

Chord and Discord



THE KILENYI BRUCKNER MEDAL

BRUCKNER AND MAHLER

BY BRUNO WALTER

WHY MAHLER TOO?

BY WARREN STOREY SMITH

SOME AMERICANS DISCOVER BRUCKNER AND MAHLER

BY PHILIP GREELEY CLAPP

MAHLER AS A POTENTIAL PUBLIC FAVORITE

BY WILLIAM PARKS GRANT

TRIUMPH AND FAREWELL: Bruckner's *Eighth* and *Ninth*

BY GABRIEL ENGEL

OVERTONES

SYMPHONIC CHRONICLE

November 1940

TENTH ANNIVERSARY NUMBER

"MY TIME WILL YET COME"



THE KILENYI MAHLER MEDAL



1935 was the seventy-fifth anniversary of the birth of Gustav Mahler. 1936 marked the twenty-fifth anniversary of his death.

This splendid Exclusive Medal of Honor by the internationally famous American sculptor, Julio Kilenyi, is the Bruckner Society's proud contribution to American recognition of the Mahler significance of the years 1935 and 1936.

The Mahler Medal of Honor is awarded to conductors who accomplish most towards furthering the general appreciation of Mahler's art in the United States.



Copyright by THE BRUCKNER SOCIETY OF AMERICA, INC., 1940.



AMONG American artistic developments of recent years the rebirth of interest in the music of Bruckner and Mahler is second to none in significance. When *The Bruckner Society of America* was founded on January 4, 1931, performances of these two composers by our major musical organizations were not merely rare, but also ineffectual, because American music-lovers had no adequate approach to the proper appreciation of the art of either Bruckner or Mahler. Therefore the *Society*, having adopted as its chief aim the fulfillment of this void, published the first biographies of these composers in English and issued a magazine, *CHORD AND DISCORD*, devoted almost entirely to discussions of their works. This periodical, distributed *gratis*, is now on file in every important public and university library in the United States. Thus the everyday music-lover's interest in Bruckner and Mahler grew by leaps and bounds. For the first time candidates for degrees in music and philosophy chose Bruckner and Mahler as subjects for their theses. Encouraged by these signs, outstanding conductors now gladly programmed (as often as they could) the symphonies which they had formerly presented almost furtively, if ever, as though offering forbidden fruits. In recognition of their achievements *The Bruckner Society of America* awarded them exclusive medals of honor designed by the noted American sculptor, Julio Kilenyi. Recently the RCA Victor has published recordings of complete Bruckner and Mahler symphonies. The *Society* may now point with pride to the fine progress initiated through its organized efforts.

The first Honorary Chairman of the *Bruckner Society of America* was Harriet Bishop Lanier. As President and guiding spirit of the original *Society of the Friends of Music* she applied herself in Bruckner's behalf, bringing about a performance (the first in New York) of the master's *F Minor Mass* by that organization under the direction of that outstanding Mahler disciple, Artur Bodanzky. The performance of Mahler's *Das Lied von der Erde*, however, also scheduled by her for that season (1931-1932), was destined never to take place. She died suddenly and with her passed the *Friends of Music*, that splendid, unique body that had for many years heroically and effectively served the cause of little-known, much-neglected serious music in America.

After the death of Mrs. Lanier, Dr. Martin G. Dumler of Cincinnati, widely esteemed for his liturgical compositions, was elected Honorary Chairman and then President of the *Bruckner Society*. A life-long Bruck-

ner enthusiast, his pioneering efforts had resulted in the first American hearing of Bruckner's *F Minor Mass* as far back as July 15, 1900. In fact, Dr. Dumler himself participated as one of the singers upon that occasion. Throughout the ensuing years he devoted much of his time towards furthering the appreciation of Bruckner's music in this country. Mahler he knew personally, and he paid deepest homage from the outset to the Bohemian's genius in the fields of conducting and composition. It was largely through his instrumentality that Mahler's stupendous *Symphony of a Thousand* attained performance during the Cincinnati *May Festivals* of 1931 and 1939 under the direction of Eugene Goossens.



LIST OF SCHEDULED PERFORMANCES — Season 1940-41

BRUCKNER

- Fourth Symphony* — St. Louis Symphony, Golschmann conducting.
Eighth Symphony — Philharmonic Symphony Society of N. Y., Walter conducting; Boston Symphony, Koussevitzky conducting.

MAHLER

- Second (Resurrection) Symphony* — Boston Symphony, Koussevitzky conducting.
Das Lied von der Erde — Philharmonic Symphony Society of N. Y., Walter conducting; Cleveland Symphony, Rodzinski conducting.
Kindertotenlieder — Philadelphia Orchestra, Ormandy conducting; Enid Szan-
 tho, soloist. Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

PHILIP GREELEY CLAPP — See page 12.

GABRIEL ENGEL is a graduate of Columbia University. He was a Pulitzer Scholar. He is the author of *The Life of Anton Bruckner* and *Gustav Mahler, Song-Symphonist*. Since its inception, he has been the Editor of CHORD AND DISCORD. He has contributed to the *Encyclopedia of Music and Musicians*.

WILLIAM PARKS GRANT was born in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1910. He has a Bachelor of Music degree (with honors) from Capitol University, Columbus, Ohio, and a Master of Arts degree from Ohio State University, 1933. Mahler was the subject of his Master's Thesis. He has written articles for *Musical Courier*, *Musical Record*, *The Etude*, and CHORD AND DISCORD. He has taught in the public schools of Ohio, and is at present in the Music Department of John Tarleton Agricultural College, Stephenville, Texas. Among his compositions are a ballet, a symphony, a song-cycle, a symphonic poem, piano pieces, etc.

WARREN STOREY SMITH, born in Brookline, Massachusetts, is Music Editor of the *Boston Post*. He succeeded Olin Downes. Mr. Smith's musical compositions include orchestral and chamber music works as well as songs and piano pieces. He became a member of the faculty of Faelten Pianoforte School in Boston after his graduation from that school. He was assistant critic on the *Boston Transcript*. In 1922 he became teacher of theory and composition at the New England Conservatory.

BRUNO WALTER, the world-famous conductor, is noted for his Bruckner and Mahler interpretations. He is a disciple of Gustav Mahler. During his career he has conducted at Cologne, Hamburg, Pressburg, Berlin, London, Leipzig, Paris, New York, Los Angeles, etc. He was one of the leading conductors at the Salzburg Festivals.

Copies of CHORD AND DISCORD are available in the principal public and university libraries in the United States.

CHORD AND DISCORD

A JOURNAL OF MODERN MUSICAL PROGRESS

Published by THE BRUCKNER SOCIETY OF AMERICA, INC.

November, 1940

Vol. 2, No. 2

Bruckner and Mahler

BY BRUNO WALTER

THROUGHOUT its ten years of existence the Bruckner Society of America has striven manfully and efficiently in behalf of Bruckner and Mahler. Therefore, in connection with its decennial retrospect, I gladly respond to its plea for an expression concerning these masters. To combine propaganda for Bruckner and Mahler into a single plan is to express the conviction that the success of the one helps the other's cause, that they belong side by side because of their artistic kinship.

I should not have agreed to write about Bruckner *and* Mahler did I not regard that little word "and" highly pertinent. Its appropriateness is borne out by Mahler's own words. I often heard him call Bruckner his forerunner, asserting that his own creations followed the trail blazed by his senior master. Of course that was over forty years ago, in the days of Mahler's *Second*, the symphony which, more vividly than all his other works, reveals his affinity with Bruckner. Yet from the *Third Symphony* on, his development was marked by an ever increasing deviation from Bruckner's course. I cannot recall Mahler making the same remark during later years. Nevertheless, down to his latest works, we meet with occasional features which might be called Brucknerian. Thus it is worth while attaining a clear idea of the nature and degree of their relationship.

Much has been written concerning Bruckner. To the literature on Mahler I myself have contributed a book. Yet (as far as I know) a comparative study of Bruckner and Mahler is still to be made. Therefore I shall attempt in these comments to measure their relationship, to thrash out the features which unite and separate them. We shall find them alike in many important respects, but different, even opposite, in others of not less consequence. We shall find them so related, that understanding the one includes a certain degree of access to the other; yet so different, that affection for the one may seem consistent with total inaccessibility to the other. Certainly, to understand and love both requires a very complex musical disposition and an unusually broad spiritual span.

