, the "black key" of B minor—are related convincingly by Rosen to Beethoven's almost obsessive use of the descending thirds. This discussion must count as one of the most lucid and illuminating attempts to relate structure to expression in the whole literature on the Beethoven sonatas.⁴

The lack of such sustained analyses in Rosen's *Short Companion* surely has to do with the circumstances under which the book was written. As he explains in his preface, the book was inspired by an invitation to perform all the sonatas at the Pontina Festival and by a seminar on them held for the piano students at the summer school in the Caetani castle at Semoneta in Italy. This seminar must have been a fruitful environment for the material contained in the opening chapters, which concentrates especially on matters of phrasing and tempo, and often makes reference to historical performance practice. The sense of a master-class environment

3. William Newman, *Beethoven on Beethoven: Playing His Piano Music His Way* (New York: Norton, 1988). Rosen cites Newman's book for its discussion of phrasing in Beethoven, and Newman supplies a comprehensive biography of writings related to performance issues. Related studies include Sandra P. Rosenblum, *Performance Practices in Classic Piano Music* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1988); Jürgen Uhde and Renate Wieland, *Denken und Spielen: Studien zu einer Theorie der musikalischen Darstellung* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1988); and Konrad Wolff, *Schnabel's Interpretation of Piano Music* (New York: Norton, 1972).

4. Rosen, *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven* (New York: Viking, 1971), pp. 407–33.

is preserved in the accompanying CD, which contains illustrations by Rosen performing at the piano excerpts of works by Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven.

As Rosen reminds us, the highly articulated phrasing of Beethoven's music has frequently been misunderstood by editors who have normalized his notation and by performers unfamiliar with the rules of slurs and accentuation as outlined in treatises such as Daniel Gottlob Türk's *Klavierschule* of 1789. In discussing accents and rubato, Rosen refers to a "fruitful confusion . . . between accenting a note and detaching it," which signals his refreshingly undogmatic approach. On the troublesome issue of the distinction between vertical strokes and dots, a distinction on which Beethoven sometimes insisted, Rosen writes that "a glance at almost any one of his manuscripts will show that it is often virtually impossible to tell one from the other" (p.21). This may be slightly too pessimistic. For, as William Newman has shown, there are occasional instances in the manuscripts when Beethoven writes a gradual transition from dots to strokes, with an increasing vigor and animation in the music expressed through the shift to a heavier and more pointed articulation.⁵ Unfortunately, his publishers were neither equipped nor willing to convey faithfully such nuances.

Rosen properly draws attention to Beethoven's interest in "multiple textures," for example, his use in the Adagio grazioso of the G-Major Sonata, op.31, no.1, of a "pearly touch" using just two fingers in rapid passagework to convey a slightly detached sound, juxtaposed with phrases employing a more *legato* treatment. The point is well taken and could be elaborated in various ways. Already at the beginning of this movement, the texture of the melody in the right hand, decorated through sustained trills and chromatic ascents, is sounded above the detached articulation of broken chords in the bass. Later, when the "pearly" *leggieramente* unfolds with fantastically intricate passagework in the right hand, the left hand takes up a more sustained and sonorous texture. There is a kind of counterpoint of textures here, devised so that each level is clearly profiled. Very often, even distinguished performers fail to articulate clearly these distinct levels of sound.

In an essay entitled "Must Classical Music Be Entirely Serious?" Alfred Brendel characterized this movement as "the first neoclassical piece of music," finding in it "a complicated balance . . . between sympathy and mockery, the graceful and the bizarre, nostalgia and anticipation, lyricism and irony."⁶ It is worth reflecting on

5. See Newman, *Beethoven on Beethoven*, pp.144–45. Newman offers an example from the autograph score of the first movement of the Sonata in A^b Major, op.26. Also see the discussion of this passage in op.26 in Sandra P. Rosenblum, *Performance Practices in Classic Piano Music*, pp.187–88.

6. Alfred Brendel, *Music Sounded Out* (New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1990), p.30.

the layers of aesthetic meaning that are bound up with the unusually elaborate textures of the Adagio grazioso. The trills and ornate decorations, the serenade-like flavor, and the exaggerated rhetoric convey a hint of sophisticated mimicry, an atmosphere of operatic elegance slightly overdone. The nature of these textures is bound up with the character of the music, as Rosen observes in writing that “the whole movement is a delightful imitation, only partly humorous but mostly affectionate, of the traditional but already outdated style of operatic singing of long decorative passages” (p.38).

More than seventy pages of the *Short Companion* are devoted to the issue of tempo. One important point relates not simply to tempo changes as such but to Beethoven’s strategies of *connecting* one section of a work to another in a dynamic, continuous process. An example particularly stressed by Rosen is the transition from the slow introduction to op.111, marked *Maestoso*, to the main body of the first movement, the Allegro con brio ed appassionato (ex.1). As Rosen puts it, “It ought to be self-evident that when Beethoven commences a trill in thirty-second notes in the *Maestoso* and continues it in sixteenths in the *Allegro*, he does not intend a break in rhythm but expects a continuous trill to bridge over into the new section. This means that the *Allegro* is pretty much exactly twice as fast as the *Maestoso*” (p.100). I agree with this basic perspective on the *Maestoso* and *Allegro*, and my own recent recording of the sonata, though quite different than Rosen’s interpretation, reflects that shared viewpoint.⁷ The matter of continuity is paramount here, and many features of the music not mentioned by Rosen lend further weight to the argument. The jagged, open-ended phrases that begin the *Maestoso* lead, in m.11, to an accented downbeat on the dominant, and the dominant note, G, is reiterated as a pedal point, dropping into the lower bass register at the upbeat to m.13. Further reinforcement of the dominant pedal on the lowest possible G occurs at the upbeat to m.15, and this lowest G is then sustained as the trill in the last measure of the *Maestoso*.

This low, mysterious *pianissimo* trill on G becomes the springboard for the powerful dramatic opening of the Allegro con brio ed appassionato. In its first two measures, a crescendo builds on the long-held pedal point, as the addition of an octave doubling expands the sonority. The tension and energy of the protracted trill then yield to a new motive, the rising fourth G–C, which is marked by the outcome of the crescendo to *forte* and then, after a silence, by the *fortissimo* statement of the head motive beginning with this rising fourth. The lifeblood of the

7. William Kinderman, *Beethoven: The Last Three Piano Sonatas* (Hyperion/Helios CDH55083, 2002).

Maestoso

The musical score is for the first movement of Beethoven's Sonata in C minor, Op. 111. It is in C minor, 3/4 time, and consists of five systems of music. The first system is marked 'Maestoso' and includes dynamics like *f*, *sf*, *p*, and *cresc.*. The second system has a measure number 3 and includes trills and accents. The third system has a measure number 6 and includes dynamics like *p*, *dimin.*, and *pp*. The fourth system has a measure number 10 and includes dynamics like *cresc.*, *f*, and *sf*. The fifth system has a measure number 14 and includes a trill and an accent.

Example 1: Beethoven Sonata
in C minor, op. 111, first
movement, slow introduction
and beginning of exposition.

(17) **Allegro con brio ed appassionato**

(20)

cresc. - - - - - *f* *ff* *mezzo p poco ritenente* *a tempo cresc.* [etc.]

Example 1 cont.

rising upbeat motive of the fourth is of course its rhythm, and it is the trill that links the Maestoso and Allegro while also providing raw material for the gradual shaping of the ensuing main theme of the movement. In this context, much depends on a convincing projection in performance of the relation between the Maestoso and Allegro. More is at stake than a correct rendering of proportions in Beethoven's tempo relations. What Beethoven seems to be aiming at here is a gradual *emergence* out of the end of the Maestoso of those primary impulses that launch and sustain the Allegro con brio ed appassionato.

Such an extension of Rosen's discussion avoids the risk of "pseudo-poetry" or "philosophical speculation" while drawing attention to the high level of integration and compelling dramatic development embodied in this music. The challenges to successful performance are considerable, since these involve engagement with a psychological process of some complexity. The discovery of a convincing tempo relation between the Maestoso and Allegro is certainly a key element. On the other hand, as Rosen writes, a faster performance of the Maestoso to promote this relation "would make most pianists nervous . . . because the opening skip, properly played with only one hand, is dangerous and tricky" (p.100). It is indeed curious that many pianists make these purely mechanical difficulties a matter of stubborn conviction. In this case, it is advisable to play the opening octave on E \flat with the right hand, which removes technical uncertainty while allowing for full concentration on the rhythm and voicing of the opening phrase. Nothing is gained through

the overcoming of difficulties that can be easily solved through straightforward redistribution of the musical material between the hands.

