Chord and Discord

February 1932

The famous silhouette of Bruckner at the organ by Hans Schliessmann appears on the cover of this Journal by kind permission of Mrs. Schliessmann.

CHORD AND DISCORD

Official Journal
of
The Bruckner Society of America

February, 1932 Vol. 1, No. 1

NEW SYMPHONIC HORIZONS

That distinguished sage among American music critics, Mr. W. J. Henderson, can perhaps still remember that gloomy day more than forty-five years ago, when the New York Philharmonic, under Theodore Thomas, first played Bruckner's Seventh Symphony. Concerning that occasion Mr. Krehbiel, young Henderson's senior colleague and the acknowledged head of the critical profession, perceiving the opposing fury with which the press greeted the gigantic work, rose (like Hans Sachs after the "Meistersinger" have scornfully rejected Walther's first song) and said in mingled admonition and prophecy:

"It is neither wise nor just to pronounce condemnation on an art-work in so superficial and flippant a manner as nearly all the New York newspapers did on this occasion; but bearing in mind a score of marvelous things in the symphony, notably several moments that approach grandeur in the slow movement, and remembering that that is not always the highest type of beauty which is obvious at a glance, we are yet constrained to say that for the present the work is a failure. It may be beautiful in twenty-five years; it is not beautiful now."

Just what the prerequisites of symphonic "beauty" were in those days is eloquently hinted at in the following excerpt from Mr. Krehbiel's representative review of the first American performance of Bruckner's *Romantic* Symphony the following year:

"With the exception of the Scherzo (representative of a hunt) none of the movements shows the form of the classic or even of the modern symphony, as followed by Brahms, Rubinstein, and Raff, and certainly still less that of Schumann, who was the most representative of romantic symphonists."

Thus Bruckner's symphony was not even a symphony, because its outlines did not correspond to certain prescribed measurements on the yardstick without which no true critic of the "Eighties" would lend a *first* symphonic performance his attention.

Almost a generation later Gustav Mahler came to America to take charge of the New York Philharmonic Orchestra. Mr. Krehbiel, as famous as ever in his realm, was official author of the organization's program notes. In the course of the season, 1909-10, Mahler's First Symphony, having battled its Odyssean way to European recognition through a score of years, was to receive its first American hearing. Imagine Mr. Krehbiel's dismay in December when the scheduled day arrived without any prefatory explanations by the composer. His repeated requests for an outline analysis had met with firm refusal. Gustav Mahler was apparently convinced that the intrusion of any traditional notions on a first symphonic hearing was a false practice that must be abolished. Half apologetically Mr. Krehbiel introduced the work to the audience as follows:

"In deference to the wish of Mr. Mahler, the annotator of the Philharmonic Society's programmes refrains from even an outline analysis of the symphony which is performing for the first time in New York on this occasion, as also from an attempt to suggest what might be or has been set forth as its possible poetical, dramatic or emotional contents. Mr. Mahler's conviction, frequently expressed publicly as well as privately, is that *it is a hindrance to appreciation to read an analysis which with the help of musical examples lays bare the contents and structure of a composition while it is playing.* All interest and attention should be concentrated on the music itself. 'At a concert', he says, 'one should listen, not look,—use the ears, not the eyes'.

"All writings about music, even those of musicians themselves, he holds to be injurious to musical enjoyment."

In short, the "twenty-five year" period Mr. Krehbiel had mentioned in that early review of Bruckner's "Seventh" was over; but American musical criticism was still "tradition-bound". It seemed unable to listen to a new work of art without holding it up to the light of Beethoven, Wagner, Brahms and others during the initial hearing.* Since then another score of years has passed, and that shell of pedantry at last shows signs of giving way. Man realizes more clearly each day that it is not the degree with which a new work clings to the form of accepted masterpieces that determines its worth. The younger master may have learned much from the older; but the very essence of his "mastery" is his individual message which finding all traditional means of construction inadequate must often create its own form and vocabulary.

Last year was the beginning of a period in American symphonic appreciation which some critics have aptly called the "Bruckner Renaissance." The young Mr. Henderson of the day of Krehbiel glory had himself become a sage of New York music critics. The founding of the Bruckner Society of America in January had been succeeded only two months later by the almost incredible decision of Mr. Toscanini that Bruckner was really worthwhile. To prove this the great conductor chose the very symphony which the "Philharmonic" programs had banned for forty-five years! His four successive performances of the "Seventh" early in March made musical history in this country. And Mr. Toscanini's "resurrection" of the work was characterized as follows by Lawrence Gilman of the "Herald Tribune":

"There are, of course, intrepreters who can expound with eloquence an esthetic gospel in which they have no faith. Mr. Toscanini is not among them. Sincerity is one of the roots of his power and persuasiveness as an artist. Hearing him in his disclosure of page after page of the music's nobler contents, one knew that the completeness of the revelation was the index of an apostolic fervor and conviction."

And Mr. Henderson of the "Sun" prefaced his account of the occasion as follows:

"Arturo Toscanini presented at the Philharmonic Symphony Society concert in Carnegie Hall last evening a program of two symphonies, Bruckner's seventh and Beethoven's fifth. The return of Bruckner to the stage of the Philharmonic is due at least in part to the devotion of his admirers in this city, who have formed a society for the propagation of the faith. The movement is entirely proper. Even Wagner required the aid of Wagner societies to spread the gospel of his art.

*In 1924, after many seasons of torture at the hands of critics, the *Friends of Music* actually resorted to the desperate step of barring them from their concerts.

"Conductors hesitate to produce the symphonies of Bruckner because of their inordinate length and because the name and significance of the composer are unknown to all but a few music-lovers. A society of Brucknerites can doubtless accomplish much toward bringing the works of the composer to public notice."

The year marked the thirty-fifth anniversary of Bruckner's death, and the new impetus to the cause of his music was already heralded in January when the Chicago Symphony Orchestra under Mr. Stock performed the "Ninth". By May this body of musicians had given that difficult work six hearings in various cities. Mr. Stock had also given the "Seventh" twice in April, a month after Toscanini's triumphant quartet of performances. The summer had brought the "Romantic" under Mr. van Hoogstraten on the "New York Stadium Concerts Series". Autumn arrived with its unforgettable contribution by the Friends of Music under Mr. Bodanzky, of Bruckner's sacred masterpiece, the "F Minor Mass". Almost legendary in its proximity to this was the sudden death of its chief patroness, Mrs. Lanier, head of that fine choral organization (now disbanded) and Honorary Chairman of the Bruckner Society. Winter was not without its encouragement, for the "Romantic" symphony was given in Portland, Oregon, under that loyal Brucknerite, Mr. van Hoogstraten.

However, it is not the intention of the Bruckner Society to confine its efforts to the furtherance of the Bruckner cause in this country. It is doing its utmost also to increase the frequency of Mahler performances. Of these 1931 showed a flattering number, clearly in excess of American precedent. The great symphonic song-cycle, "Das Lied von der Erde", given by Dr. Koussevitzky in Boston at the close of 1930 was but a prelude to his many presentations of its instrumental companion-piece, the much neglected "Ninth Symphony", during the past year. The difficult and deeply moving work was heard for the first time in America on October 16th, 1931, in Boston. Dr. Koussevitzky's fifth performance of it since that day occurred on January 9th, 1932, in New York. Last March Mr. Reiner, conducting the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, gave Mahler's Seventh. At the celebrated May Festival in the same city the mighty Eighth, the "Symphony of a Thousand", repeated its infallibly triumphant impression on an American audience, recalling the success of the performances Mr. Stokowski had given it some years before. The celebrated conductor of the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra has made the following statement concerning the "Symphony of a Thousand":

"When we played Mahler's Eighth Symphony it made an impression on the public unlike anything else I have ever experienced. There seemed to be a human quality in this work which so deeply moved the public that the greater part of the listeners were in tears at the end of the performance. This happened at all of the nine performances we gave; so it was not due to an accidental condition on one particular date."

The present year promises increased attention to Bruckner and Mahler on the part of the leading orchestral conductors. These sterling musicians have whole-heartedly endorsed the aims of the Bruckner Society of America and are much elated over the prospect at last offered them of being allowed to program the works of these masters by request rather than by stealth. Bruckner's *Te Deum, E Minor Mass,* the

Third and *Eighth* Symphonies, the solitary *Quintet* are only some of the works definitely slated for production in the near future. Mahler's *Lied von der Erde* and the *Sixth* (Tragic), two of his deepest compositions, have also been announced.