My comparison cannot limit itself to details of actual musical crea-

tion. The spiritual sources of their works, the personalities of both masters, are vital to the theme of our survey, not merely because they are more amenable to words than music itself, but because the light they shed upon the music is indispensable in an essay striving for knowledge. To demonstrate really and clearly the relationships between these composers' works, there is only one way; through performances. Renouncing for once this (to me) most agreeable method, resorting to words, though aware that no bridge leads straight from them to music, I must also seek to approach my subject indirectly. The mystic connection between the inner life of a composer and his music makes it possible to discover his soul in his work. Understanding his heart lays bare an inner path to his music. Hence I hope a discussion of the individualities of both masters will enable me to fill in some of the gaps inevitable to an essay on their works alone.

WHAT JOINS THEM

Nine symphonies composed by Bruckner, as well as Mahler, in the course of about thirty years, constitute the chief product of their creative power. The nature of the themes, developments, combinations, is (in keeping with their creator's nature) truly symphonic. Remarkable coincidences in the periodic progress of their work are the decisive step from the *Third* to the *Fourth* and the change of style between the *Fourth* and *Fifth* symphonies. The *Fourth* of each opens a new field of expression scarcely glimpsed in his previous works. A warm, romantic light rises over Bruckner's hitherto heroic tone-world; a tender fairy-tale-like idyll soothes Mahler's tempestuous heart. For both the *Fifth*, with its intensification of the polyphonic style, inaugurates the period of mature mastery. The laconic idiom of restraint, the art of mere suggestion, involving economy of means and form, is not theirs. Only in a number of his songs do we find Mahler's contradictory nature master of this style too. Otherwise both share in common the urge to yield their entire beings symphonically through unrestrained expression in huge dimensions. Their symphonies resemble each other also in the special significance of the finale in the total-architecture.

Broadly spun, essentially diatonic themes and a counterpoint directly joined to the classical tradition characterize both. To be sure, Mahler's later polyphony trod more complex, daring, and highly individual paths. To both (and to them alone) the church chorale comes as naturally as the Austrian *Laendler*. The utmost solemnity and folk-like joviality constitute the opposite poles in both their natures. They are linked with the classicists, the way leads through Schubert. Their association is strengthened, among other things, by the fundamentals of their harmony, their style of cadence and (all their deviations notwithstanding) their fondness for symmetry and regular periodic structure. Even the later Mahler, no matter to what regions his formal and harmonic boldness led him, maintained clear periodic structure and a firm

tonal foundation. Both revel in broadly built climaxes, in long sustained tensions, whose release requires overwhelming sonorous dynamics.

In their gay or lyric moments we often meet with a typically Austrian charm recalling Schubert, though in Mahler's case it is frequently mixed with a Bohemian-Moravian flavor. Above all, however, Mahler and Bruckner are (though in different ways) religious beings. An essential part of their musical inspiration wells from this devotional depth. It is a main source of their thematic wealth, swaying an all-important field of expression in their works; it produces the high-water mark of their musical surf. The tonal idiom of both is devoid of eroticism. Often inclined to pathos, powerful tragedy, and emotional extremes of utterance, they attain climaxes of high ecstasy. Clear sunshine and blue sky seldom appear in the wholly un-Mediterranean atmosphere of their music. "Romantic" was the name Bruckner gave his *Fourth*. In a related sense we find Mahler's earlier work romantic, aside from his un-Brucknerian diabolism. Yet in the later works of both the romantic note is rarely sounded.

Highly characteristic seems to me one negative manifestation of their relationship. Moved by their tremendous experience of Richard Wagner to an undying faith in his art, they show (aside from a slight influence over Bruckner's instrumentation) no Wagnerian traces in their work, or at most, so few, that the impression of their complete independence is in no wise affected thereby. Their individuality was of so sturdy a nature (astonishing in that epoch of musical history) that despite the open ear, open heart, and unreserved sympathy they lent the Wagnerian siren-song, they did not succumb to it. Of course, being essentially symphonists, they were equal to the threat of the dramatist against their self-determination, for the inspirational sources of their creation, as well as their native urge toward formal construction, differed fundamentally from his. Neither of them felt drawn to the stage, a phenomenon particularly remarkable in the case of Mahler, whose reproductive genius for the opera, expressed through incomparable interpretations, opened new paths in that field, actually instituting a tradition. Two abortive attempts of his early youth are his sole original contributions to the theater. Otherwise he never wrote for the stage, unless we include his arrangement of Weber's "Three Pintos."

Like Bruckner he took root in absolute music, save when he drew his inspiration from poetry, as in his songs. Yet was his work really rooted in absolute music? Is his *First Symphony* (originally named "Titan" after Jean Paul's novel) with its "Funeral March in the manner of Calot," are the *Second* and *Fourth* with their vocal movements, the *Third* with its (later) suppressed sub-titles, genuine symphonic music in the Bruckner sense? Indubitably Mahler's music differs from Bruckner's in the degree of absoluteness intended. It was induced and influenced by more specific imagery, fantasy, and thought than Bruckner's music, which rose from less tangible, darker spiritual depths. But does this

really involve an essential difference? Is not Beethoven's *Pastorale*, despite the "Scene at the Brook," "Rustic Festival," and "Storm," absolute symphonic music, its lesser absolute intention notwithstanding?

Let us conjure up the basic process of musical creation. The composer suddenly has a musical idea. Where there existed apparently nothing before, save perhaps a mood, an image, there is, all at once, music. A theme is present, a motive. Now the shaping hand of the composer grasps it, unfolding and guiding its trend. Fresh ideas come streaming in. Whether or not more definite imagery plays a role in the creative process, the decisive factors governing the result remain the "grace" of basic musical creation and the power of symphonic construction. That "grace" and that power were granted Mahler, as well as Bruckner. Therefore, despite the thoughts and visions that influenced his creation, he also took root in absolute music.

After all, do we know whether Bruckner, or for that matter even Mozart was not visited by imagery and thoughts during the creative process, or, whether many of their ideas, looming up out of the subconscious, did not take turnings over some conscious path, thereby acquiring more vivid coloring and more subjective character? In Goethe's *Elective Affinities* the image of Otilie fills Eduard's eyes during a conjugal meeting with his wife Charlotte, while the latter beholds the captain's image. Though the offspring of this union bore external traces of these wandering visions, it was nevertheless the child of Eduard and Charlotte, sprung from their natural union. Deep mystery surrounds the genesis and pure music may result, despite the influence of extra-musical ideas upon the act of generation. Yet if the composer's intention is really descriptive, i.e., if he makes the music the means of portraying an idea or image, then, of course, he has himself blocked the path to pure music.

To Mahler as well as Bruckner music never was the means of expressing something, but rather the end itself. He never disregarded its inherent principles for the sake of expression. It was the element in which both masters lived, impelled by their nature toward symphonic construction. Mahler's enchanted creative night was filled with violently changing dream-forms; Bruckner's was dominated by a single lofty vision. Since Bruckner (so far as I know) had, until his death in 1896, acquired no acquaintance with Mahler's work, whereas the latter was well versed in Bruckner's art, it remains to be considered whether it was not this influence, acting only upon the younger composer, that aroused the impression of the kinship felt by Mahler himself. Without a certain relationship, however, no influence can be exerted. Moreover, Mahler's individual tonal language reveals no sign of dependence, whether similarity or reminiscence. Yet we find in one of his main works, the *Second*, indications of a deeper, essential kinship and meet with occasional "Bruckner" characteristics down to Mahler's very last creations. Nevertheless he was as little dependent upon Bruckner as Brahms upon Schu-

mann, many of whose "characteristics" haunt the work of Brahms. To both Bruckner-Mahler may be applied the Faust-verdict concerning Byron-Euphorion: to each of them was granted "a song his very own," i.e., originality.