A more complex musical transition involving unusual tempo relationships is found in the finale of Beethoven's penultimate Sonata in A \flat Major, op. 110. Rosen addresses this work in his chapter of the *Short Companion* on "The Last Sonatas," and he also offers an extended discussion in the added final chapter of his expanded edition of *The Classical Style*, published in 1997.⁸ His point about tempo concerns the change in notation from eighth notes to sixteenths at the Meno allegro and involves the claim that "the goal of the original tempo is reached precisely with the return to A \flat major and the main theme in octaves in the bass (bar 174), so that the traditional sense of the sonata recapitulation is now applied to tempo as well as to theme and tonality" (p. 242).

This attainment of the original tempo of the fugue, in conjunction with its tonic key of A \flat major and an enhanced restatement of the earlier pattern of fugal entries, is clearly important, yet much more is at work in this extraordinary passage. The passage beginning at the *una corda* inversion of the fugal subject in G major carries the unusual inscription "poi a poi di nuovo vivente" ("nach und nach wieder auflebend"): "little by little with new life." Significantly, Beethoven places the quiet *una corda* presentation of the inverted fugue subject in precisely the same register as the second and most despairing version of the lamenting song, or Arioso dolente, in G minor. This helps convey the sense of a transformation of despair into renewed vitality. The ensuing, labyrinth-like passage unfolds with staggered stretto presentations of the subject, and the music passes through minor keys that recall the sphere of the Arioso. The probing, modernistic quality of this passage is reflected most of all in the radical compression of the fugue subject in diminution at the Meno allegro, where it sheds even the second of its three ascending fourths. Yet Beethoven's definitive goal lies even beyond the recapitulatory convergence onto A \flat major that occurs in m. 174. An outcome of the drastic compression of the fugue subject itself is the scintillating texture of sixteenth notes that pervades the musical texture of the closing passages, lending brilliance to the textures in the last pages of the sonata. The entire last section of op. 110, from the appearance of the inverted fugue subject to the final chord, embodies a continuous process of transformation. Even the fugal texture is left behind, as the melody is extended to reach the high register. After surmounting two diminished-seventh chords, it finds its culminating resolution in the emphatic final sonority spread across all of the pitch registers of the piano. Ultimately, it is the energy embodied in the sixteenth-note

8. Rosen, *Beethoven's Piano Sonatas*, pp. 235–42; *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven* (expanded edn. New York: Norton, 1997), pp. 488–507.

figuration that seems to give the music the necessary strength to affirm this resolution, thereby resisting the depressive character of the Arioso stanzas, which had nearly gained the upper hand. Hence the issues of tempo relation emphasized by Rosen are closely connected to the narrative design of the whole sonata.

Rosen's *Short Companion* contains excellent insights, but its discussions are rarely very thorough or sustained. The final section of the book, devoted to op. III, makes repeated reference to the thematic similarity that connects the waltz by Diabelli that triggered Beethoven's monumental set of thirty-three variations, op. 120, to the Arietta that he shaped as a theme for variations in the finale of his last sonata, op. III. Rosen states that "Beethoven's first reaction to Diabelli's tune was that it was trash" (p. 246) and later maintains that "his initial reaction was right, the waltz is indeed trash" (p. 247). This statement seems too blunt. Even if Beethoven described the waltz as a "cobbler's patch" (*Schusterfleck*), his use of that term describes a technical feature of the theme: the rather mechanical rising sequences first heard in mm. 9–12 of the waltz. On some level, Beethoven was surely very engrossed with Diabelli's theme. Rosen's references to Beethoven creating "a grand work with Diabelli's trashy tune" (p. 248) do not go very far to explore either the similarities or the differences between these contemporaneous works.

There is something terse and slightly perfunctory about the last pages of the discussion of op. III. Rosen writes of the extension of Variation 4 leading to the cadenza preceding the recapitulatory Variation 5 that "what should have been the ultimate cadence in C major ends up dramatically as the first departure from C major in the movement, and the banal structural device of the final trill becomes the most original juncture of the form" (p. 248). Regarded within the overall proportions and formal trajectory of the movement, this moment does not seem like the "ultimate cadence" or the "final trill"; we are still far from the end. What is fully prepared, however, is the cadence to C major that is to be granted at the arrival of the recapitulatory Variation 5, in which the original theme will be merged with the textures of other variations in a superimposition of rhythmic levels. Especially remarkable is the immediately ensuing cadenza-like passage. This is the inner climax, bringing the turn to E♭ major with multiple sustained trills, and leading to an ascent into the highest register expressed entirely by trills, as a vast gap opens between the treble and bass. Beethoven had often exploited the suspense of an interrupted cadence in his music, but the way this device is handled in op. III seems qualitatively new and astonishingly original. Rosen has offered a sensitive discussion of this passage elsewhere, in *The Classical Style*.⁹

9. Rosen, *The Classical Style*, pp. 446–48.

Little is said about Variation 5, but here again there are issues of climax and continuity that need to be made consciously audible in a satisfactory performance. For instance, three measures from the end of this variation, a long crescendo reaches a *forte* climax on a dominant major-ninth chord with A in the highest voice. The rich, dissonant sound of this A heard against G in other voices prepares the sustained soft trill on this same high G that resonates through much of the ensuing coda to the movement. If the climactic major-ninth has made its mark, the protracted trill on G can be heard as *transforming* that dissonance into an ethereal, vibrating sonority, creating a ringing sound that seems to resist closure and termination. The emergence of this trill, together with the original theme in the ethereal high register and the suspended figuration in triplets in the left hand, generates another climactic combination of textures. The musical development of the Arietta movement involves not only a “gradual acceleration of the movement” culminating in the “unmeasured velocity” (p.248) of the trills, but also a gradual ascent in register and the unfolding of an unsurpassed expressive plentitude in the musical texture of the coda.

The performance illustrations offered with the book are very welcome, but they do not always withstand a close critical hearing. On track 32, for instance, the performance of the Maestoso introduction of op. 111 leading into the Allegro con brio ed appassionato is rhythmically unstable. The first and third measures are deprived of much of their third beat, on which diminished-seventh chords have been tied over, and these opening phrases consequently lurch forward. The control of dynamics is not optimal. On the last quarters of mm. 12 and 14 in the Maestoso, there are marked accents given to the diminished-seventh chords, although Beethoven has provided no such indications. These accents disrupt the *piano* character of these measures and undermine the gradual transition to the mysterious *pianissimo* pedal point with the trill in the depths of the bass. The last measure of the Maestoso is rushed, losing about one of its four beats, which weakens the crucial link between the slow introduction and the Allegro con brio ed appassionato about which Rosen writes so compellingly.

If Rosen’s new addition to the vast literature on the Beethoven sonatas often does not advance the state of scholarship on these works, it still conveys insights of an outstanding musical thinker. His succinct formulations can be suggestive and thought provoking. At the same time, the implied prohibition against approaches that would address expressive meaning in broader poetic or philosophical terms can be safely disregarded. Rosen’s study of *Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas* passes over in silence many issues that urgently deserve our attention, and the book can fruitfully serve as a springboard to what lies beyond it.

Can One Be a Musician Without Being German?

Alexander Rehding

Berthold Hoeckner. *Programming the Absolute: Nineteenth-Century German Music and the Hermeneutics of the Moment*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002. xix, 364pp.

All modern music begins with C#, as Wagner pointed out, with the first chromatic note of the *Eroica* Symphony. And it ends with another C#, as Thomas Mann argued, with the subtle chromatic inflection at the return of the Arietta in Beethoven's op. 111. Between these two Beethovenian C#s unfolds the story of German music, whose story Berthold Hoeckner tells in his *Programming the Absolute*.