One of the most significant musical events of 1932 will be the American premiere of Arnold Schoenberg's *Gurrelieder,* composed thirty years ago. With the tremendously rich color effects drawn from its numerous orchestral membership, of which the voices of eight flutes and ten horns singing parts allotted them by one of the greatest orchestral masters of all time is only a hint, this work is perhaps the culmination of the penchant for massed lyric instrumentation so characteristic of nineteenth century music after *Tristan.* It is, however, a product of Schoenberg's early, pre-revolutionary days, and no doubt the unsurpassable richness of its orchestral idiom convinced its composer that he must resort to a thoroughly new mode of expression if he expected to make a real contribution to musical art. Much of the music he has written since then has been hailed by experts as epoch-making and prophetic of the path of development musical art will take during the next half-century. Perhaps the fact that Schoenberg has dedicated his rather recent *Quintet for Brass* to his little grandson, the "Bubi Arnold", is not without its intended significance that this unsuspecting child is to arrive at manhood when the world will be ready to listen appreciatively to the work inscribed to him..

Which takes us back to that gloomy premiere of Bruckner's Seventh Symphony almost half a century ago, when Mr. Krehbiel alone, of all the reviewers, sounded that broad, oracular note of tolerance which is perhaps the wisest sort of criticism of a totally new and earnest artwork.

GABRIEL ENGEL

MARTIN G. DUMLER

On January 31, 1932, Dr. Martin G. Dumler, M. M., of Cincinnati, Ohio, was elected Honorary Chairman of the Bruckner Society of America. For many years a prominent American composer of sacred music and at present Vice-President of the College of Music of Cincinnati, Dr. Dumler is deeply devoted to Bruckner's art. His regard for that master's music dates back to 1889 when he first heard some of Bruckner's works performed in Vienna. Ever since that time he has left no stone unturned in his efforts to bring about American performances of Bruckner. He not only did much to bring about the first American performance of Bruckner's F Minor Mass, which took place in St. Francis de Sales Church, Cincinnati, on July 15, 1900, but actually took part as one of the singers. In 1907 he became personally acquainted with Gustav Mahler, in whose genius he has been a firm believer ever since, As a member of the Board of Directors of the Cincinnati May Festival Association he made the suggestion last year which led to the inclusion of Mahler's *Symphony of a Thousand* on the Festival program.

The Executive Committee of the Bruckner Society of America wishes to express to Dr. Dumler its appreciation of his acceptance of the Honorary Chairmanship left vacant by the late Mrs. Lanier.

Of all our greatest composers I doubt if any one ever had as sad a fate as Anton Bruckner. Others have suffered during their lifetime, as for example, Schubert; but he died young and his works won universal recognition shortly after his death. Mozart, who had his triumphs when he was a child, fared badly when he had matured and become the greatest of all composers. He too died young and soon after was accorded his rightful place among the immortals. But Bruckner lived to the ripe old age of 72; he composed nine gigantic symphonies—several of which he never heard; and now—35 years after his death—his works are still partly unknown outside of Germany and Austria. When on rare occasions one of his symphonies is performed in England or America, the papers in these countries rehash all the old stupid phrases which were hurled at him by the Viennese papers during his lifetime.

In speaking of Bruckner it is unavoidable to mention the conditions which prevailed in Vienna during his lifetime. The musical world there was divided into two hostile camps. The real battle was not over Bruckner, but over Wagner and his 'chromatic' music. It is perhaps necessary to remark that a new era had commenced. As the system of the ecclesiastical modes had once been superseded by our diatonic modes, to find expression in all the composers since Bach (inclusive), so this system was now superseded by the new 'chromatic' system. Not that the chromatic scale was something new; but now each note in the chromatic scale was harmonized, and diatonic suspensions became chromatic. This was as daring in those days as attempts at atonality and polytonality are in ours. The innovators were Wagner, Liszt, and Bruckner; but each one worked in his own field. Wagner devoted himself to the stage, Liszt to the piano and the orchestra in the works which he called Symphonic Poems, while Bruckner devoted his efforts exclusively to the classical form of the symphony, the realm of purely instrumental music.

In destructive criticisms of his symphonies we are told that Bruckner's form is incoherent, loose-jointed. Just exactly what this means no one of these takes the trouble to tell us, for obvious reasons. The orthodox sonata-form demanded four movements—Allegro, Adagio, Menuet and Allegro. Mozart had already taken some liberties with this form. In the A Major sonata for piano he begins with a slow variation movement. In his violin sonatas there are several irregularities of this kind. He even has a sonata in two movements. Beethoven also changed the original sonata-form in several of his works. In opus 26 he starts (like Mozart) with a slow variation movement. He composed four sonatas with only two parts each. Yet no one has criticised him or Mozart for violating any form. But when Bruckner does something for which there is no precedent in strict orthodox frame-work, at once a tremendous howl arises. "He is formless!" I have studied and played all his nine symphonies, and I fail to see a single musical statement of which he has not given a formal accounting. He prefers at times to come to a complete pause, and then starts a new theme. This is decidedly to his taste, but not to the taste of his critics, who insist, *one theme must flow directly into another.* Well, in the seventh he shows he can accomplish such a transition. On rare occasions he does bring in material which is irrelevant; but in instruction books on orthodox form we are told that in the development group (modulatory group) it is permissible to insert a period which is 'free phantasy', something of the nature of improvisation. Beethoven

has done this in the first movement of the *Eroica* and it is one of the most beautiful moments in the whole symphony. But when Bruckner does it he is just formless.

He has been accused of taking his harmonies from Wagner. 'It sounds like Wagner' is the usual stupid objection. One never meets the objector face to face; he is safely entrenched in his newspaper office. It would only be necessary to ask the question: 'And will you please show me in the score just what sounds like Wagner and where Wagner has said the same thing?' . . . and the critic would be 'out of luck'.

It stands to reason that there is bound to be some similarity between works of different composers who are using the same idiom. One can find these similarities ad infinitum in the works of Mozart and Beethoven; yet only a stupid person would assert that Beethoven had copied Mozart. The works of the Russian composers Balakirew, Borodin, Glazounow, Rimsky-Korsakoff, Kalinnikow are similar in so far as these composers all use the same idiom. The same is the case with the French composers. They are all graciously accorded the privilege of using the idiom of their time . . . except Bruckner. He must not do such a thing; all his harmonies belong to Wagner. For example: there is a very common chord—Dominant Ninth chord in minor; when this chord is inverted symmetrically it becomes less common; it then becomes the Ninth chord on the seventh degree of the minor scale. Bruckner used this chord in his D minor Mass composed in 1863; and this was very inconsiderate of him; he should have known that Wagner was going to invent this chord and use it in "Goetterdaemmerung" in 1876.

His orchestra is the same as Brahms'—but he knows better how to use it. He has been accused of stealing Wagner's orchestration. But he does not use Wagner's English Horn nor his Bass-clarinette. He does use the Tuba, constructed for Wagner's 'Ring'. And why not, if it suited his purpose? Other composers have used every available resource without being criticised! Franck was censored for introducing the English horn into the symphony, but his critics are now laughed at.

We are told that Bruckner's themes are unimportant. Just when is a theme unimportant? Does any one know? I don't. I have asked several musicians and not one of them seems to know. But the critic knows. Then this conclusion is obvious, if he knows an unimportant theme he also knows when one is important. It is a shame that he is withholding this knowledge from the world. Our text-books give us no directions about how to construct important themes, nor how to avoid constructing unimportant ones. What a boon it would be to composers if the critic would only share his knowledge with them! Then we would have nothing but themes of importance!

It is not the theme that counts, but what the composers do with it. I suppose no one will dispute the importance of the theme in the Fifth symphony of Beethoven; yet this theme is—strictly speaking—not by Beethoven. In its inverted form it is found in a fugue by Bach, and Bach states that it is taken from Legrenzi—an old forgotten composer, who lived in Italy (1625-60) years before Bach was born. Legrenzi did nothing important with it; neither did Bach. It remained for Beethoven to mould a worth-while composition out of it. But if the theme per se is important, Legrenzi should have the credit and not Beethoven—an argument which would justly be considered quite idiotic except

when applied to Bruckner. In this case any argument is taken at "par value" without investigation. While speaking of themes it may not be amiss to mention that Bruckner has been ridiculed for using the theme of Isolde's Love Death in his Sixth symphony. I am not in a position to say what prompted Bruckner to use this theme. I shall refer to a similar instance in the E-flat major sonata for violin and piano by Richard Strauss. In the slow movement the piano has in the last bars the theme from the slow movement of Beethoven's Sonata Pathetique, Opus 13. I have been told that he did this to pay homage to Beethoven. Why is it not possible to accord Bruckner the same privilege and let him pay homage to his admired Wagner? One thing in Bruckner's favor which cannot be said for Strauss. The Isolde theme is not Wagner's invention; it was used by four composers before Wagner ever thought of it. It is found in a composition by Heinrich Schutz: Historia des Sterbens and Leidens (1550); Pergolese: Stabat Mater (No. 12); Bach,* W. CL. I, B minor Prelude; Gluck: Orpheus.