WHAT DIVIDES THEM

Bruckner's nine symphonies are purely instrumental works. Mahler, on the other hand, enlists words and the human voice for his *Second*, *Third*, *Fourth*, and *Eighth*. Besides the symphonies Bruckner composed three *Masses*, the *Te Deum*, the *150th Psalm*, smaller devotional vocal works, and (to my knowledge) two male choruses. Of an entirely different stamp was Mahler's non-symphonic creation. He wrote *Das Klagende Lied*, set to his own narrative poem; the four-part song cycle *Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen*, the words also by himself; songs with piano accompaniment and with verses from *Des Knaben Wunderhorn*; during a later period, orchestral songs set to poems by Rueckert, among them the *Kindertotenlieder* cycle; and finally his most personal confession, *Das Lied von der Erde*, with verses by the Chinese poet Li-Tai-Po. We see Bruckner, therefore, aside from his symphonies, concentrated almost entirely upon sacred texts, while Mahler is inspired by highly varied fields of poetic expression. In his symphonies, *Das Urlicht* from *Des Knaben Wunderhorn* and Klopstock's "Resurrection Ode" furnished him with the solemn affirmative close of his *Second*, Nietzsche's *Midnight* yielded the questing, foreboding fourth movement and verses from *Des Knaben Wunderhorn* the answering fifth movement of the *Third*. From the same collection Mahler chose a poem of child-like faith to give symbolical expression to his own hope of celestial life. In the *Eighth* the hymn "Veni Creator Spiritus" and the closing scenes of *Faust* constitute his confessions of faith.

Thus the record of his vocal creations is at the same time a clue to the story of his heart. It tells of his struggles toward God, through discovery and renewed quest, through ever higher intuitions and loftier yearnings. Yet over this dominant note, the "Ostinato" of his life, resound many other tones, defined by accompanying verses: Love and death, lansquenet life and a spectral world, the joy of life and its woe, humor and despair, savage defiance and final resignation, all these find individual and convincing expression in his musical eloquence. If I wished to present the difference between the two masters in the shortest imaginable formula, I would say (conscious of the exaggeration of such a summary): at bottom Bruckner's spirit was repose, Mahler's unrest. With Bruckner the most impassioned movement has a foundation of certainty; not even Mahler's inmost depths remain undisturbed. Bruckner's scope of expression is unlimited, though it has but few main subdivisions; with Mahler these are prodigal in number, embracing all lights and shades of a weird diabolism, a humorous buffoonery, even resorting to the eccentric and banal, besides countless expressive nuances ranging

from childlike tenderness to chaotic eruption. His heartfelt, folk-like themes are as Mahlerian as his sardonic cacophonies, whose lightning apparitions render all the darker the night of his musical landscape. Mahler's noble peace and solemnity, his lofty transfiguration are the fruits of conquest; with Bruckner they are innate gifts. Bruckner's musical message stems from the sphere of the saints; in Mahler speaks the impassioned prophet. He is ever renewing the battle, ending in mild resignation, while Bruckner's tone-world radiates unshakable, consoling affirmation.

We find, as already stated, the inexhaustible wealth of the Bruckner music spread over a correspondingly boundless, though in itself not highly varied realm of expression, for which the two verbal directions, "feierlich" (solemnly) and "innig" (heartfelt), most often employed by him, almost sufficed, were it not for the richly differentiated *scherzi* that remind us of the wealth of the humoristic external ornaments of impressive Gothic cathedrals. Even Bruckner's orchestra undergoes scarcely any change. With the *Seventh* he adds the Wagnerian tubas, in the *Eighth* the harp, but he does not alter his instrumental methods as such. Beginning with the *Fifth* the character of his harmony and polyphony no longer varies, though (to be sure) it is sufficiently rich and inspired to require no change.

Mahler renewed himself "from head to toe" with each symphony: the *First*, his "Werther," as I once named it; the *Second*, a kind of "Requiem"; the *Third*, which one might be tempted to call a pantheistic hymn; the *Fourth*, a fairy-tale *idyll*. From the *Fifth* to the *Seventh* imagery and ideas yield to absolute-musical intentions. Even though each of these three symphonies has its own individual atmosphere, they stand considerably closer to each other in style and general content than the widely separated first four. They share in common a musically more complex, polyphonically more profound idiom, richer in combinations, imparting a new, stronger impression of Mahler's varied emotional life. The human voice is the main instrument in the *Eighth*. A magnificent, specifically choral polyphony determines the style of the hymn-like first movement, while in the Faust-scenes the composer adapts his musical idiom to the Goethe-word and the demands of lyric singableness through a sort of simplification. In *Das Lied von der Erde* we meet with still another Mahler, inaugurating a third creative period, with a new manner of composition and orchestration. On this highest plane is born the *Ninth*, the mighty symphonic presentation of the spiritual sphere of *Das Lied von der Erde*. The sketches toward a *Tenth* bring to a sudden end this sharply defined course of creative evolution, the outstanding feature of which was its rich differentiation. This applies also (as already stated) to his instrumentation. An inborn, extremely delicate sense of sound, an ear open to orchestral possibilities lead, at the beck of expression and clarity, to unique mastery over the orchestra. From wealth of color and charm of sound to an objective exposition of his in-

creasingly complex polyphony, this is the path Mahler's orchestral technique, changed and intensified by the increasing demands of each work, had to travel.

Each orchestral song, from the very earliest, reveals an individual instrumental combination, mainly of an amazing economy. The symphonies, with the exception of the *Fourth*, are inhabited by orchestral masses over which an unbounded tonal fantasy holds sway. In contrast to Bruckner he was compelled to struggle ceaselessly for the solution of orchestral problems, increasing with each new work. In this respect he always felt himself, as he complained to me, "a beginner."

The great stress in Bruckner's music rests upon the idea, in Mahler's upon the symphonic elaboration of the idea involving processes of forming and transforming which in the course of years scaled the highest peaks of constructive power. It is characteristic of the difference between the two composers that their opponents attack the form in Bruckner's, the substance in Mahler's work. I can understand these objections to some extent without, however, acquiescing in them. From Schenker comes this charming thought: that "even a little bouquet of flowers requires some order (guiding lines) to make it possible for the eye to encompass it at a glance," i.e., to see it as a bouquet. "Form" is such order, premeditated, organic association, complete, strict unity. Our classic literature contains matchless examples of organic unity. Yet we have art works of undoubtedly highest value (I mention Goethe's *Faust* as the most significant instance) the genesis of which resisted this strict organic unity of form, gaining more in richness thereby than they lost in lucidity. I confess that for many years, despite my love for Bruckner's tonal language and his wonderful melodies, despite my happiness in his inspirations, I felt somewhat confused by his apparent formlessness, his unrestrained, luxurious prodigality. This confusion disappeared as soon as I began performing him. Without difficulty I achieved that identification with his work which is the foundation of every authentic and apparently authentic interpretation. Now, since I have long felt deeply at home in his realm, since his form no longer seems strange to me, I believe that access to him is open to everyone who approaches him with the awe due a true creator. His super-dimensions, his surrender to every fresh inspiration and new, interesting turning, sometimes not drawn with compelling musical logic from what has gone before, nor united to what follows, his abrupt pauses and resumptions: all this may just as well indicate a defect in constructive power as an individual concept of symphony. Even though he may not follow a strictly planned path to his goal, he takes us over ways strewn with abundant riches, affording us views of constantly varying delight.

Mahler's striving for form succeeded in bringing transparent unity to the huge dimensions of his symphonies. His was a conscious effort towards order. All his singularities of mood, his excesses of passions, his outpourings of the heart are seized and united according to a plan dic-

tated by his sovereign sense of form. He once told me that, because of the pressure of time (his duties as director left him only the summer months for composing) he may perhaps not have been, at times, sufficiently critical of the quality of an idea, but that he had never permitted himself the slightest leniency in the matter of form. Yet the objection to his thematic art finds no corroboration in this confession, for that objection refers, as far as I know, only to so-called "banalities," i.e., intentional ironic turns, meant to be humorous and dependent for acceptance or rejection upon the listener's capacity for humor. It is not in these that Mahler perceived a deficient quality. He referred to a few transitional lyrics in later works, which struck him as perhaps not select enough, though they would scarcely disturb anyone's enjoyment of the gigantic whole.