The story of nineteenth-century music, staged as a battle between program music and absolute music, is one of the most over-rehearsed tropes of an aesthetically inclined musicology and has enjoyed particular popularity in the German tradition of previous generations. In the various stagings of this battle absolute music usually wins over program music—the first comprehensive study of nineteenth-century music history, Hugo Riemann's ambitious *Geschichte der Musik seit Beethoven 1800–1900*, written in the first year of the new century, conjured up such a scenario, analyzing the error of program music in particularly stark terms: “If a composer declines his right to express *his* emotions through music, preferring instead to portray the emotions of others, he takes a consequential step: he strips music of its innermost essence and progressively uses its means in a figurative, secondary sense, giving up any naïveté and spontaneity in favor of reflection and capriciousness.”¹ Following

1. Hugo Riemann, *Geschichte der Musik seit Beethoven 1800–1900* (Berlin: W. Spemann, 1901), p. 758 (my trans.).

Riemann's argument here—whose underlying anti-democratic sentiment is perhaps more astute than we generally like to admit—music's essence consists in subjectivity, interiority, and immediacy, all of which would be jettisoned in the attempt of composers of program music to pander to the masses. The positions have no doubt become more supple over the decades since these early attempts at systematizing nineteenth-century German music, yet the lines in the sand have been firmly drawn.

Hoeckner's story, however, is not an ordinary one. He does not seek to play the two sides against each other as mutually exclusive, antagonistic forces but injects Riemann's lopsided dualism between particular and universal with a good dose of dialectics: in Hoeckner's hands, the narrative of German music is continually suspended within a dialectical force field between the two traditions. Programmatic music and absolute music in this view are mutually determining, and their codependence is played out in ever-changing settings: Schumann's Romantic piano music between formalist analysis and poetic criticism, Wagner's *Lohengrin* between absolute music and music drama, Liszt's *Berg-Symphony* between the New German School's program music and Hanslick's formalism, Schoenberg's grappling with dodecaphony between expression and systematicity, and finally Beethoven between Adorno and Schenker.

On one level, one could read this historical trajectory in chronological order, as outlined by the sequence of chapters. This chronological reading, however, does not do justice to the ever-increasing complexity of relations between Hoeckner's protagonists and between their works, with each chapter adding a new layer. The concept of art religion, for instance, is introduced in the Liszt chapter, and followed through—*hinübergerettet*, as Hegel would say—in its subsequent metaphysical manifestations in Schoenberg and in Thomas Mann's novel *Doktor Faustus*. All this is framed by two metatheoretical discussions in the outer chapters, both of which deal with Beethoven—the first comparatively straightforward (though never simple), and the last incomparably enriched by the multiplicity of levels, both historical and metaphysical, that has been reached in the final chapter.

That Beethoven would form the framework and anchor point for this history of German music is hardly surprising. As Carl Dahlhaus put it in one of his famous paradoxes, anyone aspiring to becoming a composer in the nineteenth century had to come to terms with the idea “that the only legitimate way of imitating Beethoven consisted in studying his works with the view to comprehending inimitability and how it manifests itself.”² In this particular instance, however, the

2. Carl Dahlhaus, *Die Musiktheorie im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert: Erster Teil, Grundzüge einer Systematik* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1984), p.8 (my trans.).

reliance on Beethoven speaks to a particular allegiance to the thought of Adorno, who lies behind much of the conception of Hoeckner's narrative.

Thus, the tendency to zoom in on the smallest detail and out again to the grandest music-historical trajectory is a technique he distilled from Adorno. This approach makes it possible for Hoeckner to tell the one-hundred-and-fifty-year-long story of German music in the split second between one C# and another. It is perhaps a testimony to the changes in the field of musicology over the last decade, since Rose Subotnik's pioneering *Developing Variations*, that this methodology is likely to raise far fewer eyebrows than it would have done ten years ago. In fact, Adorno wrote in a fragment of his unfinished *Beethoven* manuscript, which in the published version was placed very near the beginning:

The difficulty of any musical analysis lies in the fact that the more the piece is dissected into its smallest units, the closer one comes to mere sound, and all music consists of mere sounds. The most specific thus becomes the most general, and the most abstract, in the wrong sense. But if this detailed analysis is omitted, the connections will elude us. Dialectical analysis is an attempt to sublate [*aufheben*] each danger in the other.³

Hoeckner's book presents the most thoughtful reading of Adorno's *Beethoven* project yet, but he is careful not to follow Adorno slavishly. His own project focuses on the notion of the *Augenblick*—literally, the “blink of an eye”—or musical moment, an idea that he develops out of Adornian-Benjaminian thought but whose musical aspects are more strongly invested in current Anglo-American analytical concerns than is Adorno's own work.

The very notion of the moment—a word that, as Adorno once lamented, has no real equivalent outside the German language⁴—can in many ways be understood as a reflection of Adorno's diagnosis of musical analysis. A moment, in Hoeckner's sense, can be as little as a single note—no more than a single C# (and, as Hoeckner would add, no less). As an individual note, however, such a C# has no meaning in itself—that would be Adorno's “abstraction in the wrong sense.” Rather, its significance as a moment can only unfold within the context of the whole of the musical work.

The totality of the musical work, of which Adorno became increasingly suspicious over the course of his intellectual career, may constitute a different kind of

3. Theodor W. Adorno, *Beethoven: The Philosophy of Music*, ed. Rolf Tiedemann, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Stanford, Ca.: Stanford UP, 1998), p.4.

4. Adorno, “On the Question: What Is German?” *Critical Models: Interventions and Catchwords*, trans. Henry W. Pickford (New York: Columbia UP, 1998), p.213.

moment, which Hoeckner calls the moment of the whole or the moment of structure. As Adorno elaborates in his essay “The Fetish Character of Music and the Regression of Listening,” which was a determining factor of his American reception due largely to its early availability in translation, once the performance of a musical work is completed, the whole reveals itself to the listener as one entity that appears to be removed from any temporal duration.⁵ The first note seems to link up directly with the final note; for the structural listener, the work of art only lasts one conceptual moment.

Adorno comes closest to engaging the former notion of the moment (moment-as-detail) in the context of the latter (moment-as-totality) in his strangely little-known 1965 radio talk “Schöne Stellen” (which is usually rendered as “beautiful moments,” but is perhaps better understood as “beautiful bits”). In it, Adorno presents his favorite spots of music as a kind of Classical DJ.⁶ Always aware of the dangers of atomistic listening—which would fetishize isolated passages—Adorno here explores the magic of musical detail. Of particular importance for him is one example from the slow movement of the “Tempest” Sonata, op.31, no.2. The second subject of this movement is repeated (at mm.35–36) with a slight embellishment, adding a B \flat to the original phrase. Adorno cannot praise this variation highly enough: “Through the addition of the songlike second step downwards from C to B \flat , the seemingly extra-human theme is humanized, answered by the tears of one whom the earth has reclaimed.” As if this final allusion to one of the most famous lines of Goethe’s *Faust* was not enough, Adorno spells out the sublime effect of this moment by likening it to Goethe’s *Elective Affinities*, quoting, slightly inaccurately, “Hope descended from the heavens like a star.”⁷

That Adorno’s invocation of *Elective Affinities* simultaneously invokes Walter Benjamin’s important essay on the novel is not merely of philological interest. Rather, as Hoeckner points out, it is a sign of Adorno’s abiding indebtedness to Benjamin’s poetic mode of criticism. Thus the image of the star, the possibility of hope, and its connection to these few measures in Beethoven’s op.31, no.2, was a trope that occupied Adorno throughout the *Beethoven* project—in fact, the very same point is made no fewer than five times in the edited version of the book. A very careful reader of Adorno, Hoeckner makes this image of the star the central metaphor in

5. Adorno, “The Fetish Character of Music and the Regression of Listening,” in *Theodor W. Adorno: Essays on Music*, ed. Richard Leppert (Berkeley and Los Angeles: U California P, 2002), pp.288–317.

6. Adorno, “Schöne Stellen,” in *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Rolf Tiedemann (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1984), vol.18, pp.695–718.

7. Adorno, *Beethoven*, p.184.

his exploration of the moment. It recurs at key points throughout the book—in Rilke, Hegel, Goethe, Stefan George, and, last but not least, Beethoven—and becomes instrumental in what Hoeckner calls the “hermeneutics of the moment.”