*The Well-tempered Clavichord, part I.

Bruckner introduced the Chorale into the symphony. It is quite understandable that this should appeal to him. Having been associated with religious institutions most of his life, he found in the solemnity of the Chorale a welcome contrast to his other utterance. In his treatment of it one might guess that his prototype was the elaborate chorale-prelude of Bach.

It is impossible to weigh justly a Bruckner symphony after one or two hearings. It would have taken many years for Beethoven to attain public appreciation if Liszt had not made propaganda for him through his piano arrangements of the symphonies. It would likewise have taken many years for Wagner to be appreciated if there had not been piano scores of his operas. Bruckner had the further disadvantage of not having composed anything besides his symphonies, his string-quintette and his choral music, which might bring his name to the public's notice,—no piano-music, nor other instrumental solo-music,—no songs. To realize the significance and beauty of his music one must study it beforehand in miniature score and in arrangements for piano two hands, four hands, or for two pianos four-hands. In this way the music-lover may get to know this deep music intimately and thoroughly, and be able to follow all its details, when at rare, but let us hope, ever increasing occasions, our orchestras present Bruckner's symphonies.

TH. OTTERSTROEM—Chicago

BRUCKNER'S "ROMANTIC" IN PORTLAND, ORE.

The Society has received the following communication from Dr. Willem van Hoogstraten, conductor of the Portland Symphony Orchestra:

> On Dec. 14th we performed Bruckner's *Fourth*. The orchestra from rehearsal to rehearsal grew more and more into the spirit of the music and finally played it with deep devotion and enthusiasm. I can honestly say that the symphony was well received by the audience. I thoroughly believe in the sincerity of my audience here, and as Bruckner's music is intensely sincere, it will only be a matter of time before this symphony becomes popular in the real sense of the word. Very likely we will play it again next season.

The beautiful and brilliant but rather unliturgical atmosphere of devotion in the masses of Haydn, Mozart and Schubert brought about a striving for simplification and purification of church music in Central Europe during the first half of the nineteenth century. In the hands of secular musical pedants possessed at best of third-rate inspiration, however, the planned reform resulted in so thorough an abasement of the artistic standard that had been set heaven-high centuries before by Palestrina that only the touch of a devoted genius could restore the music of the ritual to its pristine dignity and glory. No mere imitation of the manner of the old Italian church master could have been a convincing, regenerating expression of faith after the middle of the nineteenth century. When Bruckner's Great Mass in D minor resounded for the first time in the cathedral at Linz in 1864, the effect was so overwhelming that not only was Bishop Rudigier "unable to pray", but the leading critic hailed the work as epoch-making and fearlessly compared its religious power with the great mysticism of Palestrina's music.

This mass and the two in E and F minor that succeeded it mark the maturity of that long period of years the younger Bruckner devoted almost exclusively to the composition of sacred music. So fine are these three works that if he had composed nothing else his reputation as a creator of liturgical music would have been supreme. But standing at the very threshold of his nine giant symphonic creations these masses are not only significant through their positive status as great church music, but also through their implied revelation of that transitional era of "storm and stress" in Bruckner's life which closed only when he turned definitely from the chiseled perfection of his "masses" to the rugged, worldly and dramatic struggles of symphonies that clamored for existence.

The 1860's constituted a "Golden Decade" in musical annals if there ever was such a decade; for three of the greatest musical premieres in history occurred within those years. "Tristan," Meistersinger" and "Rheingold," a mighty trinity of tone-poetry, added their combined romantic spell to a world of art already intoxicated with the rich emotional beverage of "Lohengrin" and "Tannhaeuser," and, mirable dictu! the naive, devout, unliterary Bruckner, the modest church composer, was the "reiner Tor" chosen by Fate to take up the whole burden of symphonic beauty and vitality pulsating in the scores of these music-dramas, and make it the vehicle of a more spiritual revelation issuing anew from the deep spring of absolute music. The metamorphosis from the composer of masses to the symphonies was for years a bewildering one. Titanic struggles of the soul are waged in that most earnest of all "first symphonies, the "kecke Beserl," composed by Bruckner before the completion of his last "great mass". Just before writing his first mass he had experienced his thrilling introduction to Wagner's music when the opera conductor, Otto Kitzler, analyzed for him the wonders of the "Tannhaeuser" score. From that time the symphonic urge became ever stronger in Bruckner, even thrusting itself upon the music of the "masses" to a degree utterly disconcerting to most secular auhorities, who could see in the powerful, romantic fervor of these new works only an elaborate, profane statement of faith that rendered them utterly unfit for ritual use. Since then sixty years have passed and the tremendous evolution

of musical idiom has not only opened the cathedrals of Central Europe to Bruckner, Mozart and Schubert, but the "mass" itself has attained the status of a great and free symphonic form in which tremendous tone-poetical works have been recently composed. These present, on the one hand, no peril to the liturgy, for they are concert "masses", while on the other hand they are for the world new bulwarks of optimism and faith resting on no rigorously phrased "credo", but rather striving toward the spiritual heights sounded in Mahler's "Symphony of a Thousand".

Curiously enough, it is not Bruckner's great "concert" mass in F minor, but his first Mass in D Minor composed in the very blaze of that first Wagnerian revelation, that forecasts most eloquently the free, realistic expression characteristic of the "concert" mass of to-day. The mass in D is studded with romantic touches anticipatory of Wagner. A year before "Tristan", its "Kyrie" opens with the leading phrase of the "Liebestod", to receive thoroughly dramatic treatment at that time with precedent only in Beethoven's "Missa Solemnis". Before the "Kyrie" is over there occurs a moment of religious ecstasy while the very phrase sounds that is to accompany the "descent of the dove" in "Parsifal" twenty years later. The "Agnus" begins with the "spear-motiv" from the "Ring". The "Et resurrexit" is introduced with a highly realistic symphonic passage of twenty-eight bars in which the prominence given kettle-drum and contrabass lends a grim, dramatic coloring Bruckner never again dared to exploit except in his symphonies. The "Benedictus" is a veritable pastoral "symphonic poem". It is no wonder that no less a judge of artistic quality in music than Gustav Mahler chose this "liturgical" mass in preference to the later ones in E and F for "concert" performance at Hamburg in 1893. Bruckner himself was completely aware of the symphonic leanings of the work, for many of his symphonies, even the latest ones, make use of thematic material presented here for the first time, and perhaps most prophetic fact of all, the closing portion of the mass, like the Bruckner symphonic finales, gathers together the earlier threads of the work, thus achieving the convincing unity of a form completely rounded out. This "cyclic" form, perfected by Bruckner in his symphonies was also adopted by the next symphonist, Mahler, who lent it enhanced significance through a wealth of psychological details characteristic of the artwork of our own time.

The second mass, in E minor, a strictly liturgical setting, is practically an a capella work for eight mixed voices; for the unique instrumental accompaniment of wood-wind (without flutes) and brass is marked as "not indispensable". The rich choral writing, recalling the glory of Palestrina, is nevertheless full of typical "Bruckner" enharmonic touches to be met with later in his symphonies. The consummate mastery of musically sonorous dissonance in the score reaches its climax in the second "Miserere" where all seven tones of the diatonic scale seem to combine naturally to form a tower of orderly sound, according to the critic Goehler, "perhaps the most magnificent harmony that has ever been penned."

The last mass, in F Minor, though composed as a "concert" mass, is unanimously rated on account of its irreproachable union of all the characteristics necessary to a perfect setting of the sacred text, as the best of the three. The "Benedictus", an adagio of "Beethoven" depth,

forecasts the spirit of the mighty slow movements of the symphonies to come. Perhaps the complete triumph of his work as an expression of faith, as well as the limitations put upon symphonic utterance by church forms led Bruckner to the broader, freer fields of the symphony. Not until he had finished his Seventh symphony did he return to serious contemplation of sacred music, and then the "Te Deum" he wrote, often called the greatest "Te Deum" of all, bore eloquent witness of the tremendous spiritual growth he had achieved in the world of absolute music.

MRS. WOODS BECKMAN, Altoona, Pa.