The relative beauty of themes and the value of musical ideas cannot be a subject for discussion. I limit myself to the declaration that, after life-long occupation with his works, Mahler's musical substance seems to me essentially music, powerful and individual throughout, beautiful when he strives for beauty, graceful when he strives for charm, melancholy when for sorrow, etc. In short it was truly the material suited to the rearing of such mighty structures, and worthy of the sublime feelings it served to express. Mahler was, like Bruckner, the bearer of a transcendental mission, a spiritual sage and guide, master of an inspired tonal language enriched and enhanced by himself. The tongues of both had, like that of Isaiah, been touched and consecrated by the fiery coal of the altar of the Lord and the threefold "Sanctus" of the seraphim was the inmost meaning of their message.

THE PERSONALITIES

The favor of personal acquaintance with Bruckner was not granted me, but that Vienna, into the musical life of which I entered as a young conductor, was still full of the most lively memories of him. I came in touch with "Bruckner circles," which abundantly supplemented Mahler's narratives of his own Bruckner-experiences. I gathered from reports of pupils and friends of the master, from numerous anecdotes, so vivid a picture of his personality, his atmosphere, his mode of life, his conversation, his habits and eccentricities, that I feel as if I had known him thoroughly. One drastic difference between Bruckner and Mahler struck me even then: no feature in Bruckner's personal make-up reflected the greatness and sublimity of his music, while Mahler's person was in full harmony with his work. What a contrast in the very appearance of the two masters! Gustav Mahler's lean figure, his narrow, longish face, the unusually high, sloping forehead beneath jet-black hair, eyes which betrayed the inner flame, the ascetic mouth, his strange, irregular gait — these impressed one as the incarnation of the diabolical conductor Johann Kreisler, the famed musical self-reflecting creation of the poet E. T. A. Hoffmann. Anton Bruckner's short, corpulent, com-

fortable figure, his quiet, easy manner contrast as strongly as possible with such romantic appearance. But upon the drab body is set the head of a Roman Caesar, which might be described as majestic, were it not for the touch of meekness and shyness about the eyes and mouth, giving the lie to the commanding brow and nose.

As might be expected from their contrasting exteriors the two men themselves differed. Bruckner was a retiring, awkward, childishly naive being, whose almost primitive ingenuousness and simplicity was mixed with a generous portion of rustic cunning. He spoke the unrefined Upper-Austrian dialect of the provincial and remained the countryman in appearance, clothing, speech, and carriage till the end, even though he lived in Vienna, a world-metropolis, for decades. His conversation never betrayed reading, whether literature or poetry, nor any interest in scientific matters. The broad domains of the intellectual did not attract him. Unless music was the topic he turned his conversation to the narrow vicissitudes and happenings of every-day existence. Nevertheless his personality must have been attractive, for almost all reports agree upon the peculiar fascination exerted by his naivete, piety, homely simplicity, and modesty, bordering at times on servility, as borne out by many of his letters. I explain this attractive power of his strange personality to myself as due to the radiance of his lofty, godly soul, the splendor of his musical genius glimmering through his unpretending homeliness. If his presence could hardly be felt as "interesting," it was heartwarming, yes, uplifting.

It was entirely otherwise with Mahler, who was as impressive in life as in his works. Wherever he appeared his exciting personality swayed everything. In his presence the most secure became insecure. His fascinating conversation was alive with an amazingly wide culture reflecting a world of intellectual interests and an uncommon capacity for swift, keen thinking and expression. Nothing of importance ever thought, accomplished, or created by man was foreign to him. His philosophically trained mind, his fiery soul grasped and assimilated the rich, nourishing intellectual diet without which so Faustian a being could not exist, yet which could as little satiate or appease him as it had Faust. A firm consciousness of God that knew no wavering filled Bruckner's heart. His deep piety, his faithful Catholicism dominated his life, even though it is rather his work that reveals the true greatness of his faith and his relationship to God. Not only his *Masses*, his *Te Deum*, his devotional choral works, but his symphonies also (and these before all) sprang from this fundamental religious feeling that swayed Bruckner's entire spirit. He did not have to struggle toward God; he believed. Mahler sought God. He searched in himself, in Nature, in the messages of poets and thinkers. He strove for steadfastness while he swung between assurance and doubt. Midst the thousand-fold, often chaotic impressions of world and life he tried to find the ruling prime thought, the transcendental meaning. From his Faustian urge for knowledge,

from his commotion by the misery of life, from his presentiment of ultimate harmony stemmed the spiritual agitation which poured from him in the shape of music. Change characterized Mahler's life; constancy Bruckner's. In a certain sense this is also true of their work. Bruckner sang of his God and for his God, Who ever and unalterably occupied his soul. Mahler struggled toward Him. Not constancy, but change ruled his inner life, hence also his music.

Thus their work and their nature were in many respects akin, in many at variance. Yet both belong to that wide, august circle of friends who never abandon us to languish in grief or solitude, but offer us solace in all pain. Theirs is a precious legacy that for all time belongs to us. Those friends are always present. Their spirits dwell in our book-chests, music-cabinets, in our memory, at our beck and call day and night. Our two masters have long since been received into this circle because they continue the work which the great musicians of the past have left. Great was the difference between the two, as I have shown; but conjure up one and the other is not very distant. Along with Bruckner's music (aside from the described more concrete connections) there vibrates a secret Mahlerian undertone, just as in Mahler's work some intangible element is reminiscent of Bruckner. From this intuition of their transcendental kinship it is clearly permissible to speak of "Bruckner and Mahler"; therefore it is possible that, despite the differences in their natures, despite the very incompatibility of important features of their work, my unqualified and unlimited love can belong to them both.



PHILIP GREELEY CLAPP AWARDED KILENYI BRUCKNER MEDAL OF HONOR

After a performance of Bruckner's *Romantic* by the State University of Iowa Orchestra, Iowa City, Iowa, under the direction of Philip Greeley Clapp on February 28, the Kilenyi Bruckner Medal of Honor was presented to Professor Clapp, Head of the Music Department, by Dr. Earl E. Harper, Director of Fine Arts, on behalf of the Society in recognition of Clapp's long continued effort to create a greater interest in and appreciation of Bruckner's music in the U. S. A. Clapp, a Bostonian by birth, conducted the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra during Kunwald's illness in 1913. His works include the tone poems *Norge* and *A Song of Youth*, Symphony in E Minor (played by the Boston Symphony) the orchestral prelude *In Summer* (performed by the St. Louis Symphony), Symphony in E Flat (performed by the Boston Symphony) songs, etc. He wrote a number of essays and reviews on Bruckner and Mahler in the *Boston Transcript* and lectured on the works of these composers before professional groups and in the classroom. The performance of Bruckner's *Fourth* was the first performance of a complete Bruckner symphony by a university orchestra in the U. S. This season Professor Clapp plans to include Bruckner's *Seventh* and possibly the *Fifth* as well as Mahler's *Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen* on his programs.

LIEDER EINES FAHRENDEN GESELLEN IN DENVER

According to John C. Kendel (*Musical America*, issue of May 10, 1940) Mahler's *Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen* "made a distinct impression on the audience." Suzanne Sten was the soloist and Fritz Mahler the guest conductor of the Denver Symphony Orchestra.

Why Mahler, Too?

BY WARREN STOREY SMITH

TWENTY years or so ago there was, generally speaking, no such musical figure as Bruckner'n'Mahler, the bicephalous composer of formidable symphonies, variously regarded with dislike, indifference and high esteem. The pairing of composers seems to be an ineradicable human or, perhaps, critical instinct. But at the close of the nineteenth century and in the first decades of the twentieth such pairing was commonly not of Bruckner and Mahler but of Brahms and Bruckner and of Mahler and Strauss. The north German was linked with the Austrian, his unwilling rival in the Vienna of the eighties and nineties, and the Bohemian with the Bavarian, as one of the outstanding representatives of the then new German school.

In his *The Symphony Since Beethoven* Felix Weingartner thus grouped them. He suggested that if Brahms and Bruckner could have been rolled into one we would have had once more a "great composer." And appraising Mahler and Strauss he was decidedly more sympathetic toward the former. In 1897 he had conducted a partial premiere (three movements out of seven) of Mahler's *Third Symphony*. Shortly afterwards he wrote, in the first edition of his twice-revised brochure: "Mahler's most striking characteristic is the remarkable breadth of his themes. . . . Another very favorable characteristic of Mahler is the thoroughly musical nature of his compositions, in spite of the programmes which he gives. He is a musician through and through." And he adds, "In many ways he is like his teacher,¹ Bruckner, only he understands better how to work with his themes and how to build up his movements" (translated by Carl Ambruster). In the light of modern critical opinion all that Weingartner has to say on Brahms and Bruckner, Mahler and Strauss is worth reading. His disparaging attitude toward Brahms was, however, considerably modified in the third edition of his work (1909).