The image of the star invokes for Hoeckner, and consciously so, the notion of the “constellation,” which Adorno, too, borrowed from Benjamin.⁸ It refers to the fleeting juxtaposition of ostensibly disparate concepts, between which meaning emerges. Thus he would not assert any fixed patterns of influence between these disparate authors, all of whom invoked the notion of the star, but would look rather for momentary flashes of illumination between them. What is more, in Hoeckner’s rather more poetic hermeneutics, the star—and the association of hope—is further linked with the *Augenblick*, both in its meaning as moment and in its literal translation as a “blink of the eye.” In the final chapter, then, and in the hands of Schoenberg, the once hopeful *Augenblick* gradually turns from the star into the gaze—Tristan and Isolde’s significant eye-contact, the forbidden backward glance at Eurydice, and the eyes of Echo from Thomas Mann’s *Doktor Faustus*, which were once heavenly blue and have now turned black. Finally, in the hands of Schenker, we are left with nothing but the stark theoretical gaze. This gradual transformation of what is essentially always the same is nothing but a version of Horckheimer and Adorno’s dialectic of enlightenment, the condition of modernity itself, paralleled by the moment of German music between Beethoven and Schoenberg; it is the “moment of negativity,” as Adorno puts it in another *Beethoven* fragment, emanating as it does from Beethoven’s middle-period works.⁹

These constellations return on the musical level, with the consequence that questions that traditional musicology might be tempted to ask remain open: is the C# of the *Eroica* the same as in the *Arietta* or not? Or, further, would the innocuous C# that brings chromatic disorder into the steely C-major opening of Wagner’s *Meistersinger* Overture also resonate with the Beethovenian sounds? Or indeed, does the C# that forms the tonal cornerstone of Pfitzner’s String Quartet, op. 21, belong to the same trajectory of German music? Such questions remain unanswered, and necessarily so, as the tones resist simple identification: like the individual C#, the meaning of these works only emerges within their constellation with others. All that need be done, indeed all that can be done, is to place them beside each other and listen for their mutual resonances.

And Hoeckner is a careful listener, though of a fundamentally different type than

8. See Simon Jarvis, *Adorno* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998), pp. 175–92; and Susan Buck-Morss, *The Origin of Negative Dialectics: Theodor W. Adorno, Walter Benjamin, and the Frankfurt Institute* (New York: Free Press, 1977).

9. Adorno, *Beethoven*, frag. 227.

Adorno. It is perhaps telling that while he meticulously analyzes the language surrounding Adorno's poetic description of op. 31, no. 2, he all but disregards the musical detail of Adorno's "falling star": that is, the added B \flat of the "Tempest" Sonata. Following more in Felix Salzer's vein of structural listening than in Adorno's understanding of the same concept, Hoeckner pays particular attention to Schenkerian *Fernhören* of distant links between structurally important notes, rather than the detail in the surface ornamentation that so enchanted Adorno.

What enchants Hoeckner, by contrast, are particularly "impossible" notes, such as Leonore's two different screams in the dungeon, which are discussed at some length in the first chapter: the "wrong" dissonance B \sharp in *Leonore*, on the one hand, and the tamer, revised dissonance B \flat in *Fidelio*, on the other. As Hoeckner argues on the basis of the long-range connections that link each note with tonal centers in the rest of its respective opera, both tones would have to sound at the same time to achieve genuine synthesis; the moment of ultimate reconciliation could only be achieved by the nonexistent note between B \flat and B \sharp . As long as Leonore cannot utter this tone, he concludes, she, the opera, and modernity at large—all remain unredeemed and irredeemable.

Such observations put Hoeckner in close range of very recent approaches in the field of opera studies and move him further from a kind of music analysis that Adorno might have practiced. In many ways, Hoeckner's notion of the *Augenblick* appears more rigorously dialectical than even Adorno's precedent; or rather, Hoeckner demands a Benjaminian "dialectics at a standstill," when the part and the whole come together, for one moment. It would be difficult to see how Adorno's "moment" from op. 31, no. 2, could fuse the part and the whole, at least in a sense that would satisfy Anglo-American musicology of the twenty-first century. By contrast, Hoeckner's observations fall on the fertile soil of what was formerly known as the New Musicology.

It is perhaps because of the distance between Hoeckner's musical observations and Adorno's aesthetico-political program that Hoeckner is anxious to emphasize his faithfulness to his model. In such assertions as "Adorno would have wanted it no other way" (p. 9), which occur at various points in the earlier parts of the book, Hoeckner reassures us, and himself, of the intentional compatibility between his project and Adorno's. The irony in these pronouncements is surely not lost on Hoeckner, though he is probably right to make them: for his attempt to turn Adorno into a musicologist in the postmodern age is paralleled by similar attempts that have been made over the last decade in the field of literary studies.¹⁰ And here as there,

10. For a critical survey of such adaptations, in particular Adorno in America, see Peter Uwe Hohendahl, *Prismatic Thought: Theodor W. Adorno* (Lincoln: U Nebraska P, 1995), pp. 3–72.

it seems just about possible to upgrade his thought—to be sure, with a certain amount of well-calculated violence to his nonsystematic system—in order to ensure Adorno's continued *Aktualität*.

In many ways, Adorno seems more topical today than ever before. For Fredric Jameson, writing in 1990, Adorno's time had only just begun.¹¹ And it is not simply for his one-hundredth anniversary that there seems to be a current flood of publications on Adorno's musical writings, many of which reach out beyond the narrow disciplinary confines of musicology. (A sure sign that Adorno's impact is here to stay, or at least an indication that Adorno has become a force to be reckoned with in wider musical circles in America, can be found in two recent articles by Charles Rosen and Alex Ross, in the *New York Review of Books* and the *New Yorker* respectively, which set out to explain aspects of Adorno's musical and philosophical thought to a wider readership.¹²) Hoeckner's updated analytical outlook therefore speaks to a particular topical need in the musicological field, which he diagnoses as being "stranded in the no-man's-land between scholarship and criticism" (p.11).

But perhaps the most crucial aspect of this upgraded version of Adorno's thought is the focus on "German music," a topic that is clearly of supreme interest in the academy at present. We need not go as far as Charles Rosen's somewhat blinkered, though not wholly unfounded, accusation of Adorno as "anti-Slavic" to see that Adorno was primarily concerned with the German repertoire. Yet, interestingly, Adorno had relatively little to say about the notion of German music per se—as compared, for instance, with a German musical thinker of the stature of Friedrich Nietzsche.

Accordingly, some passages that Hoeckner cites have to be tweaked a little to bring out the nationalist import and to focus the discussion on the topic of German music in terms that would contribute to the current debate. Thus, Wagner's famous comment on the C# in the *Eroica* is not merely the beginning of all modern music, but "also meaning, of course, *German* music" (p.3), as Hoeckner notes with added emphasis. For Adorno, it seems, it was simply not necessary to comment on the nature of German music explicitly, not least because he could count on the purported universality on which the nineteenth-century discourse of German music was built. It was in this spirit that Thomas Mann asked in his *Reflections*

11. Fredric Jameson, *Late Marxism: Adorno, or, the Persistence of the Dialectic* (London: Verso, 1990), p.5.

12. Charles Rosen, "Why Should We Adore Adorno?" *New York Review of Books* 49 (24 October 2002); and Alex Ross, "Ghost Sonata: What Happened to German Music?" *New Yorker* 79 (24 March 2003).

of a *Non-political Man*, with more than a hint of irony, “Can one be a musician without being German?”¹³

This is not to say, of course, that Adorno was oblivious to such concerns. (It would be very difficult indeed to blame Adorno for not paying enough attention to the social and political significance of art.) Rather, it seems that this was not a category that grabbed Adorno’s attention, although he was clearly aware of it, particularly after his time in exile:

If I were to summarize what I hope to have learned from America, then I would first say it was something sociological and infinitely important for the sociologist: that over there, indeed beginning with my English stay, I was induced no longer to regard as natural the conditions that had developed historically, like those in Europe—“*not to take things for granted.*” My now departed friend Paul Tillich once said that he was first deprovincialized in America; he surely meant something similar. In America I was liberated of a naïve belief in culture, acquired the ability to see culture from the outside.¹⁴

Again, it is Thomas Mann who put most concisely what was at stake here when he continued his questions in *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man* with the same feigned starry-eyed incredulity: “Can one be a philosopher without being German?”¹⁵ The main reason that Adorno was aware of, but not keenly interested in, the fact that the music he cared most about was German, was probably that he was interested in music particularly for its philosophical content. As Lydia Goehr pointed out recently, what Adorno learned from music was a particular mode of thought.¹⁶ And from this angle, it mattered little whether this musical mode of thought was German or not.