FRANZ SCHALK

With the passing of Franz Schalk last September the Bruckner cause in Europe suffered the loss of one of its mightiest bulwarks. To him as to no other conductor had all devotees of Bruckner come to look for the most inspiring interpretations of the master's symphonies. The executive brilliancy that commenced almost four decades ago with that soul-stirring premiere of the *Fifth* at Graz acquired ever greater spiritual quality with the years until the mere mention of Schalk's "Bruckner" was a sound full of wonderful magic significance for the lover of symphonic music. Perhaps the highest token of the boundless regard and gratitude of the European Brucknerites towards him was the dignity of the Honorary Presidency of the *Internationale Bruckner Gesellschaft* to which the unanimous wish of that organization's membership had elected him.

And now there remains only a single one of that stalwart band of giants of the baton who in their early career swore lifelong fidelity to the art of the great master the privilege of a personal friendship with whom gracious Fate had accorded them. The celebrated Dr. Karl Muck, whose record of major performances of Bruckner's symphonies began over forty years ago, was the only logical successor to the post of honor left vacant by the recent death of Franz Schalk. It is the fervent hope of all that Dr. Muck be granted many years in which to lend his distinguished services towards furthering the transcendental art of Bruckner.

BRUNO WALTER

On January 31, 1932, Bruno Walter was elected Honorary Member of the Bruckner Society of America. On the one hand, from earliest youth one of Gustav Mahler's dearest friends, and later his chosen disciple, on the other hand, unhesitatingly named by the dying Schalk as the man best fitted to take over his adandoned baton, Bruno Walter is the living embodiment of the broad musicianship absolutely indispensable to one who is to carry the banner of the greater symphony on into the future. In Europe today he possesses the enviable reputation of being not only an ideal Mozart conductor and a Mahler interpreter equalled by none except Mengelberg, but also (and this is a recognition only lately granted him) one of the ablest of the world's Bruckner conductors.

MEDALS OF HONOR

The Executive Committee of the "Society" has prepared special medals for presentation to the following conductors for their distinguished contribution toward the advancement of popular appreciation of the works of Bruckner and Mahler in America.

Bruckner Medals: to Willem van Hoogstraten, Frederick A. Stock, Arturo Toscanini.

Mahler Medals: to Artur Bodanzky and Serge Koussevitzky.

ROMAIN ROLLAND ON BRUCKNER

Villeneuve du Leman
Jan. 6th, 1932

Dear Mr. Grey,

I accept, with pleasure, honorary membership in your Bruckner Society and I thank you for electing me. I admire profoundly the composer of these monumental symphonies, who of all the great musicians of the nineteenth century was in his art (if not in his character) nearest akin to Beethoven.

I beg to be excused from writing an article for your Journal. I am taken up with duties which require all my time.

Please be assured of my most sympathetic attitude,

Romain Rolland

BRUCKNER'S THIRD (WAGNER) AND EIGHTH SYMPHONIES IN BOSTON

According to press reports, the Boston Symphony Orchestra under the direction of Dr. Serge Koussevitzky will perform these two works this season. The *Third* will be a "first time". The *Eighth* was played in Boston under Koussevitzky's direction two years ago.

BRUCKNER'S STRING QUINTET IN CHICAGO

Before the musical season 1931-1932 is over, Bruckner's String Quintet, his sole contribution to chamber music, and a work which is universally regarded as being on a par with his symphonies, will have had its first hearing in Chicago. The pioneering spirit which has at last placed this great "minor symphony" on the program of a well known musical organization of that city is a credit to the Chicago String Quartet, which has undertaken to perform this rarely heard Bruckner masterpiece.

BRUCKNER'S E MINOR MASS

Two American performances of this second of Brückner's three monumental settings of the Missa Solemnis are scheduled for the near future. One of these will take place in Altoona, Pa., under the direction of Rev. Father Joseph A. Hauber. The performance was to have taken place last November but was postponed because of the inauguration of the Cathedral.

The other performance, which was also postponed, will be given in St. Henry's Roman Catholic Church, Bayonne, N. J., under the direction of the noted American composer and musicologist, Mr. James P. Dunn, whose lecture on Bruckner's Masses at the Roerich Museum last October proved a valuable preface to the unforgettable performance of the F Minor Mass by the "Friends of Music".

Most recently a newspaper critic in a moment of revelation following a performance of Mahler's "Ninth" in New York remarked that it was a great pity so little had been written about the composer's individual treatment of the orchestra. This reviewer suddenly realized, as too few music-lovers do, that the content of a symphony is so inextricably interwoven with the peculiarities of its orchestral idiom that some acquaintance with these determining characteristics is absolutely necessary to any adequate comprehension of the work as a whole.

Even Mahler's closest friends, people of high musical culture, were frequently amazed by the utter strangeness of his attitude toward the art. He would stand outside the grounds of a country fair completely fascinated by the babel of tones issuing simultaneously from human throats, hurdy-gurdies, carousels and a brass band. In the confusion of these many tunes accidently mingled, he claimed, lay the essence of true polyphony, which is an ensemble of independent voices, each singing in the manner best suited to it.

In the light of this Mahler's symphony orchestra is really a community of independent soloists ideally cast, who perform in some wordless drama of absolute music various roles created for them by a serious composer whose freedom of expression recognizes no limitation save that imposed by the great, utterly human soul of true art. Paradoxical as it may sound, Mahler's scores, thoroughly modern though they be, are as transparent and simple as those of Mozart. There is in his music a total absence of that prevalent vice, the padding of parts to obtain increased fulness or richness of orchestral sound. Where other composers instinctively surround dissonant voices with soothing harmonic accompaniments Mahler resorts to the extreme of ascetic scoring, intentionally laying bare pointedly discordant parts by the exclusion of all others. In melodic polyphony alone lay the heart of music for him; and in order to keep as close as possible to it he unhesitatingly braved the perils to his popularity involved in the many unpleasant surprises of his "discordant" scores for the average ear. Not that harmony as a basic influence is absent from his music. It is present, but its importance is enormously reduced by the incessant claims of the intricate melodic web upon the listener's attention. Mahler asks us not to hear vertically, as harmonies are written, but horizontally, as the lines of themes progress.

And these are great themes, suited to the colossal structure of the forms he chose. Great themes, though perhaps not in the same, simple, pure, austere sense characterizing the immortal themes of the classic symphonists of the past; but songlike themes of broad and daring outline, themes unprecedentedly rich in fantasy, and completely free from the restraining shackles of triads grouped according to age-old formulas of melodic construction. Above all Mahler is the "song" symphonist. His most intricate polyphony only reflects to what degree his soul is a "singing" soul, thoroughly saturated with melody. When he conducted an orchestra even the heavy-voiced tuba was compelled to "sing". To obtain enhanced songlike eloquence Mahler almost revolutionized the symphonic idiom of each instrument.

He exploited each instrument not merely for the clearest musical effect of which it was capable, but even more for its most striking emotional accents, thus endowing the orchestral language with a psychological power it had never possessed before. The prodigal profusion of his unexpected usages in instrumentation was the strange feature that accounted in a great measure for the public's misunderstanding of his music.

Solo flutes which the habit of masters had made the vehicles of sweet melodies were now suddenly heard sounding ethereally, totally bereft of expression, as if issuing out of infinite distances. The brilliant little E-flat clarinet, newly abducted by Mahler from the military band, now invaded the proud precincts of the symphony orchestra and was heard to burst forth in mockery, grotesque to the point of scurrility. Owing to the parodistic gifts of this reclaimed instrument not even the gloomy atmosphere of a funeral march would be safe from an interruption of ribald merriment. The spell of most tender moments would be rudely broken by an instrumental sneer. The oboe, no longer the accustomed high-pitched voice of poignantly sweet pathos, was now heard singing comfortably in its natural, middle register. The bassoon, suddenly become most eloquent of repressed pain, would cry out, most convincing in its highest tones. The contrabassoon would have a coarse grotesque remark to make all alone.

The horn (in the treatment of which most authorities agree Mahler was the greatest master of all time) had never had so much to say. To the noble level of expressiveness it had attained in Bruckner's hands Mahler added a new power, enabling it by means of dying echoes to carry smoothly an idea already exploited into a changed musical atmosphere. Sometimes a solo horn would issue with overwhelming effect from a whole chorus of horns among which it had been concealed; or singing in its deepest tones it would lend a passage an air of tragic gloom. In Mahler's resourceful use of the horn every register seemed possessed of a different psychological significance.