But why the present situation? How has it come to pass that Bruckner and Mahler now need championing, while propaganda for Brahms and Strauss would be a quite superfluous endeavor? Undoubtedly, if Bruckner's far more formidable, more radical symphonies had been accepted as readily as those of his younger contemporary, it still might be "Brahms and Bruckner." And if the symphonies of Mahler had made their way as speedily as the tone poems of Strauss, these two composers would still be the Haydn and Mozart or Bach and Handel of the early twentieth century.

Brahms, as we all know, would never have labored in Bruckner's behalf, since he had scant respect for him as composer. Strauss, on the other hand, was one of the earliest supporters of Mahler. Yet regardless of the attitudes, wishes and intentions of the two men, Brahms has proved to

¹ Mahler, though a disciple of Bruckner, was never his pupil.

be Bruckner's worst enemy and Strauss has impeded a cause that, personally, he was only too glad to further. If the less perplexing symphonies of Brahms had not been ready at hand to fill a needed place in the repertory, those of Bruckner would certainly have been more eagerly investigated. And, as Leigh Henry has pointed out, the brilliant talent of Strauss blinded the world to what seemed the more sober radiance of Mahler. Furthermore, both Brahms and Strauss enjoyed the advantage of a greater terseness of utterance, and hence of an easier assimilability. Even in Strauss versus Strauss, brevity has been of assistance. We hear more *Don Juans* than *Don Quixotes* or *Domesticas*, more *Tod und Verk-lärungs* than *Heldenlebens*, and it is certainly arguable that this preference is not wholly a matter of relative merit.

And so Brahms and Mahler failed to gain ground as rapidly as their rivals, while the first World War tended to increase this disparity. In this country, of course, all four were classed as modern German composers and therefore dropped for a time from the current symphonic repertory. Brahms was the first to be restored to it and Strauss soon regained his former position, but for some time little attempt was made to rescue Bruckner and Mahler from the temporary oblivion into which they had fallen, a state of affairs partly attributable to the persistent hostility and obscurantism of certain reviewers.

In the case of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, to cite one example, Mahler's music was brought back to the repertory considerably earlier than that of Bruckner. Pierre Monteux — of all conductors — introduced Mahler's *First Symphony* to Boston in 1923, while Bruckner was not returned to Symphony Hall until six years later, when Serge Koussevitzky revived the *Eighth Symphony*, which had slumbered on the library shelves since 1909. The last few years have gone a long way to place both composers in the position they rightfully should occupy in American musical life, even though conductors and audiences still stand in need of considerable persuasion if the former are to be rescued from their inertia and timidity and the latter from their apathy and prejudice. No doubt, because of efforts already made, critical antagonism has perceptibly waned.

Thus there are plenty of superficial reasons for a Bruckner-and-Mahler society in this country. Nevertheless, the fact still remains that the two composers have more points of difference than of similarity. It is perfectly possible to hold to the one and despise the other, even though it is equally possible to like or dislike them both.

Assuming the resemblances arising from a common musical ancestry and the fact that Mahler was, in a sense, the heir of Bruckner, what have the symphonies of Bruckner and Mahler in common, outside their general largeness of design and the prevalence in both of long-spun, song-like, diatonic themes? About as much, or as little, as the men themselves. Mahler wrote self-consciously; Bruckner, instinctively. Mahler's music variously reflects his philosophic attitude toward life, his *Weltschmerz*,

pessimism and sardonic irony, his avowed escapism in the recollections of his childhood. Even his religious mysticism was something wholly distinct from Bruckner's childlike faith. In one sense or another, Mahler's instrumental music was almost always programmatic, however much he may have tried to throw the listener off the scent by asking him to hear it as music *per se*. Bruckner, on the other hand, wrote with almost no external preoccupation. His own "poetic" interpretations of his music, as in the case of the *Romantic Symphony*, the *Adagio* of the *Seventh* or the *Scherzo* of the *Eighth* were in the nature of afterthoughts, and not always especially happy ones. When Mahler uses thematic material from his songs, it is with a far more literal intent than was the case with Bruckner's symphonic borrowings from his sacred choral music in the *Adagios* of the *Second* and *Seventh*. Incidentally, in the matter of form Bruckner, for all his minor irregularities, was, as compared with Mahler, a hidebound traditionalist. Like Mozart, he was the product of one century, while Mahler, like Beethoven, straddled two.

It might even be said that in their divergence in the matter of the programme Mahler is calculated to repel the absolutist and Bruckner to attract him, that Mahler makes his greatest appeal to the listener who is only too willing to line music up with human experience. Just now that tends perhaps to narrow his audience, since abstract music is again very much in the saddle. Your neo-classicist will have much in common with Bruckner, though he may shrink from his very uncontemporary lushness and magnificence. For Bruckner's symphonies are quite as general in their implications as those of Brahms, or Schubert's *C-major*, and far more so than Beethoven's *Eroica*, *Fifth*, *Pastorale* and *Ninth*.

It was these last-named works, however, that were Mahler's points of departure. We hear the *Pastorale* in the opening of the *First Symphony* and parts of the *Third*, which was also nature music; the funeral march in the *Eroica* finds many echoes in Mahler. And of Beethoven's innovations in regard to the use of voices in the *Ninth* Mahler made the most, carrying that essentially unsymphonic procedure farther than it had ever been carried before or probably will ever be carried again. In his *Second*, *Third*, *Fourth* and *Eighth Symphonies* we find voices; solo, choral or both. Moreover, if Bruckner had written *Das Lied von der Erde* — and we can as easily imagine him writing *Pierrot Lunaire*, *Wozzeck*, or *Elektra* — would he have thought to call the work a symphony?

The man of the world and the peasant, the cosmopolite and the provincial, the man of intellect and wide reading and the man who, though lettered, was still far from learned, the man of family ties and the celibate (even though an unwilling celibate) could not in the very nature of things write the same sort of music. There is in reality no such composer as Bruckner'n'Mahler. In fact, only the English-speaking countries have ever imagined that there was.

RCA VICTOR RECORDING
BRUCKNER'S NINTH

The Austrian composer's symphonies are too seldom played in this country, and the publication of this particular symphony, in many ways his greatest, should do much to dispel the opinion still disseminated by those who refuse to recognize Bruckner's genius, that his symphonies are formless monstrosities, merely because their architectonics differ from those of Beethoven's or Brahms's.

There is unfortunately not sufficient space at my disposal to expatiate on the structural aspect of Bruckner's symphonies. This has been done in masterly fashion by Ernst Kurth in his *Bruckner*, a two-volume book of 1,350 pages, in which the ninth symphony alone is analyzed in a chapter seventy-six pages in length. The author calls attention to the Gothic character of the first movement with its stupendous principal unison theme, a theme which Lawrence Gilman in a conversation with me once admitted he considered to be the most wonderful ever conceived by any composer. The other-worldly, mysterious mood of the opening pages, which culminate in the unfolding of this cataclysmic D minor subject, are no whit inferior in inspiration to the opening pages of Beethoven's ninth symphony. However Bruckner's world was a totally different one from the German master's. He was first and last a mystic with a vision which permitted him to reveal sublimities which have led Tovey to compare his creations with "Paradise Lost."

The scherzo of the ninth symphony has been described by Kretschmar as the most "sinister, gruesome scherzo in the symphonic literature." Ernest Bloch told me long ago that he was convinced that it was the most magnificent movement of its kind, and that any composer could have been proud to affix his signature thereto. It is in the final adagio movement, however, that the symphony reaches its apex. Those commentators who can only see in Bruckner a Wagner epigone would do well to peruse Kurth's book. In reference to the opening theme of this adagio, he calls attention to the basic differences in the harmonization of Bruckner's theme from that of the "Tristan" motive from which some claim it derives. There is nothing in Bruckner's chords of the erotic intensity immanent in "Tristan"; they are on the contrary oppressive and stifling; they enmesh the melody in an anguished hold. There could have been no fourth movement to this symphony, for in this adagio we have the utterances of a man who has left all earthly thoughts behind him and has turned his gaze to celestial spheres. To have attempted a finale, with its inevitable mood of resurgence would have been unthinkable. Bruckner has taken his farewell from the world which treated him so shamefully in tones which radiate a peace which transcends any known to ordinary mortals.