Only once did Adorno tackle the *Gretchenfrage* of the postwar years, “Was ist deutsch?,” in the 1960s, toward the end of his life. In his answer, he acknowledges that the question had become incomparably more difficult since Wagner’s self-righteous dictum, “to do something for its own sake.” In Adorno’s eyes, Wagner’s conceit had been the expression of what was a partial, but nevertheless necessary condition for both German music and German philosophy. In the end, however, he could only agree on a definition that, characteristically, eschews the very notion

13. Thomas Mann, *Reflections of a Non-political Man*, trans. Walter D. Morris (New York: F. Ungar, 1982), p. 56.

14. Adorno, “Scientific Experiences of a European Scholar in America,” in *Critical Models*, p. 239.

15. Mann, *Reflections*, p. 50.

16. This point was made by Lydia Goehr at the “Adorno zum 100. Geburtstag” conference (University of Texas at Austin, April 2003).

of a definition for such a category: “It is in the faithfulness to the idea that the way things are should not be the final word—rather than the hopeless attempts to determine finally what is German—that the sense this concept might still assert is to be surmised: in the transition to humanity.”¹⁷ Adorno’s attempt to come to terms with Germanness, while avoiding the “hopeless” efforts to reify the notion of Germanness, is remarkable for the very hopefulness on which it is based. The story of Germanness—of German music and German philosophy—he seems to say, is not over yet; they both continue to be living and redeemable categories. The significance of German music was irrevocably changed by the horrors of Auschwitz, but it abided. It is in this sense that he concluded one fragment from the *Beethoven* book: “One can no longer compose like Beethoven, but one must *think* as he composed.”¹⁸

This sentence could well be read as a summary of Hoeckner’s hermeneutics of the moment. The horrors of the Holocaust, needless to say, also loom large behind the historical conception of *Programming the Absolute* and come to the fore particularly in the outer chapters of the book. Apart from one or two forward-looking remarks on Adorno’s notion of *musique informelle*, and the music of the sixties, the narrative of the book ends with Schoenberg, Beethoven, and the Holocaust. In this final chapter, a kind of paraphrase of the end of Adorno’s *Negative Dialectics*, Hoeckner performs a grand, extraordinarily ambitious synthesis; so comprehensive and tightly packed is it that it is hard to imagine any loose ends. We revisit all the previous sites of German music: formalism and hermeneutics, philology and philosophy, Jews and Germans. This final chapter is, of course, the *Augenblick* of the book that brings together the part and the whole, and suspends the dialectical dynamic for a moment.

Or perhaps forever. As Hoeckner points out, borrowing a phrase from the final paragraph of *Negative Dialectics*, he wishes to show “solidarity with the metaphysics of German music at the moment of its fall” (p. 11). Unlike Adorno, then, for Hoeckner German music has become a historical category, whose moment is irrevocably past—though what abides is the idea of a hermeneutics of a moment, a hermeneutics of hope.

What Hoeckner has achieved in his book—and this is no mean achievement—is to return Adorno’s philosophical thought to the music from which he took his vantage point. In our time, however, the notion of German music has become a category that needs to be recaptured in terms digestible by our current brand of

17. Adorno, “On the Question: ‘What is German?’” p. 214.

18. Adorno, *Beethoven*, p. 160.

musicology, separated as it is from Adorno's by geographical, historical, and methodological distances. In this scenario, we end up with a seemingly impossible Adorno, lodged between a modernist Auschwitz-driven agenda and a postmodern rehabilitation of music analysis. And yet, like a Leonore who screams simultaneously B \flat and B \sharp , Hoeckner steers us successfully—and forever dialectically—between the interests of current Anglo-American musicology and Adorno's German intellectual traditions. As the moment of German music recedes into history, the musical Adorno enters the twenty-first century.

Jane R. Stevens

Hartmut Hein. *Beethovens Klavierkonzerte: Gattungsnorm und individuelle Konzeption*. Beihefte zum Archiv für Musikwissenschaft, Volume 48. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2001. 433pp.

As Hartmut Hein observes at the outset of his study of Beethoven's piano concertos, these works have received remarkably little scholarly attention compared to that given to Mozart's works of the same sort, or to Beethoven's own symphonies, quartets, and sonatas. It is at least interesting, then, that two studies of these concertos should have emerged in the same year. At the same time that Hein submitted this doctoral dissertation to the Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität in Bonn, in April of 1999, Leon Plantinga's *Beethoven's Concertos* was being published in New York and London.¹ Students of Beethoven and of the concerto are thus unexpectedly confronted with two serious investigations of essentially the same music, but ones sharply divergent in content and especially in approach. Hein's study is not at all a redundant survey traversing the same territory covered by Plantinga, but a largely complementary investigation of often quite different issues.

Hein explains the scope of his study in his foreword:

The aim of this contribution [to the study of Beethoven's concertos] is to get a picture of his Viennese piano concertos in their entirety with all their movement-types (or rather—individuals). Discussions of aspects of genre and formal history are to stand as much at the center as the analytic descriptions

1. Leon Plantinga, *Beethoven's Concertos: History, Style, Performance* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1999).

of single movements (against the background of the view of composition history as context of traditions and their transcendence through particular shaping ideas). The scholarly discourse of earlier accounts of individual works or aspects of genre will also be discussed in detail, but along with approaches, reflections and critical qualifications of my own analytic methods (p.9).

As his subtitle suggests, then, Hein has conceived his project as a largely analytic one. He has written a detailed stylistic study of a traditional sort that in recent years has fallen somewhat out of favor in this country: beginning with the earliest Piano Concerto in B \flat , op. 19, which was first composed in 1790 in Bonn, he moves chronologically through the five published concertos, examining each movement in detail. Omitted are both the very early Concerto in C Major, WoO 4, composed in Bonn during the composer's early teens, and the 1815 sketches for a never completed concerto in D major. The exclusion of these two pieces is easy enough to justify as a recognition of Beethoven's own judgment not to publish or even fully complete the scores. But Hein chooses rather to emphasize his aim of tracing the development of a genre, which he seems to conceive (citing Dahlhaus) as having an "ontology," an essential reality in some way separate from the individual compositional choices of the composers who contribute to it. If the history of a genre is understood not primarily as "empirical-descriptive" but as a kind of "problem history" directed at an understanding of the ontology of a musical genre, he argues, it must be based on the most important examples.

In pursuit of his stated goal the author has not merely provided a systematic, movement-by-movement analysis of these five works, but—as in many of the most influential studies of this type—has presented his work within the framework of an underlying conclusion designed to inform our broader understanding of the composer's development of the concerto. As Hein sees it, the first two concertos take on the "normative structures" found around 1790, and they form part of a "developmentally oriented 'genre history' of their predecessors"; Beethoven makes the concerto his own in a kind of dialogue with that tradition. The later three concertos, on the other hand, are "self-referentially constructed as a constitution of each work character through individual concepts of an already altered compositional self- and problem-consciousness re-forming the form on principle" (p.37). In the initial part of his study, he treats the first two concertos movement-by-movement; in the second part, on the other hand, he deals with the first movements of each of the three pieces (in a section entitled "The idealization and individualization of the first movements"), before turning to the second and third movements of each, to which he devotes considerably less space.

The reason for the long scholarly neglect of all these works, Hein believes, is the distaste for virtuosity that he attributes to the critics of the nineteenth century, who elevated the symphony (and therefore the symphonic) as the highest musical ideal and rejected the virtuoso concerto in favor of the “symphonic concerto.” His only extended discussion of near-contemporaneous theorists’ views on this topic (or on any other) focuses on Adolf Bernhard Marx’s 1859 monograph on Beethoven, together with the earlier essay on the concerto, and more briefly on Koch’s article on the concerto in his *Musikalisches Lexikon* of 1802, identified as an early expression of the distaste for virtuoso music. He makes no mention of the fact that “empty virtuosity” had been widely condemned by critics throughout the eighteenth century, when there was no developed notion of the “symphonic.” (Those writers attacked virtuosity for its failure to achieve affective musical expression.) As for the concertos that preceded Beethoven’s own, he appears similarly uninterested. Despite his repeated assertion that he is investigating Beethoven’s concertos in relationship to the history of their genre, he devotes very little time to exploring what that genre might have represented in the music Beethoven would have known before he wrote his own first published concerto. His only systematic review of earlier concertos is included in the section on op.19, which begins with a summary of the “pattern” of Mozart’s keyboard concertos drawn largely from the analyses of Konrad Küster (though particular passages from Mozart are mentioned in passing throughout the early part of the book). Hein establishes Beethoven’s notion of the genre, of its essential elements, not from analyzing the works the fledgling composer would have studied but on the basis of his own music. The notion of “generic norms,” then, refers not to a continuing historical development of a genre, but rather to the genre as it can be distilled from these five pieces—and even, as the shape of this book explicitly suggests, from just the two earliest of them.