Those short, sharp, fanfaresque trumpet 'motives' so characteristic of Wagner and so effectively transplanted by Bruckner into the symphony attain new life with Mahler; but either disappearing gently in a soft cadence, or singing bravely on, they soar with ever increasing intensity and breadth to a powerful dynamic climax, to be finally crowned with the triumphant din of massed brass and percussion. Or where usage had led to the belief that the intensification of a melodic line was the peculiar task of many instruments in unison, Mahler would save the clarity of this line from the covering danger of massed voices by asking a single trumpet to take up the theme with intense passion. Above a sombre rhythm powerfully marked by a chorus of trombones over percussion he would set a solitary trombone to pour out grief in noble, poignant recitative. Never had such significance been given the percussion group as Mahler gave it. His mastery of this section was doubtless a heritage of the fascination with which he had in infant days listened to the martial strains issuing from the Iglau* barracks. Often he would even combine various percussion instruments, giving them amazing contrapuntal treatment, much as though they were true solo instruments.

**The town in Bohemia where Mahler spent his childhood years.*

"Tradition is slovenly" was his oft-repeated motto. He rejected every stereotyped means of obtaining a desired effect; and it was often the utter originality of his solution to an instrumental problem which while carrying richer meaning was yet regarded by the misunderstanding listener, fed on conventional combinations, as merely grotesque. In this intensified and clarified musical idiom, however, there was nothing actually revolutionary. It signified nothing more than that the inevitable development of the orchestral language had been sent forward a whole generation by the genius of one man.

His great mastery of the "color" possibilities of each instrument kept Mahler, the absolute symphonist, thoroughly modern in a musical world gone "program" made. With this ability he could afford to stand aside from those who blindly risked the sacrifice of musical content to the sensational effect of trick instrumental combinations. There was no emotion he could not give clear expression without abandoning a pure, "linear" method as essentially legitimate as that of Bach. Through orderly contrapuntal "line" scored in his eloquent idiom, he achieved "color", and yet retained that transparent clarity of expression which in the higher orchestral world has become synonymous with the name Mahler.

So striking and vital was the originality of his method that it speedily evoked a "school" of emulators but little concerned with the real content of his symphonies. A generation went by; meanwhile the latest offspring of major music came into existence, the "chamber-symphony", over whose many exclusively solo voices the "lineo-coloristic" method of Mahler holds paternal sway. And above this spirit hovers that of the Wagner of the "Siegfried Idyll", the accidental forerunner of all this "modernism", whispering, "Create something new, children,—always something new."

—GABRIEL ENGEL

MAHLER'S FOURTH IN LOS ANGELES

The Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra under the direction of Dr. Artur Rodzinski performed Mahler's Fourth on December 31st and January 1st. These were the first performances of this symphony in Los Angeles.

MAHLER'S FIFTH IN NEW YORK

The Philharmonic Symphony Society will perform Mahler's Fifth under the direction of Bruno Walter on February 11, 12, 13, and 14th. The last of these performances will be broadcast over the Columbia chain.

MAHLER'S SIXTH IN BOSTON

According to press reports, the Boston Symphony will perform Mahler's Sixth in Boston this season. The performance will be under Dr. Koussevitzky's direction.

DR. SERGE KOUSSEVITZKY ON MAHLER

"GUSTAV MAHLER in my estimation belongs on a par with the greatest masters of symphonic art. He is not yet fully accorded the appreciation which is his due. Twenty years have passed since his death, and we can better understand this remarkable man who was able to sing with profound and pathetic accents the final song of the romantic era, using a technic—both contrapuntal and orchestral—which was thirty years in advance of his time. Once Mahler's significance is grasped, the world will make light of his apparent weaknesses, his banalities, his longeurs. To make his art better known should be the desire of every artist."

PAPER TRUMPETS

A mere glance through the files of newspaper musical criticism of the past two generations is sufficient to suggest the suspicion that those countless, formidable columns of ink are the very barriers which have retarded the recognition of the greatest and most serious works of musical art by the general public. Quotations would be odious, and are even unnecessary, for the vicious cause of this condition is to-day in America as powerful as it was in Europe in the heyday of the notorious Hanslick. The modern metropolitan newspaper is a stupendous financial investment the success of which is entirely dependent upon the numbers of its readers. The success of every "columnist" is obviously reflected in the size of his following. Naturally, the better the musical critic can adapt the flow of his utterance to the pulse of the average reader the more popular he will be. Thus arises the great temptation to enrich the report of a concert with pointed, clever remarks the aim of which is clearly to bring about the greatest possible number of chuckles rather than to help the layman along the true path of artistic progress. The critic as popular entertainer is no doubt very dear to the cause of large newspaper circulation. Because such a writer generally knows much more about music than those who read his effusions with delight, these dependent multitudes feel highly gratified that so witty an authority is of the same mind as they. The fame of the critic waxes greater; it goes to his head, and he becomes still more entertaining. Meanwhile, serious art, the subject of popular pleasantry,, is brought almost to a standstill.

Bruckner is daily becoming a less fruitful subject for this entertaining school of newspaper "criticism". Mahler has for two decades served as chosen sacrifice upon the altar of the columnist's cleverness. Schoenberg and others are already marked to follow when the name of Mahler is no longer conducive to the generation of wholesale snickers.

The music critic is entrusted with a tremendous responsibility. It is in his power to hasten or to retard musical progress. Let him, therefore, lay aside personal vanity and other ulterior considerations which may prevent him from assuming in a thoroughly honest and dignified manner the lofty role of the public's chosen judge of a new art-work. There are three essential factors involved in musical progress, the composer, the critic and the public. The critic must stand squarely and midway between the other two. If he caters he is not only pernicious to progress but he shirks a sacred responsibility.

—ROBERT G. GREY

SIDES AND ASIDES

SEVENTH SYMPHONY, ANTON BRUCKNER

New York, March 4, 6, 7, 8, 1931; Philharmonic Symphony Society of New York; conductor, Arturo Toscanini. The last performance was broadcast over a nation-wide chain.

"The Friends of Bruckner—an increasingly numerous clan—should derive considerable comfort from Mr. Toscanini's indorsement of the work, since he accorded to it a performance of surpassing eloquence—a performance which must surely have dispelled the doubts of many as to the salience and significance of this music. The applause at the conclusion of the symphony was earnest and prolonged, and though no doubt it was intended in part for Mr. Toscanini and the players of the Phiharmonic Symphony Orchestra, much of it certainly was a tribute to Bruckner." . . .

—EDWARD CUSHING, Brooklyn Eagle

"The symphonies of Bruckner can never be called masterpieces. *They are fragments of masterpieces, so tremendous that the colossal unfinished achievement, part of it towering to the skies, other parts supine in the scaffolding and rubbish that lie about the base, stir us as many a finished work of art cannot. - - - -*

It would, therefore, be well if audiences could know more than they do of Bruckner's symphonies. - - - -

The eighth Symphony is superior to the Seventh and probably the greatest of the Bruckner symphonies. The Fifth is a work of peculiar originality and vastness. *The opportunity to know Bruckner more intimately than we can as programs are now constituted would be welcome, because the pure gold of his genius is worth hunting through much rough slag and ore."*

—OLIN DOWNES, N. Y. Times

"Yet often he was able, if not to shapen or to enter the inner chamber of Blake's 'palace of wisdom', at least to behold the incredible turrets shining in the evening light. For a few he was, and is, at his most rewardingly characteristic, one who knew the secret of a strangely exalted discourse. *Sometimes, rapt and transfigured, he saw visions and dreamed dreams; and we know that for Bruckner, then, some ineffable beauty flamed and sank and flamed again across the night."*

—LAWRENCE GILMAN, N. Y. Herald-Tribune

"This work shows, particularly in the two middle movements, so much individuality, beauty and genius that it is difficult to understand how mere prejudice could have kept it so long from the music-lovers of the metropolis. - - - -

In his handling of the 'brass', particularly horn, tuba and trumpet, Bruckner surpassed his chosen master, Wagner. The splendor and majesty of expression he attains in the overwhelming 'fff' of the funereal second movement and in the final passage of the first and last movements, alone assure him a place among the immortals."

—JOACHIM H. MEYER, N. Y. Staatszeitung und Herold

N. B. All italics in the course of this entire pamphlet are our own. (The Editor)

"At last Arturo Toscanini has consented to conduct Bruckner with as result a signal triumph for both the living batonist and the dead and gone composer.

The revelation took place in Carnegie Hall last evening at the concert of the Philharmonic Symphony Society, and a huge audience received it with close attention and heartfelt applause. - - -

In fact, Mr. Toscanini's reading of the finale solved the problems of that difficult section as no other has done within my experience. It moved at his behest with the jubilant majesty of the stars in their courses."