JEROME D. BOHM, *Herald Tribune*

. . . The availability of the original score has roused a certain curiosity about the Austrian master; but since critical discussion and public apathy still continue in a dubious knowledge of the music itself, the present excellent recording is doubly welcome.

Bruckner is long-winded, pompous, magniloquent. Agreed: but so is Wagner. . . .

. . . In the last analysis, this is not the work of a symphonist in the Beethoven sense of the word; but Bruckner is one of the great voices of the nineteenth century, and his music cannot be brushed aside by an epithet or a yawn.

GAMA GILBERT, *New York Times*

The most interesting recent release is that, by Victor, of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony in D minor, played by the Munich Philharmonic Orchestra under Siegmund von Hausegger. . . .

There had been some talk that Bruckner was failing in his later years, but the symphony as it stands is fully as inspired as his other works. . . .

It consists of a first movement, with a long introduction, a scherzo and trio and an adagio and it is recorded on seven disks (fourteen sides). "Bruckner at his best" should be the verdict on hearing it. His scherzos are always good and this is no exception. The adagio has that nobility and simplicity which are endearing qualities of the composer. The Ninth Symphony (Loewe version) was last played by the Boston Symphony in 1914, and we should lose no more time in hearing the original. Mr. Koussevitzky, with his wonderful ear for orchestral sonorities, would have a field day with this work.

ALEXANDER WILLIAMS, *Boston Herald*

Some Americans Discover Bruckner and Mahler

BY PHILIP GREELEY CLAPP

NEW music faces peculiar risks. An author, a painter, a sculptor may communicate his ideas directly to his public; even a playwright may publish his play as a book "which he who runs may read." The composer of new music is for some time at the mercy of conductors and executants, who may vary considerably in skill but who vary little in relying upon habit rather than study in rehearsing new material. The public itself, though also habit-bound to a considerable extent, is more subject to moments of spontaneous appreciation than professional performers, whose power of sympathetic response often becomes calloused by long hours daily of grinding out rehearsals and concerts; but your musical layman is too well aware of his own naivete to relish being caught in the act of openly admiring the wrong thing, and thus is disposed to keep his real opinions about a new piece to himself pending a verdict from the critics, whose capacity for musical enjoyment is even more jaded than that of professional players.

One might suppose that, since nobody could make a living by performing music or discussing it unless someone else had first provided some music to perform and discuss, a composer's status with performers, critics, and managers would be as honorable, if not as that of a mother in a maternity hospital, at least as that of a father. Actually it is not even that of a charity patient. True, the musical middlemen cannot get along without compositions to perform and discuss; but the concert repertory is already large, and they can get along quite well without your new piece or mine. The composer seeking a hearing for a new composition thus finds himself in the position of a beggar, and, if the new work is a symphony or otherwise demands time and care to rehearse and perform, he may be treated as if he had demanded a dinner when he should have whined for a cup of coffee.

Conductors, executants, and managers are not wholly to blame for this. The composer has lived with his work from conception to completion, and to him it seems clear and fairly important; to those upon whom he must depend for performance it is quite unfamiliar and consequently none too clear, while its importance has still to be demonstrated. The conductor must prepare a full programme well in a limited time, and may even then displease his public; the executants must work extra hard on unfamiliar material, and may even then displease the conductor; the manager must keep deficits within the limit of his guarantor's devotion to civic uplift. Early rehearsals often go badly, and composers have been known to be touchy. In the end "the profession" comes to feel toward composers as the early American settlers felt toward the Indians, that the only good ones are dead.

Composers, however, are a stubborn breed. Even to complete a score demands that the composer must have won many victories over himself, and the man who conquers himself is at least partly qualified to fight for his convictions. He will undoubtedly have to do so, inasmuch as what seems essential to him in shaping the individuality of his composition may seem irrelevant and objectionable to persons who hastily judge him not by what he is trying to do and say but by the measure of his conformity to what others have done and said. It is by no means true that composers are always right and their advisors always wrong; nevertheless it is true that competent composers have ruined more scores by taking advice than by rejecting it — for example, Beethoven would not yield a jot in any of his symphonies, but weakened many passages in *Fidelio* because his inexperience in the theater led him to accept the counsel of “practical” men, as the score of *Leonore* will attest; and who can fail to prefer the recently restored originals of some of Bruckner’s symphonies to the versions which his kind friends previously made available to the world? True, the composer of today’s novelty is probably no Beethoven or Bruckner, and may not even be fully competent; the best he can do is to compose as well as he can and gamble on what he finds within himself rather than upon what benevolent or malevolent people try to put into him. After all, a marksman may or may not hit his target, but his chances are at least better if he aims at it; even a dead shot has to learn by practice, while ordinarily good marksmen develop their less eminent skill by the same means.

If a composer is so fortunate as to secure a hearing, what is the chance that his work is really heard? — Even if the conductor has not noticed that there are chords of C major on pages nineteen and twenty-seven of a sixty-page score and triumphantly made a cut from the former to the latter, and even if the performance is eloquent as well as faithful, the public inevitably can derive only a vague impression from a single hearing. A book may be reread, an art gallery or a play revisited; a musical novelty is usually performed once and then let severely alone for a long time. Before the public has even a second chance to hear a composition it will have been reviewed, usually without enthusiasm, by a reviewer who himself has heard it only once — or perhaps less than once in America, where reviewers sometimes have to review two or more simultaneous concerts. It is a brave concert-goer indeed who will openly defend a composition which a critic has disparaged either by censure or condescension. What chance then has a composer or a composition in the face of perfunctory performance and reviews?

If history is evidence, he has a remarkably good chance. Most of Beethoven’s symphonies were first performed by inferior orchestras as items of interminable programmes in poorly lighted and heated halls without ventilation before very mixed audiences, and after the slaughter was over the critics made mincemeat of the *corpus delicti*, yet somehow they managed to survive. One is forced to conclude that vigorous music

has about it something provocative which draws people back to it, if only for the satisfaction of redemonstrating how bad it is. Inevitably, since good music improves upon acquaintance, it is more important to assure that it is performed from time to time than to assure perfection in the first performance. A typical orchestra and audience are likely to include between them at least a few discerning individuals who discriminate in some measure between a work and its presentation, and sooner or later some one of these is likely to concern himself to present adequately a composition which seems to him to possess merits which a garbled performance may have belied. Furthermore, the composer is probably helped rather than hindered in communicating at least a part of his musical ideas to the general public by the fact that a majority of this same public consists not of "experts" seeking to classify everything within hearing but of laymen seeking musical enjoyment; to the latter even a masterpiece, unless it is very familiar, affords an alternation of attractive and perplexing passages rather than uninterrupted delight, so a novelty may fare as well as an unfamiliar classic with this large element in any audience provided it includes some striking themes or motives and some impressive climaxes.

True, your layman is susceptible to prestige suggestion, and will tolerate fewer perplexities in the compositions of Jones than in those of an acknowledged master whom he is supposed to admire; and this type of prejudice extends to such phases as the sense of duty which impels most European laymen to reject all contemporary work by foreigners, and Americans to reject everything native. However, there are innocent tricks of the trade by which even these prejudices may be offset: for example, the composer may be present and take a bow at the production of his novelty. This is highly effective, even though some of the personalities thus exhibited might be less enjoyable at close range. Many concertgoers who could not have borne twenty-four consecutive hours in the apartment under Beethoven's, and could not have finished a half-hour's conversation with him except by leaving the room or getting thrown out, must have sensed his fundamental nobility when they saw and heard him play or conduct, even while they pitied him for his deafness and smiled at his eccentricities. In the end his presence at the performance of his works undoubtedly served to make many a casual listener remember the compositions themselves more vividly, and not a little more favorably.