Given his approach, it is not surprising that his analysis basically ignores the long tradition of concerto form and style with which Beethoven would have engaged, a tradition that for much of its history had been importantly grounded in some version of the model usually called *ritornello* form. Whereas Plantinga sees *ritornello* form as a significant element in the design of Beethoven’s own concertos, Hein only occasionally attempts to integrate some remnant of a *ritornello*-form model into his own analyses. His discussions typically take account of *tutti*-solo exchange, and its concomitant formal patterns, only as a secondary element within an analysis firmly based in the traditional language of sonata form. That analysis, furthermore, privileges first of all the identification of two themes in each movement (the fundamental importance of which is spelled out in a brief list of

essential characteristics of sonata form), all material deemed thematic being labeled either “Hauptthema” or “Seitenthema,” with other music identified as transitions or cadential sections. Whatever its validity for later composers, however, it must be recognized that this kind of bithematic structure is far from universal in Beethoven’s music. Hein’s analyses are consistently carried out on a very small scale, focusing most often on a phrase-by-phrase description. These analytic findings are usually summarized in diagrammatic tables showing large sections by theme, melodic motive, and key; in the case of opening movements, however (those with the most obvious ties to traditional concerto form), these tables show only parts of movements rather than the whole shape. The picture that emerges is one of a rather traditional sonata form based in thematic statement and its continuation, correlated with principal harmonic areas, in which timbral forces (identified as tutti and solo) are barely noted.

These objections, like many other subsidiary ones, stem in part from the differences between Hein’s assumptions and those of much recent American work on this period. It is indeed enlightening to compare the bibliography included in this study with that provided by Plantinga, a comparison that yields some insight into the orientation of both the books and their authors. Hein cites the works of no theorists or critics besides Marx and Koch (with the rather odd exception of Vogler), nor does he provide any scholarly commentary on those writers themselves. Plantinga, on the other hand, who directs explicit attention to the theoretical background of this music, lists a number of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century writers together with many modern studies of them. Yet he strangely omits Marx’s 1825 article on the concerto, which Hein discusses together with the later monograph on Beethoven. Both authors include Scott Burnham’s *Beethoven Hero*, but only Plantinga lists his study of Marx’s writings; similarly, whereas Dahlhaus’s book on Beethoven appears on both lists, Plantinga adds also his essays on Marx, while Hein includes instead his book on Classic and Romantic aesthetics. Hein’s taste for the theoretical also shows up in his interest in Edwin Simon’s work on the double exposition; Plantinga includes the more empirical study of Mozart’s recompositions of keyboard sonatas as concertos. These examples (which could be multiplied) provide a suggestion of the rather different scholarly worlds within which these two books arose.

In any study of this kind, with its emphasis on the analytic detail of a small number of pieces, the larger argument can easily be lost. Most important for Hein is his premise, made clear from the outset, that each of the last three concertos represents Beethoven’s idealization of the genre as he himself conceived it, at the same time that each is fully individualized, unlike any other. In this as in other

respects, the Fifth Concerto must appear from our own perspective as the culmination of all his concertos. In the piano concertos composed after the turn of the century, the element of the “symphonic” (nearly always used in quotation marks) increases, and the Fifth is truly a “symphonic” concerto. Thus it is finally Beethoven himself who develops the concerto into an essentially symphonic work, one that—by using the concerting relationship of tutti and solo to build a “potential for conflict”—takes on a “symphonic-dramatic structure.”

Throughout his study, as promised in his foreword, Hein engages the ideas of other analysts about the works he is discussing and about larger interpretations of their form, sometimes in substantial and enlightening ways. Because these critiques are often embedded in analyses of particular movements, however, they are difficult to find without a systematic reading. A discussion of the idea of “double exposition,” for instance (a construct he appears to know principally through the work of Simon in the 1950s²), occurs during the discussion of the first solo section of the first movement of op. 19; the notion of reprise as “synthesis,” with the related issue of identifying the “exposition” in a concerto-form movement, is explored later in conjunction with the analysis of the same movement. This obstacle to easy access to the author’s ideas is one among several minor annoyances. The only index is a listing of references to particular musical works, so that the many discussions of basic formal issues must be uncovered—and noted—one by one. On the other hand, the reader must be grateful for the footnotes that replace the all too common endnotes. The most significant hurdle here (especially, one suspects, for the non-native reader of German) is probably the author’s writing style, which is consistently marked by an intense and self-conscious sort of analytic sophistication that seems designed to resist easy and immediate comprehension. Symptomatic of this liability are the quotation marks that pepper the text, most often and apparently as a sign of the writer’s distance or incomplete acceptance of terms he has nevertheless decided to use. A minor example (p. 31), chosen at random, is his introductory rejection of the appropriateness of the idea of progress (“Fortschritt”) as applied to the succession of the concertos, a concept that might well require signaling quotes; but then, elaborating on the meaning of that term, he speaks of “the historically ‘later’” in relation to “the ‘earlier,’” flagging words that would not appear to be laden terms. It is not unusual to find quotation marks applied to eight or ten words or more on a single page.

2. Edwin J. Simon, *The Double Exposition in Classic Concerto Form* (Ph.D. diss. University of California, Berkeley, 1954); and “The Double Exposition in the Classic Concerto,” *JAMS* 10 (1957), 111–18.

In the end, of course, the interest and usefulness of this work will rest on the close analyses that constitute its essential content. And like any detailed analytic study, this one repeatedly inspires responses, whether in agreement or in objection. But it deserves to be read closely and thoughtfully, and any serious student of Beethoven's concertos willing to give it the necessary concentrated attention—whatever his eventual judgment—will find here much food for thought as well as debate.

A. Peter Brown's Symphonic Compendium

Melanie Lowe

A. Peter Brown. *The First Golden Age of the Viennese Symphony: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Schubert*. The Symphonic Repertoire, Volume II. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002. xxvii, 716pp.

In a venture as selfless as it was ambitious, the late musicologist A. Peter Brown took it on himself to address the lack of a broad-based, single-author study of the symphony. A single volume at inception, the project ultimately expanded to a five-volume series titled *The Symphonic Repertoire*, two volumes of which Brown completed before his untimely passing in March 2003. Volume II, *The First Golden Age of the Viennese Symphony*, and volume IV, *The Second Golden Age of the Viennese Symphony*, are now published. Brown drafted volume III, *The European Symphony, ca. 1800–ca. 1930*, which is in the final stages of preparation for publication. Hopefully, a generous scholar will realize volume I, *The Eighteenth-Century Symphony*, for which Brown left some sketches of content and organization, and perhaps another can assemble and edit volume V, *The Symphony in Europe and the Americas in the Twentieth Century*, originally planned by Brown as a symposium. The symphonic repertoire as Brown conceived it is in essence the symphonic canon—that body of orchestral works, widely understood as symphonies though not always titled “Symphony” (e.g., tone poems and character pieces)—that receives regular concert and recorded performance. His monumental study was not intended to be “a history in the narrative sense, since it does not attempt to place a large number of symphonies under a covering hypothesis” (p.xv). Rather, *The Symphonic Repertoire* is a compendium of sorts: a “synthesis of ideas” Brown “accumulated” during a scholarly and teaching career that spanned more than three decades (pp.xx–xxi).

Volume II, *The First Golden Age of the Viennese Symphony: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Schubert*, the logical starting point for a scholar whose primary research interest was late eighteenth-century music, reveals Brown's capacious knowledge of this repertoire and the relevant scholarly literature. Following a short chapter that introduces the reader to eighteenth-century Viennese musical culture and concert life, four lengthy chapters present systematic surveys of the symphonic output of the four great symphonists of the time. An enviable number of musical examples supports Brown's analyses, and, where musical examples are not provided, measure numbers easily direct the reader to readily available scores. Thirty-one plates offer a firsthand look at contemporary portraits, concert announcements, manuscripts, and catalogue pages. Forty-two tables present a wealth of information: compilations of other scholars' lists of symphony performances in Vienna between 1772 and 1828; seven different datings, including Brown's own, of the Haydn symphonies alongside the earliest dated manuscript source; the authenticity status of Mozart's early extant symphonies from the first edition of the Köchel catalogue through recent scholarship; performance timings for Beethoven's symphonies from the Norrington and Gardiner recordings; a concordance of the different numberings for Schubert's later symphonies and symphonic sketches; and more. The four "composer" chapters conclude with a bibliographic overview that categorizes the extensive musicological literature by topic and publication format, and the list of works cited at the end provides a wide ranging, though not comprehensive, bibliography for both the genre and the period.