—PITTS SANBORN, New York World-Telegram

SEVENTH SYMPHONY, GUSTAV MAHLER

Cincinnati, March 6, 1931; *Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra; Conductor, Fritz Reiner.*

"Enthusiasm was too general and appreciation too convincingly demonstrated to be argued down. - - -

Also it may be said that what might have seemed to be temerity in programming such a colossal composition in reality became an instance of courageous conviction on the conductor's part and a mighty compliment to his audience. - - -

No program is needed because the music is absolutely tangible. It is a stupendous example of inspired workmanship, healthy genius of expression and artistic maturity. *It covers a gamut of moods, and excites a range of emotions quite bewildering in extent. - - -*

Mostly, Mahler is a modern romanticist, but here and there his music is prophetic of the day which we are living in. He uses classic forms and every needed known device in treatment of material. *And with all his classic structure, romantic nature and overwhelming technique of manipulation, he has reached into what even to us who survive him is the far distant future."*

—GEORGE A. LEIGHTON, Cincinnati Enquirer

NINTH SYMPHONY, ANTON BRUCKNER

Chicago, Pittsburgh, Ann Arbor, Milwaukee, Evanston; Feb.-May, 1931; *Chicago Symphony Orchestra; Conductor, Frederick A. Stock.*

"Into the Ninth Symphony (styled the *Unfinished* as it lacks the final movement) the versatile Stock imbued a mysticism, religious fervor, and grandeur, that gave the loveliness of its simplicities new importance and renewed interest. His interpretive understanding gave significance to a composer whose works have been too long misunderstood. - - -

After the riotous regime of ultra modernity and atonality in the realm of music, the works of not only Bruckner, but also those of Mahler should at last come into their own."

—RALPH LEWANDO, Pittsburgh Post

"It was Pittsburgh's first hearing of Bruckner.

In his ninth symphony one is awed by the grandeur of the score. Bruckner knew his counterpoint and polyphony and he crams his movements with thematic and color riches.

It was an impressive work, and despite its length, we would like to hear it again next year."

—HARVEY GAUL, Pittsburgh Post Gazette

EIGHTH SYMPHONY (SYMPHONY OF A THOUSAND)

GUSTAV MAHLER

Cincinnati, May 6, 1931 (*May Festival*); *Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra; Conductor, Eugene Goossens.*

"It is gratifying to think that the triumphant premiere which Mr. Specht recalls must have brought deep solace to the self-torturing, hypersensitive, unhappy Mahler. The event took place in the autumn before his death, at Munich (the date was September 12, 1910). 'After the performance', wrote Leopold Stokowski, who was present, 'the vast audience sprang to its feet, and a scene of such enthusiasm ensued as one sees only once in a lifetime. To those who realized, in part at least, the inner sadness of Mahler's life, there was something infinitely tragic in his figure at that moment of supreme triumph'.

It was Mr. Stokowski who introduced the *Symphony of a Thousand* to America in an extraordinary series of performances with the Philadelphia Orchestra which he undertook in the spring of 1916. The work was produced on March 2, and had a run which, for a mere symphony, was almost equivalent to the triumphant persistence of *The Green Pastures*. - - -

In the following month, the *Society of the Friends of Music* imported Mr. Stokowski with his army of executants to New York, and the work was disclosed to this capital at a memorable concert in the Metropolitan Opera House. - - -

It is curious that Bayard Taylor, half a century ago, should have spoken of the closing scene of *Faust* as 'a symphony': an ever-rising and ever-swelling symphony, with its one theme of the accordance of Human and Divine Love; as (again) 'this mystic Symphony of Love'. It almost seems as if he had previsioned the tonal possibilities of the poem—possibilities which Mahler, in ths symphony of today, has in so large a measure realized and fulfilled. For here, take it all in all, is one of the noblest scores of our time. In it, now and again, are pages unforgettable for their superearthly beauty—inspirations of which their creator might justifiably have said, with the singer of the Odes of Solomon, ' So are the wings of the Spirit over my heart, and I have been set on His immortal pinions.' "*

—LAWRENCE GILMAN, N. Y. Herald Tribune

*Jan. 24th, 1932. Although the interim shows no performance of Mahler's "Eighth", since the one recorded above, Mr. Gilman sounds a violent dischord in an "aside" about this monumental work in today's issue of the N. Y. Herald Tribune. The occasion is an article introducing Mahler's Fifth Symphony; the cause, we must confess, beyond our comprehension.

We quote the puzzling passage:

"That vein (peasant humor) is native to him, genuine and unforced and individual. But Mahler in his pseudo-apocalyptic vein: Mahler as Lucifer, as Prometheus, as Faust, as the Angel Gabriel, as Deity, assisting at the birth of worlds and the resurrection of mankind, is, for the most part, a bore and an affliction.

"The writer heard the symphony for the first time. He could listen with a clear and unprepared mind to the sheer effect of music and performance, and that effect was overwhelming. - - -

We do not say that it is the purest musical material. Technically it is a tour de force. . . But if Mahler is sometimes forced to substitute

straw for bricks in the first part of his symphony, he is such a master of his structure and his feeling is so true and tremendous that criticism in the listener is overwhelmed if it is not entirely silenced. And this is no more than just to the composer, for Mahler is not to be judged entirely as other men who write music. . . He saw mighty visions and he believed, and there is that in his music—at least when it is presented as it was this evening—that makes fault-finding with detail or measuring with a yardstick seem somewhat petty."

—OLIN DOWNES, N. Y. Times

FOURTH SYMPHONY (ROMANTIC) ANTON BRUCKNER

New York, July 12, 1931 (*Stadium Concerts Series*); *Philharmonic Symphony Society of N. Y.; Conductor, Willem van Hoogstraten.*

"*The symphony,* last heard here at the Stadium three years ago, *improves upon acquaintance. . . There is often an ingratiating melodiousness, especially in the slow movement, where we are reminded of Schumann's D minor symphony; the scherzo has a marked freshness and elan; passages where the brass instruments intone sonorously have an impressive dignity of the type found in Bruckner's seventh and eighth symphonies to a greater degree.*"

—FRANCIS D. PERKINS, N. Y. Herald Tribune

"*Bruckner now seems destined to become an integral part of our musical life, as he long has been in Germany and Austria.*

Last evening the Stadium was to have been treated to him again, but if the weather forbade, at least the Philharmonic Symphony made the Great Hall of the City College ring to the tune of the Austrian's fourth, or "Romantic" symphony, while a considerable congregation of displaced Stadiumites listened with unmistakable interest.

Mr. van Hoogstraten is a Bruckner enthusiast, and he directed the symphony with cherishing care and tremendous vigor. The charge has been brought against Bruckner that in the intervals between fine episodes he goes irretrievably dull. *Well, I defy anyone to recall a dull moment in the symphony last evening—and that is a feather in the cap of Mr. van Hoogstraten as well as a tribute to the composer.*"

—PITTS SANBORN, N. Y. World-Telegram

NINTH SYMPHONY, GUSTAV MAHLER (FIRST TIME IN AMERICA)

Boston, Oct. 16, 17 *and Nov.* 9, 1931; *Boston Symphony Orchestra; Conductor, Dr. Serge Koussevitzky.*

"A strange figure in the symphonic field, not one to be slighted, much less wholly admired; not one to be ignored; a man of great moments, but, as Rossini said of Wagner's 'Tannhaeuser', of dreadful half-hours. And how often is Mahler trivial when he thought he was important. - - -

The performance was remarkable. The enthusiastic audience recalled Dr. Koussevitzky two or three times."

—PHILIP HALE, Boston Herald

One might write also of Mahler's marvelous pertinent orchestral technic, of the perfection with which all his projected effects 'come off'; of the economy of his writing in the face of the great length of his works—of the idiom, the flavor, which defines Mahler as specifically as that of Strauss defines Strauss or of Debussy defines Debussy; of the advanced musical thinking which places the symphony at least a decade ahead of its day. Suffice it to say that detractors eager to note 'influences' in this symphony—and not too sure of their musical history—all too easily find in it supposed traces of works which did not see the light of day until a later date!"

A. H. MEYER, Boston Evening Transcript

"Unmistakably and from end to end it is a superb technical achievement—often the germinating *motives* are brief and simple. - - -

What does he not do with them, more particularly in the first and the second movements! The modernists are lions for counterpoint, expert practitioners withal. Yet the youngest of them sits in admiration and amaze before 'old' Mahler's polyphony. He has outdone them all, and a generation ago."

—H. T. PARKER, Boston Evening Transcript

"It impressed one hearing it for the first time as a masterpiece deserving a permanent place in the repertory, and frequent performance. What is more significant, the audience, few of whom can have heard it before, applauded with a warmth seldom bestowed here on unfamiliar music. - - -

One can only repeat that yesterday's performance, an unusually eloquent and sympathetic one, proved that Mahler is a genius to be classed with Brahms, possibly in some ways above him."