Undoubtedly the fact that Bruckner and Mahler were known personalities in the communities which first heard their symphonies had much to do with keeping the latter before the public. The symphonies themselves were relatively long and difficult, involving a great deal of rehearsal time, and some of them involved the expense of extra executants and instruments not commonly used in symphonic instrumentation. The critics did not fail to point out these obvious unconventionalities, the more since they were as obviously befuddled to record the con-

tent of what they were supposed to have heard as any medical student hearing a man's heart and lungs through a stethoscope for the first time. A vocational psychologist of today might have hesitated to exhibit either personality as possessing any sure popular appeal, for Bruckner impressed many people as quaintly rustic and Mahler as cantankerous. That power and individuality which a few friends of each knew he possessed nevertheless communicated itself to the intuitive faculties of the general public, most of whom knew these men only by sight, much sooner than to the majority of those who were supposed to be well acquainted with them professionally, with the inevitable result that both men had a considerable following among the laity long before any professional colleague dared openly to admit merit in their music. Controversy still raged concerning them in their own land as long as they lived, and after they died; but this controversy, even while they were still living, did not "dispose" of them but rather "established" them — their music is still performed, and their personalities are still more vividly remembered than those of many more recent men whose vogue exemplifies the maxim, "Easy come, easy go."

If in Europe the difficulty of winning the public to appreciate a style of symphony unfamiliar because really new was partly offset by identifying the new style with personalities vivid if unconventional, in America the new style has had to gain ground more slowly because the personalities in question were not at first real to most of the musical public. Bruckner never visited America. Mahler made two visits here as a conductor; but circumstances too familiar to the readers of CHORD AND DISCORD to be retold here finished his American career before it was fairly started. First impressions of these composers, so far as the older generation of American concertgoers is concerned, are necessarily derived from certain dutiful and labored presentations of their symphonies back in the days when every American symphony orchestra had a German conductor of the pre-Wagnerian outlook. All honor to these usually ultra-conservative but artistically conscientious conductors of an earlier day that they risked their positions by giving Bruckner and Mahler at all; the fact remains that these early performances were infrequent and often dull, and thereby made few friends for Bruckner and Mahler. The generation of conductors represented by Karl Muck and Frederick Stock, on the other hand, have given eloquent performances of symphonies by both composers, and to these must be added Mahler's few performances of his own works while in this country, together with Leopold Stokowski's highly successful series of performances of Mahler's *Eighth*; but the critics and the public had already been prejudiced against the whole style by earlier and less able presentations, and the expense of augmenting orchestras for the large instrumentation demanded by some of the works was too great to permit frequent performances, with the result that a few years proved too short a time to build up a Bruckner-Mahler public before the first World War for a while di-

rected American attention elsewhere. After the War most American orchestras were directed by conductors trained in France, Italy, or Russia, and few of these at first undertook to add Bruckner or Mahler to their repertory or ours; it is a pleasure to recognize as exceptions the fine Bruckner and Mahler performances which Bruno Walter and Frederick Stock continued to present from time to time.

Meanwhile a new generation of concertgoers sits in our symphony halls, and a majority of these younger music-lovers would seem to be little acquainted with Bruckner and Mahler, or to respond but coolly to performances of works by these composers which now occur more frequently as the younger conductors have added these composers to their repertory. What chance is there that an enthusiastic Bruckner-Mahler public may develop here? The only possible answer must be in terms of opportunity for young music-lovers to become well acquainted with the works of these composers by listening to the works themselves rather than to what hostile critics or elderly concertgoers say against them. In this connection the experience of some young Americans, one born in a city with a symphony orchestra and the others several hundred miles from any musical center, may be interesting and could be typical.

John Doe was born during the late eighties in an eastern city which was justly proud of its symphony orchestra. Older members of his family were season-ticket holders, and John heard occasional concerts even while he was a very little fellow; at fifteen he was promoted to the proud status of a season-ticket holder in his own right. For years the quiet old gentleman who sat in front of him followed the programme score in hand, and John's parents told him that this same old gentleman had loaned his large collection of scores to the public library for reference. John learned to read scores, first by looking over the old gentleman's shoulder while the orchestra played, and then by going to the library and poring over the scores more slowly; later, when he could read scores fluently, he went to the library as soon as the programmes were announced and studied them before their performance. John's family were diffident about addressing the old gentleman, as he was a rather prominent personage; but the old gentleman recognized John at the library, and gave him plentiful encouragement and helpful suggestions. When John became a season-ticket holder he could already read a score like a book.

During John's first complete season the orchestra played Bruckner's *Ninth Symphony*. The performance may have been more than a bit dry, but the excellent programme notes were quite the contrary. John's inborn love of music combined with his pride in being so grown-up as to possess a season-ticket to make him the most receptive of listeners, and the statement of the programme notes that Bruckner had been misunderstood both for his music and for his devotion to Wagner, whom John already admired, made John a Bruckner enthusiast on the spot. His elders and betters said he would get over it, but he never did: certainly the elo-

quent performances of Bruckner which he later heard under Muck, Fiedler, Nikisch, Loewe, Schillings, Mengelberg, Toscanini, Stock, Walter, and many others were not calculated to cure him!

At about the time of his first exposure to Bruckner John read a review of European composers then contemporary, in which Mahler was favorably compared to Richard Strauss. John had heard a good deal of Strauss and had greatly enjoyed his music, but he had heard or read no Mahler. Fortunately the library loan collection included Mahler's *Second Symphony*, the monumental and dynamic quality of which was self-evident even without a performance; John did not physically hear the work until several years later, but he practically committed it to memory within a few months of his first glimpse of the score. When the donor of the scores discovered this, he added several more Mahler symphonies to his collection, and John was soon closely familiar with them. Two or three years later the orchestra performed Mahler's *Fifth*, with what effect upon John the reader may imagine. As the family purse could hardly finance musical pilgrimages to New York, John had to miss hearing Mahler as a conductor in this country, but later he heard him in Europe direct a number of general programmes as only he could direct, and finally he heard both the initial performances under Mahler's own baton of the colossal *Eighth*. I am afraid that John even today is as incurable a Mahler as a Bruckner addict.

In due course John found himself in charge of the music department of a Middle Western state university, and, again in due course, after developing certain other musical fields which had to be built up first, saw his way clear to broaden the scope of an already meritorious student orchestra. The student members came from very different environments from that which had enabled John to attend symphony concerts and study scores during his childhood and adolescence; in most of the communities from which these students came to the university symphony orchestras were not only out of sight and hearing, but totally out of mind, as witness the fact that few of these students had even availed themselves of the opportunity to listen to symphony concerts by radio. That this was due to lack of direction rather than lack of interest was soon demonstrated by the enthusiasm with which the really musical contingent in the student body responded to whatever musical opportunities were offered by the University. Moreover, the interest in high school bands which had followed the first World War as a matter of course had in certain of the large high schools grown into an interest in school and community orchestras; and, while most of these orchestras were wary of attempting entire symphonies even from the earlier masters, and certainly were not even talking about Bruckner and Mahler, girls and boys often came to the University with four years of fairly good fundamental routining in a pretty respectable orchestral repertory, and a good proportion of these had sufficient natural curiosity and technical foundation to study with enthusiasm and success

the standard symphonic literature from Haydn and Mozart to Brahms and Tschaikowsky.

In survey courses John had played whole Bruckner and Mahler symphonies to successive classes whose members had responded to these much-abused composers with an enthusiasm which suggested that Bruckner and Mahler today need not be difficult to hear unless prejudice derived from critical readings makes them so. By coincidence the score and parts of Bruckner's *Fourth Symphony* proved to be quickly available at a moment when many of the orchestra members were studying Bruckner in one of the survey classes; a good phonographic recording had become available shortly before this, and there had been good radio performances within the year by two leading orchestras. The moment seemed propitious to "read Bruckner's *Fourth* for practice"; and the reading went so well that, not long after, an orchestra consisting of half-a-dozen faculty members and more than ninety students presented the work in a public concert. The audience was no less enthusiastic than the performers: it should be stated here that this audience, mostly local and non-professional, had become intelligently and attentively familiar with the usual classical literature at performances by the University Symphony Orchestra and with a considerable body of modern symphonic material through annual visits of a fine professional orchestra, but had not been so preoccupied with musical affairs elsewhere as to commit the natural error of reading reviews of metropolitan concerts. Many of these lay enthusiasts listened regularly to the NBC and Philharmonic-Symphony broadcasts as well; but musical interest in the community was wholesomely individual and unorganized, with notable freedom from "study programmes" and other such second-hand attempts to learn music by garbling and gabbling. In short, a lay audience pretty well acquainted with Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, Schumann, Berlioz, Liszt, Wagner, Brahms, Tschaikowsky, and Franck, and not unacquainted with Bach and Handel on the one hand and Strauss, Debussy, Ravel, and Sibelius on the other, but quite innocent of the supposed critical "authority" of Hanslick and later pontiffs, found Bruckner's *Fourth Symphony* delightful, and a few months afterward responded warmly to his *Quintet* for strings. The inquiry is now to be heard from these same students and their public, "When will the Orchestra play some Mahler?"