While Brown addresses questions of authenticity, chronology, grouping and periodization, artistic development, and reception, the heart of each composer chapter lies in the movement-by-movement formal analysis of every symphonic work of reasonably certain authenticity by Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Schubert, combining for a total of around 700 analyses of individual movements. Particularly striking are the many musical relationships Brown notes among this assortment of over 170 multimovement works, both within a composer's *œuvre* and among works of different composers and genres. For example, he hears the concertante elements in Haydn's Symphony No. 31, "Hornsignal" (1765), as an echo of the trilogy of Symphonies Nos. 6–8 (1761), but the cyclic and topical coherence of the work as an anticipation of certain symphonies of the late 1760s and early 1770s (p. 101); the syntax of the Menuetto of Mozart's Symphony in G Major, K. 124, as the first evidence of Haydn's influence in the young composer's music; and the three-key exposition of Schubert's Symphony No. 2, movt. I, as possibly derived from Beethoven's String Quartet op. 18, no. 3, movt. I, the *Coriolan* Overture, op. 62, and Symphony No. 8, movts. I and IV (p. 587). Brown's obvious enthu-

siasm for this repertoire finds little voice in the rather dry analytical language, but on occasion his prose descriptions do betray a more intimate relationship with the music: his imaginings of the “breathtaking” experience it must have been to hear Esterházy cellist Joseph Weigl’s “beautiful cantabile control” in 1763, or the reverberating timpani in the great hall of the Eisenstadt Palace, leave the reader wishing for a time machine (pp.83, 81).

As Brown acknowledges, there is no overarching argument or historical narrative that determines or shapes the total content of the five-volume series. And yet, since one of Brown’s intentions for volume II was, by his account, to produce a study of the eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Viennese symphony “dominated for better or worse by the viewpoint of a single author” (p.xix), there are clear narrative threads that suggest an argument underlying the information and analysis presented at the surface. Loosely tying together the nearly 300 pages on Haydn’s 106 authentic symphonies is the commonly articulated notion that we can observe in Haydn’s “evolution of the [symphonic] genre” a “microcosm of [the symphony’s] history” (p.301). Many of Brown’s stylistic observations support this claim by demonstrating how various generic styles heard in Haydn’s early symphonies ultimately synthesize into the celebrated symphonic style of his later symphonies. Brown also finds a hallmark of Haydn’s style in his foiling of listener expectations, and a parallel if secondary narrative thread traces the development of Haydn’s compositional “surprises” from the “Morzin” Symphonies through the two “London” cycles. The “story” behind the Mozart chapter is one of personal rather than generic progress. Mozart’s symphonic composition proceeds from the assimilation of local styles—English, Viennese, Italian, German, his father’s, etc.—to the synthesis of such models into his own individual style. Beethoven, on the other hand, achieves symphonic advancement not so much by the incorporation of other styles but by promoting organic unity as an integral symphonic value within his own style. As the cycle became increasingly unified through tonal relations, rhythmic and melodic motives, and structural devices, Beethoven “reformulated the genre” into a “new standard for the composers of the nineteenth century” (pp.555–56). Within Schubert’s symphonic composition, however, the evolutionary process parallels the one Brown observes in Mozart’s career. An early dependence on the symphonies of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, as well as other eighteenth-century symphonic composers, leads to the later synthesis of these sources into Schubert’s own personal style. Brown’s combined telling of these four composers’ symphonic stories, then, suggests that during its first golden age the Viennese symphony undergoes an evolutionary process of stylistic synthesis to yield an increasingly individualized and unified symphonic entity.

Brown does occasionally acknowledge the flaws of viewing the history of the symphony as “an evolutionary development from smaller to larger, simple to complex, *galant* to more expressive” (p. 57) as in, for example, his echoing (though without citation) of James Webster’s cogent warnings neither to confuse early with immature (p. 103) nor to value Haydn’s *Sturm und Drang* symphonies more highly than emphatically *galant* ones (p. 109).¹ But these few nods toward the recent questioning of such master-narratives cannot offset the weight of the more conservative counterargument maintained by the multitude of small conclusions drawn within Brown’s analyses. For example, he excuses the disappointing first movement and finale in Haydn’s Symphony “A” because “it is possible that this symphony is earlier than the evidence seems to indicate” (p. 54) and complains that in Symphony No. 39 a “blatantly *galant* movement interferes with an otherwise esthetically satisfying experience” (p. 127). Such estimations clearly endorse the teleological view of the symphony’s history that Brown’s occasional cautionary remarks intend to dismiss.

Likewise, a rather old-fashioned scholarly agenda emerges from the contents and methodologies of volume II as a whole. Implicit in Brown’s encyclopedic treatment of this symphonic repertoire is the value of comprehensiveness over narrowness of focus, or, put more bluntly, breadth over depth. While it is certainly useful to be able to find some discussion of the musical style and structure, circumstances of composition, and reception of every symphony Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, or Schubert wrote, a more substantial consideration of certain works that constitute the heart of the symphonic canon—say, the “London” symphonies, the “Jupiter,” the *Eroica*, or the “Great C Major”—must be sacrificed to make room for the roughly equal treatment of works of lesser historical significance, musical interest, or prominence within the performed repertoire. More significant, however, is that Brown’s approach to the repertoire tacitly argues for analysis—specifically the formal analysis systematized by Jan LaRue in his *Guidelines for Style Analysis*—as not only the imperative first step in approaching any piece of music but the most important one as well. The discussion of each movement centers around his outlining—in prose or diagram—of the overall formal process, while smaller-scale charts indicating the morphological structure of a section in measure-units often supply further details of formal organization. Brown’s analyses generally offer the reader noteworthy insights into compositional procedures and stylistic tendencies,

1. James Webster, *Haydn’s “Farewell” Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991), esp. pp. 335–73. See also Webster, “Haydn’s Symphonies between *Sturm und Drang* and ‘Classical Style’: Art and Entertainment,” in *Haydn Studies*, ed. W. Dean Sutcliffe (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998), pp. 218–45.

but the analytical strategies from work to work and composer to composer are so similar as to suggest that only one key is needed to unlock this rich and varied repertoire. Moreover, rarely do his observations consider social context, cultural situation, political interpretation, aesthetic position, or aspects of reception as *musically* relevant: music and history remain separate domains. Occasional footnote references to the work of other scholars may point the reader to more inclusive and diverse approaches, but they do little to challenge Brown's seeming promotion of the "purely musical" (pp.460 and 468; see also 133, 286, and 423) as an incontrovertible construct within the music of this time.

The discussion of Beethoven's Symphony No.3, *Eroica*, demonstrates the weakness resulting from Brown's stringent dedication to comprehensiveness, his valuation of analysis above all other types of engagement, and his hesitancy to venture outside the realm of the "purely musical." Few would question the tremendous importance of the *Eroica* in our understanding of both Beethoven's career and the history of the symphony and, to be fair, neither does Brown underestimate its historical significance. But because he treats the *Eroica* to the same types of consideration as every other symphony by Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Schubert, any sense of the work as truly unique, groundbreaking, and extraordinary within the Viennese symphonic tradition feels oddly diminished. As in the discussion of every symphony in volume II, Brown narrates the circumstances of composition, offers a movement-by-movement and section-by-section analysis, notes venues of first performances, and provides excerpts from early reception documents. And while the reader is treated to another substantive if systematic formal reading, Brown's lack of engagement with the wealth of recent *Eroica* scholarship is especially troublesome, not to mention counterproductive in light of his stated intention "to present up-to-date overviews of the status of research" (p.xix). Aside from briefly mentioning Scott Burnham's recounting of four programmatic readings of the first movement (and here, Brown notes only those readings with named heroes, thereby largely ignoring Burnham's greater point about the sense of destiny, freedom, and self-realization heard in the *Eroica*'s heroic quest),² there is hardly a single reference to the recent rich discourse on either the *Eroica* itself or Beethoven's heroic style in general. Moreover, Brown's acceptance of only one interpretation—that "the theme of the Finale in both meaning and content is the wellspring for the entire symphony" (p.472)³—not only forces the anachronistic interpretation

2. Scott Burnham, *Beethoven Hero* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1995), pp.3–28.

3. Brown's interpretation, based on Constantin Floros's historical work, seems also informed by Peter Schleuning's derivation of the *Eroica*'s motives from the *Englische* of the finale, though Schle-

that a finale must wholly resolve the rest of a work, but, more disconcerting, allows for a near complete sidestepping of the *Eroica*'s unusually colorful reception history. Unfortunately the reader, especially the lay listener or undergraduate most likely to find the volume useful, leaves Brown's discussion of a most significant work with the impression that it deserves treatment hardly different from the other 170 plus symphonies in the Viennese symphonic repertoire.