—P. H., Boston Globe

"To Dr. Koussevitzky, then, our full gratitude for having given us first in 'The Song of the Earth', and now in the Ninth Symphony, the two works of Mahler's maturity and prime, in which he sounded a note unheard in music since Beethoven wrote his last sonatas and quartets. Like Beethoven, Mahler in his later years found in composition an escape from the world of reality, become increasingly distasteful to him. Like Beethoven he achieved at times a spiritual calm, a clarity of spiritual vision, beyond the usual human experience; like him could express it in terms of tone.

This mood of spiritual ecstasy, so different from the sensuous mysticism of Franck and of Wagner's 'Parsifal', finds voice in the last division of 'The Song of the Earth' and in the sublime Adagio that concludes the Ninth Symphony."

—WARREN STOREY SMITH, Boston Post

MISSA SOLEMNIS IN F MINOR, ANTON BRUCKNER

New York, Oct. 25, 1931; *Society of the Friends of Music; Conductor, Artur Bodanzky.*

"A cause to advance, an issue to contest, is precious to certain people. And now there is hot-to-do about Anton Bruckner, whose Mass in F minor was performed for the first time in this city by the Friends of Music, Arthur Bodanzky conductor, yesterday afternoon in the Metropolitan Opera House. - - -

He (Bruckner) was a composer only half articulate. He had ideas of sufficient value to float imperfect scores, and some of these ideas are so great that they keep his music alive, if not violently kicking, and cause its inclusion from time to time on concert programs. - - -

But the net value of the mass is, in our belief, exaggerated, and one performance is sufficient for some seasons to come."

—OLIN DOWNES, N. Y. Times

"The Bruckner Mass is a concert work. It is romantic, unchurchly, uncatholic and was certainly never intended for use in a sanctuary. - - -

But on the whole the mass justified the claims of Brucknerites. It is certainly one of the highest flights of the composer. Stylistically it is coherent and its melodic character and formal evolution are so simple, and even naive at times, as to make it quickly comprehensible to the listener. It is an art work in which intellectual power is singularly wanting, but which wins by its clear revelation of a humble and pious soul."

—WILLIAM J. HENDERSON, N. Y. Sun

"Yesterday's carefully prepared performance proved a powerfully convincing presentation of the lofty musical and spiritual qualities of the F minor Mass, and unless all indications are deceptive, the 'Friends of Music' should include the work in their regular repertoire. - - -

In the fervor of its utterance, in the broad, bold outlines of its musical framework, in the masterly handling of its themes (the rearing of a monumental structure out of small 'motiv'-like fragments) in its enduring outlook upon life (a veritable peak of romanticism) the F-minor Mass reveals most colorfully the supreme church musician, who hid deep in his simple soul a world of lofty thoughts."

—JOACHIM H. MEYER, N. Y. Staatszeitung und Herold

"It is quite short, taking only sixty-five or seventy minutes to perform, and is obviously designed for liturgical performance, in a church, as part of religious services, rather than as a concert work. It is relatively unpretentious; the choral writing is not particularly elaborate; few, if any chances for extended vocal display are offered the soloists; the orchestration is less rich than in the composer's later music. - - -

With melody of a Germanic, romantic type, the music gives a clear expression of Bruckner's religious faith—thorough, convinced, unquestioning and, in this case, optimistic; a serene devotion, often tender, sometimes jubilant."

—FRANCIS D. PERKINS, N. Y. Herald Tribune

"After devoting a great deal of attention to Bach, Beethoven and Brahms, not to mention Gustav Mahler, the Friends of Music, at their initial concert of the season at the Metropolitan Opera House yesterday, got around to Anton Bruckner . . .

And it is safe to say that few of the recent attempts to endear the music of this simple, devout Austrian to the local public are likelier to bear fruit than this first performance in New York of the Mass in F minor. - - -

The Mass, which is neither long nor in any of its parts exceedingly elaborate, is of a singularly sustained inspiration."

—PITTS SANBORN, N. Y. World-Telegram

"FOR US this ponderous Mass was uninspired and uninspiring. It never soared, though it strove bravely and persistently to do so. It beat its wings, but couldn't leave the ground. - - -

The work unquestionably has some beautiful details, both in the choral writing and in the orchestra; but it has also monotony of color, and though it contains at least two ingenious examples of fugal writing, it quite generally fails to contrast successfully the several choirs when contrast would dispel this monotony. Beyond question it carries the conviction of Bruckner's sincerity. But, it plods emotionally, and its religiosity has little of 'lift.' "

—OSCAR THOMPSON, N. Y. Evening Post

NINTH SYMPHONY, GUSTAV MAHLER

New York, Nov. 19, 1931, *Jan.* 9, 1932. *Boston Symphony Orchestra; Conductor, Dr. Serge Koussevitzky.*

"How does it happen, then, that we have waited 22 years (the Ninth Symphony was completed in 1909) to hear one of his most important works? Echo answers. He has never had, in this city, an enthusiastic press, and for this reason, it may be, as well as for others more practical, conductors have been reluctant to perform it. As for the public, given the chance, it might express a preference for Mahler's music."

—EDWARD CUSHING, Brooklyn Daily Eagle

"Mahler's Ninth Symphony, which opened the concert, was interpreted with an eloquence, a conviction, a richness of color which may well have given the music fictitious significance. - - -

Mahler's symphony, played for the first time here, is too long."

—OLIN DOWNES, N. Y. Times

"But length in music is after all, a relative thing. *Die Meistersinger* is almost twice as long as *Thais;* but not everyone would believe it without a stopwatch.—Mahler's instrumental demands in this score are considerable, but they are not exorbitant, and any one of our major orchestras could have met them without turning any grayer than usual the hair of of the trustees.—It should be added to the repertoire of other symphonic bodies, and it should be heard again; for it is a remarkable score".

.....LAWRENCE GILMAN, N. Y. Herald Tribune

"Mahler's musical relationship to Bruckner, his prodigious prolixity, his occasional flights into the empyrean of beauty, all have made him an object of adoration and the victim of misplaced propaganda among the confraternity of Brucknerites and their sympathizers. But enormous plans, ponderous masses of structure and openly exhaustive effort do not make compositions great. Schubert's *Erlkoenig** is a more unassailable masterpiece than any of Mahler's symphonies.—That the symphony was worth hearing is beyond question."

—W. J. HENDERSON, N. Y. Sun

*Editor's Note:—Perhaps, after all, history does repeat itself. We take the liberty to remind Mr. Henderson that when the *Erlkoenig* made its bow in New York the *Ameican Musical Journal* of May, 1835 greeted the Schubert master-song with the following tirade:

"The violation of all harmony, although the modern school may defend its obsolute correctness, is here, in our thinking, misplaced; the discord is too piercing for the ear. We might overlook it in a chorus of devils a la Weber, but in this instance it is not to be endured. This is a song of the Rosalie species certainly, but far very far, its inferior; nor do we think that Charles E. Horn, with his excellent taste and his beautiful touch of the pianoforte, could reconcile us to this monstrum horrendum which we, however, strongly recommend as a beautiful specimen of modulation, a good pianoforte lesson, and a useful exercise for the voice."

"Only violent antipathy or prejudice could have prevented an earlier hearing of this symphonic swan-song (as it proved to be) for the tenth symphony is a mere fragment.—Koussevitzky's performance of this emotional and certainly sincere work helped much to remove that prejudice. The apparently genuine enthusiasm of the audience must have been balm to Koussevitzky's pioneering heart."

—MUSICAL COURIER, November 28, 1931

"To Serge Koussevitzky and the splendid Boston Symphony Orchestra all gratitude for this unforgettable performance!—From a purely musical viewpoint Mahler's last symphony is one of the most significant products of all symphonic creation, and that despite numerous weak spots, the result of an over-attention to detail detrimental to the firm maintenance of the major structural outlines. The manner in which the composer raises the opening movement out of thematic particles to a mighty edifice is one of the greatest examples of symphonic construction. Those distant, alluring horn calls, reminiscent of the 'Nachtmusiken' of the 'Seventh', sound here once again.—In wealth of coloring this, as well as the other movements, reveals the tone-sorcerer, who with the exception of Richard Strauss, is without equal in modern music."

—JOACHIM MEYER, N. Y. Staats-Zeitung und Herold

(*Translated by the editor.*)

"The music grows in intensity, eventually to die away in one of the finest expressions of that ineffable loneliness and yearning which was inseparable from the tortured spirit of Mahler.—As the music faded into the silence of eternity, the high receding violins spoke of the ultimate consolation which is complete surcease from pain, from thought; the last sleep whch is our inalienable birthright.—The symphony is scored for an enormous orchestra, scored with the utter mastery that was Mahler's, and technically the Bostonians performed it magnificently."