At the same time, however, evaluation is integral to Brown's survey of the genre. We regularly encounter his opinion (or his endorsement of someone else's) that a particular cycle or movement "ranks high" (p.286), "is the most satisfying" (p.586), or even contains "one of Western music's most polished statements" (p.415). Some readers may enjoy hearing their author's preferences and tastes, and, of course, no scholarly writing, no matter how objective it may appear to be, is uninformed by the writer's penchants and aversions. But such personal assessments rarely further the author's argument or the reader's understanding of the subject. In at least one conspicuous case, Brown's value judgment of *Wellington's Victory* prevents him from engaging the work more fully, thereby perpetuating misunderstanding of this perennially maligned composition (pp.530–31). While few today would defend Beethoven's Battle Symphony as worthy of as much space as the *Eroica* in any survey of the composer's *œuvre*, a brief description of its contents and another listing of defects merely reiterate the tired complaints that embarrassed commentators have noted for decades. Although Brown's study is intended as a survey of research and an illumination of style rather than as essays of original scholarship, it is unfortunate that this *a priori* condemnation has kept him from at least some fresh speculation about possible cultural and aesthetic meanings. We may not find this work to be "good music," but that doesn't mean there isn't anything interesting to talk about, especially in a book where value is supposed to come from analysis rather than prefigure it. Indeed, Richard Will's enlightening discussion of *Wellington's Victory* within the context of the battle-symphony genre (published in 2002, two years after Brown's volume) demonstrates compellingly what can be gained when cultural situation informs stylistic assessment and critical engagement tops evaluation.⁴

uning's provocative work is cited in neither the footnotes nor the bibliography. See Floros, *Beethovens Eroica und Prometheus-Musik* (Wilhelmshaven: Heinrichshofen, 1978); Schleuning, "Beethoven in alter Deutung: Der 'neue Weg' mit der 'Sinfonia Eroica,'" *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* 44, no.3 (1987), 165–94; and Martin Geck and Schleuning, "*Geschrieben auf Bonaparte*": *Beethovens Eroica: Revolution, Reaktion, Rezeption* (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1989).

4. Richard Will, *The Characteristic Symphony in the Age of Haydn and Beethoven* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002), pp.190–200.

Brown's discussions of the *Eroica* and *Wellington's Victory* are indicative of volume II's most significant problem: aside from the single-volume treatment of all of the authentic symphonies of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Schubert, there is little here that advances the total state of scholarship on the subject. Sadly, *The First Golden Age of the Viennese Symphony* does not offer much new or original interpretation of individual works or the Viennese symphonic repertoire as a whole. Nor does Brown's overview of the status of research venture much beyond the more traditional concerns of chronology, authenticity, and textual accuracy to review or embrace new interpretive strategies, research methodologies, or considerations of musical meaning. Indeed, some of the most exciting and recent scholarship on this repertoire, while often present in the notes and bibliography, seems not to have had enough impact on the author to influence the content of his text.

"To write that the coverage of these works in the musical literature is extensive would be an understatement" (p.xix), and indeed, as Brown himself acknowledges in the preface, the question of why we need such a book begs to be asked. Among the myriad publications that deal with this repertoire are several monographs in English, many written within the past twenty-five years, devoted to the complete symphonies of each of these composers: H. C. Robbins Landon (1955) on Haydn; Robert Dearling (1982), Stanley Sadie (1986), and Neal Zaslaw (1989) on Mozart; Sir George Grove (1903), Robert Simpson (1970), and Anthony Hopkins (1981) on Beethoven; Maurice J. E. Brown (1970) and Brian Newbould (1992) on Schubert. Several other books treat individual symphonies or cycles of symphonies from this repertoire: James Webster (1991) on Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony, Bernard Harrison (1998) on the "Paris" Symphonies; Elaine Sisman (1993) on Mozart's "Jupiter" Symphony; Thomas Sipe (1998) on Beethoven's *Eroica*, David Wyn Jones (1995) on the Pastoral, and Nicholas Cook (1993) and David B. Levy (1995) on the Ninth Symphony, to name but a few recent ones. So, given such wide-ranging and substantive treatment of the eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Viennese symphony in English, what does Brown's hefty volume contribute to the musicological literature? Brown's own attempt at a chronology for Haydn's symphonies and his assessment of the Mozart sources on questions of authenticity are certainly welcome and possible solutions to thorny problems from a scholar whose wealth of experience lends them considerable weight and credibility. Many of the tables, particularly those that compare the results of various scholars' conclusions on issues like dating and authenticity, will be very useful for those in need of a synopsis of the status of such fundamental research. Further, many readers will no doubt appreciate Brown's comparative and evaluative analytical remarks on these 170 plus symphonies, for his observations and insights on matters of musical style

and artistic development do offer a concise but still detailed assessment of the repertoire.

As a compendium of an abundance of information, much of which is available in, but scattered throughout, other publications, volume II of *The Symphonic Repertoire* will likely be most valuable to lay listeners, students, and scholars alike as a convenient reference tool. Its systematic organization, concise assessment of the present state of research on many important issues, and orderly treatment of the repertoire make it exceptionally easy to navigate. Should one be seeking basic historical information like the venue of a first performance, an overview of sources and authenticity status, a few quotable documents from a symphony's early reception, a succinct analysis of a movement's structure and formal processes, or bibliographic information for further study, Brown's book assures a quick and efficient search. The five-volume series as a whole, if completed, will no doubt be a valuable resource for musicians and music lovers interested in the symphony in general and a useful first stop for students and scholars engaging in further research. We owe Professor Brown a debt of gratitude for envisioning *The Symphonic Repertoire* and generously taking on such a daunting project.

Q

Contributors

William Kinderman's most recent publication is the three-volume study *Artaria 195: Beethoven's Sketchbook for the Missa solemnis and the Piano Sonata in E \flat Major, Opus 109* (University of Illinois Press, 2003). His CD recording of Beethoven's last three piano sonatas appeared with Hyperion/Helios in 2002 (CDH55083). He is Professor of Musicology at the University of Illinois.

Raymond Knapp is Professor of Musicology at the University of California, Los Angeles. His *Symphonic Metamorphoses: Subjectivity and Alienation in Mahler's Re-Cycled Songs* appeared in summer 2003 (Wesleyan University Press), and his book *The American Musical and the Formation of National Identity* is forthcoming (Princeton University Press). He is working on a follow-up volume to the latter, relating the American musical to the performance of personal identity.

Melanie Lowe is Assistant Professor of Musicology at Vanderbilt University and holds a secondary appointment in Vanderbilt's program in American and Southern Studies. She has published articles on the music of Joseph Haydn, classical music in American media, and early adolescent girls and teen pop. She is currently completing a book on pleasure and meaning in the late-eighteenth-century symphony.

Katarina Marković-Stokes completed her Ph.D. in musicology at Brandeis University. Her dissertation interprets the idiosyncratic formal procedures in Mahler's Symphonies Nos. 1–3 in the context of Romantic criticism and Idealist philosophy; her recent papers consider the notion of *Kunstreligion* in the writings and music of Mahler and the tradition of the female lament in Balkan folk music. A recipient of the Sachar and Max Kade research grants, she is currently preparing a book on Mahler's Second Symphony.

Alexander Rehding is Assistant Professor of Music Theory at Harvard University. He is coeditor of *Music Theory and Natural Order from the Renaissance to the Early Twentieth Century* (2001) and author of *Hugo Riemann and the Birth of Modern Musical Thought* (2003). He is currently working on a study of musical monumentality.

Jane R. Stevens teaches music history at the University of California, San Diego. Her interest in the musical thought of the eighteenth century has often focused on the early development of the solo keyboard concerto and its theorists in the eighteenth through the twentieth centuries. Her book *The Bach Family and the Keyboard Concerto: Evolution of a Genre* appeared in 2001.

Q