—PITTS SANBORN, N. Y. World-Telegram

"Prune it down until nothing is left save Mahler's musical ideas and the amount of development that they are worth, and the Ninth Symphony would last about twenty minutes.—Some day, some real friend of Mahler's will do just that . . take a pruning knife and reduce his works to the length that they would have been if the composer had not stretched them out of shape; and then the great Mahler war will be over."

—DEEMS TAYLOR, N Y. American

"The playing was so fine as almost to win over some of us who have grown weary of the efforts of successive conductors to acclimatize Mahler to our soil.—But the bad seemed to us not as bad and the indifferent not as indifferent as in some of the other symphonies.—Though not a great work, this is one to give pleasure. Its liabilities include its length."

—OSCAR THOMPSON, N. Y. Evening Post

MAHLER'S NINTH (SECOND N. Y. PERFORMANCE)

"Too little has been written in appreciation of Mahler's superb instrumentation; of its eschewing of filling-in effects such as often clutter up the scores of Strauss and of his great skill in saying much with little means. Although he calls for a huge orchestra, he is sparing in its use. Polytonality may be traced here to its original source and his poignant use of dissonance is that of a master.—After the profound utterances of Mahler, Ravel's pretty work seemed doubly trivial."

—JEROME D. BOHM, N. Y. Herald Tribune

"Musicians welcomed a second hearing made possible by the matinee, and there were many standing in a crowded house.—First and last the triumph was Mahler's."

—W. B. CHASE, N. Y. Times

"The work made a far better impression on the present reviewer than when it was done in New York last November by the same orchestra and conductor. The audience, too, seemed deeply interested last week and gave eloquent applause to the music and its vivid and colorful performance."

—MUSICAL COURIER, January 16, 1932

PHONOGRAPH-RECORDINGS

Thus far only a single symphony of Bruckner has made a complete phonograph appearance. This is the Polydor recording of the Seventh made by the Berlin Philharmonic under Jascha Horenstein before the days of improved electrical devices for good musical photography. There is, however, a rather fine Parlophone recording of the great "Te Deum" sung by the Bruckner Choir. The Scherzos of the Third and Fourth are available on H. M. V. records, that of the Fourth played by the Vienna Phlharmonic under Clemens Krauss.

Mahler's symphonies are completely unrecorded. The best of his music to be had for the phonograph is Polydor's version of the "Kindertotenlieder", beautifully sung by Heinrich Rehkemper. There exist, also, recordings of some Mahler songs.*

Good phonograph recordings furnish perhaps the most effective means of popularizing music, but unfortunately, the exclusively commercial basis upon which outstanding companies venture upon the publication of records still restricts phonographic versions of Bruckner and Mahler symphonies to mere hopes for the future. How immediate this future of realization will be depends wholly upon the frequency with which these symphonies are performed by major musical organizations; for their overwhelming impression upon the audiences has been repeatedly demonstrated beyond all doubt.

WELCOME CONCESSIONS

Urged by complaints from several musical organizations who found the performance rights of Bruckner and Mahler symphonies prohibitively expensive, the Society communicated directly with the Universal Verlag, publishers, of Vienna. Shortly after this the following gratifying announcement was made by the Associated Music Publishers, American representatives of the European establishment:

Charges for rights of performance of Bruckner's works have been removed.

Charges for rights of performance of Mahler's works have been reduced fifty percent.

Charges for rental of Bruckner material have been reduced fifty percent.

Members of the Bruckner Society are entitled to a reduction of twenty-five per cent from the list price of miniature scores and piano arrangements of Bruckner and Mahler works. These can be obtained by writing to the Associated Music Publishers, 25 West 45th Street, New York."

*Records mentioned above are obtainable at The Gramophone Shop, 18 East 48th Street, N. Y.

THE BRUCKNER SOCIETY OF AMERICA

DR. MARTIN G. DUMLER, M. M., Hon. Chairman

HONORARY COMMITTEE

Dr. Emanuel de Marnay Baruch
Dr. Martin G. Dumler
Otto H. Kahn
Ludwig Vogelstein

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

James P. Dunn
Frances Grant
Frederick W. Jones
Gabriel Engel
Frederick Betz
Ernst Lert
Dr. Henry T. Fleck
George R. Marek
Robert G. Grey
Joachim H. Meyer
Max Smith

HONORARY MEMBERS

Artur Bodanzky
Lawrence Gilman
Percy Goetschius
Eugene Goossens
Henry Hadley
Willem van Hoogstraten
Erich Kleiber
Serge Koussevitzky
A. Walter Kramer
Leonard Liebling
Compton Mackenzie
Margaret Matzenauer
Willem Mengelberg
Egon Pollak
Fritz Reiner
Romain Rolland
Artur Rodzinski
Frederick A. Stock
Albert Stoessel
Olga Samaroff Stokowski
Arturo Toscanini
Bruno Walter

FOUNDER MEMBERS

Edwin Aderer
Major Theodore Bitterman
Prof. Franz Boas
Solton Engel
John Festeneck
Lolita Cabrera Gainsborg
Mrs. Robert G. Grey
Ella Gross
Dr. John Haynes Holmes
Mrs. Christian Holmes
Mrs. Ella M. Kronacker
Mrs. A. Lendle
Dr. Ernst Lert
Mrs. Samuel Lipman
Max Loewenthal
Mrs. Max Loewenthal
George R. Marek
Otto Munk
Mrs. Fred A. Muschenheim
Morris Nathan
Victor Neustadtl
Mrs. Otto L. Schmidt
Jack Silverstein
Clara M. Staehr
Frederic Stettenheim
Josef Stransky
Prof. H. H. L. Schulze
Marion Telva

GABRIEL ENGEL, Editor
440 West End Ave.,
[illegible]

THE LIFE OF ANTON BRUCKNER

A Monograph

By GABRIEL ENGEL

"This hand book is invaluable to the program maker or musicologist who desires to know something of the man who is said to have written the world's finest 'Te Deum'."

—Harvey Gaul, Pittsburgh Post Gazette.

"It is a sympathetic and convincing tale—well told. Not padded out with unnecessary details but giving the essentials forcefully yet not unduly controversial."

—Karleton Hackett, Chicago Post.

"Not enough is known in America or in English writing about the life of Bruckner, and this first attempt to cover the subject—is therefore most welcome, for it tells the main facts about the much misunderstood master's studies, struggles, tendencies, disappointments, and triumphs. The interesting quartet, Bruckner-Wagner-Hanslick-Brahms, come in for discussion of their association, also there are arresting passages about Muck, Mahler, Nikisch, all of them pupils of the composer who had the courage to oppose Hanslick and the simplicity to dedicate a symphony to God. A reading of Gabriel Engel's sympathetic tribute is well worth while."

—Leonard Liebling, Musical Courier

"This small volume gives a picture of the composer and an estimate of his work in clear precise language. The last chapter 'The Symphony of the Future' is of special interest."

—Joachim Meyer, Staats-Zeitung und Herold

"A convenient and timely monograph."

—Pitts Sanborn, N. Y. World-Telegram

"This monograph . . . tells in an entertaining fashion its story of the composer's long struggle for recognition and makes out an impressive case for him as the successor of Beethoven."

—Warren Storey Smith, Boston Post

The monograph can be obtained through Mr. Robert G. Grey, Secretary, 222 West 83rd Street, N. Y., or through the Roerich Press, 103rd Street and Riverside Drive, N. Y., N. Y. (Price 50 cents plus 5 cents postage.)

(In Preparation)

GUSTAV MAHLER

By GABRIEL ENGEL

From the Author's Preface:

"This biography is not an unqualified eulogy. It is the first life of Mahler written by one who cannot boast a more or less intimate personal acquaintance with him. It is, nevertheless, the first account of his life based on his collected letters, the recent publication of which has at last made available material proving him to have been a far more human and fascinating figure than the halos of sentiment cast over him by ultra-partisan German biographers will admit.—Mahler's compositions receive much the same treatment in these pages as other incidents in his life; for he lived his works, and nothing was more abhorrent to him than the guide-book explanations and programmatic rhapsodies which constitute the rather rambling method of the biographies by his countrymen.—The book is necessarily short; for it is a first word from a new point of view; yet it is no mere chronicle of dates and facts intended to preface an aesthetic discussion of the thousand and one details of nine colossal symphonies. It is primarily and almost entirely a narrative."