And why not? — Bruckner and Mahler are logical successors of earlier masters, just as these in turn took what their predecessors left them and added their own individual contributions in terms of personality and outlook. Shakespeare to the contrary, there is probably no ethical reason why an unmusical person should concern himself with music at all; but the man who has "music in his soul" will do well to nourish his spirit by listening to what the composers have to say to him rather than to the chatter with which uncreative men try to explain and evaluate it. We justly ridicule certain governments for demanding that music shall

express political ideas, yet we permit ourselves to be bullied into supposing that it must exemplify esthetic canons, which are themselves too often only the expression of professional politics. The experience of John and his pupils at least shows that Bruckner, and probably Mahler, may awaken a spontaneous and valid response among people whose only "preparation" is that of listening to other fine music, without prior critical or academic mortification of the flesh and spirit of the sort commonly considered indispensable among the would-be elite. There seems no reason why other American music-lovers might not come honestly by a love for Bruckner and Mahler by similarly direct means — get them played by students and their teachers without the formality of critical baptism.

Of course, to state that playing and hearing a composer rather than reading about him may lead a group to appreciate him does not imply that there are no difficulties in getting acquainted with Bruckner and Mahler. For instance, there is the undoubted fact that their symphonies are longer than average. If a man feels that his own time is too valuable to devote from fifty to ninety minutes consecutively to one work by one composer, after all he has his own life to live and his own time-table to draw up and follow if he can; the chances are that, if he likes music well enough to listen to it attentively, and listens to it attentively enough to like it, he will enjoy a long symphony every now and then — as witness the recent "discovery" of Schubert's *C-major Symphony* by our public. What is most important to the layman is that he shall not try to improve his musical digestion by dosing himself with critical poison. Even so, the factor of actual rehearsal time may be formidable in the sight of a professional conductor with from six to eight hours available in which to prepare one, two, or even three full programmes; all the more reason, then, why part at least of the performances of works by our two exponents of "heavenly length" should be entrusted to such amateurs as have the time and devotion to expend in working up a good performance.

Quite clearly the economic question of extra players is more easily answered in the amateur than the professional world. In pre-War Germany and Austria extra players of good skill were usually available from the nearest army post at a very nominal fee; today in America the extra players must be paid full rates, which nobody begrudges them if they get the engagement — unfortunately it is usually simpler to play something else, in which case Bruckner and Mahler are not played and the extra men are no better off than ever. Competent amateurs may not be plentiful; but, if they are available, compositions for large orchestras may be played without pecuniary bankruptcy, at least.

Technical difficulty is not a great stumbling-block in Bruckner to an orchestra, whether professional or amateur, which has developed sufficient skill to play the Wagner preludes well. True, Bruckner often forgets that he has not an organ at his disposal, and demands of wind-players a capacity and control of breath which many amateurs cannot

develop in such scanty time for individual practice as most of them can command; "John" reports that he found it helpful to include in his orchestra a few extra wind players, not for promiscuous and noisy doubling, but to relieve the solo players altogether in ordinary *tutti* and to double with them in a few of the more overpowering climaxes. With a little help of this kind conservatively administered, players in an orchestra will find Bruckner's technical idiom not unlike that of Beethoven, Schubert, and Wagner, while the conductor will find that Bruckner "comes out" with clarity and orchestral balance considerably more readily than Brahms and certain others whose difficulties players have gladly mastered by sustained hard work.

Mahler, on the other hand, often does demand virtuoso technical powers of his players, and, in addition, demands the full exercise of these powers during the entire duration of symphonies long enough to occupy an entire programme. In the nature of things an amateur player of whatever skill has some other occupation which takes most of his time, and thus cannot devote long hours consecutively to instrumental practice; it would be much easier to find a group of amateurs who could work up and play separately each passage in a Mahler symphony than to find a group every member of which could physically carry the entire work through consecutively without getting fagged below the threshold of efficiency, simply because most of them would not be hardened by long individual practice to the point of playing at the absolute top of their bent for ninety minutes running. "John" has not yet produced a Mahler symphony with amateurs, but he has a plan. — When most of his wind players had just completed a week's trip with the University Band in which they played three concerts daily, he took advantage of their temporary condition of athletic prowess to present a two-hour programme drawn from Wagner's *Ring*. In the future he hopes to capitalize some similar opportunity in terms of one or two movements of a Mahler symphony, preferably in a year when relatively few of the principal players are due to graduate; the year following might be the auspicious moment for the entire symphony, with the advantage that some of it would have already been carefully rehearsed at the time of the first venture. Before presenting any Mahler symphony in whole or in part John plans to present some of the songs with orchestra as an introduction to Mahler's style for both orchestra and audience.

As the world is going now, the chances are that we in America must depend more and more upon ourselves to prepare and perform the music which we wish to hear. It is even possible that the world must depend upon us for a while to keep the best music of the past two centuries in actual performance anywhere. Even if this last is not the case, it is surely not too much to say that European music during recent years has tended decidedly toward the expression of disillusionment and despair under a thin defensive veneer of indifference and nonchalance; let no man blame artists who have had to endure recent living conditions

abroad if they find themselves unable or indisposed to sing the aspirations and ideals of a brighter day, yet those aspirations and ideals are as needful as ever and must be sung and sung again. That young Americans are performing the greater music of a more hopeful era because they enjoy it and thrive on it is a phenomenon too precious to be neglected, and that their instinctive and uncorrupted response to what is high and noble extends to Bruckner and Mahler is but added evidence that now is a good time to adjourn preaching, for practice has begun.

~~~~~

WNYC AND WQXR BROADCASTS

One of the noteworthy features of the WQXR broadcasts of Bruckner was the performance of Bruckner's *Quintet (Adagio)* by the Vienna Chamber Orchestra (Carl Bamberger, Conductor) on March 15th. Recordings of Bruckner and Mahler works were broadcast regularly by both stations. In February the Municipal Station put all available Bruckner and Mahler recordings on the air.

SEVITZKY BROADCASTS BRUCKNER'S "TE DEUM"

On March 20, the Indianapolis Symphony, the Indianapolis Symphonic Choir, and soloists (Fabien Sevitzyk conducting) broadcast Bruckner's *Te Deum* over C. B. S. This was the second broadcast of this work over the Columbia Broadcasting System. The orchestra, chorus, and soloists acquitted themselves well under the authoritative leadership of Sevitzyk. Additional broadcasts of Bruckner's music would certainly be welcome.

KINDERTOTENLIEDER PRESENTED BY CONVERSE CLUB CHAMBER ORCHESTRA, BOSTON, MASS.

(Stanley Hassell, Conductor; Evelyn M. Duncanson, Soloist; May 9, 1940)

... The "Kindertotenlieder" (which may be translated as "Songs on the Death of Children") were composed in 1902, inspired by verses of the poet Rueckert. As he wrote his five songs Mahler reportedly was obsessed with the thought that his own first child might die young, which actually occurred before five years had passed.

A first hearing of music so tenderly wrought, yet in an idiom of much complexity, can give one only a notion of its beauty. One's first impression is of sheer loveliness of sound, the combination of soprano and unusual orchestral tint — especially of the woodwind instruments — which Mahler favored.

Mr. Hassell must be complimented upon his enterprise in preparing music of extreme difficulty that demands a skilled and well-rehearsed orchestra and a singer of utmost musicianship.

JORDAN HALL, *Boston Globe*

"Better late than never" might well be said of the performance by the Converse Club, at Jordan Hall last evening, of Mahler's "Kindertotenlieder," freely translated as "Songs on the Death of Children," composed nearly 40 years ago and never before heard in Boston, though Dr. Koussevitzky once privately threatened a performance and Bernard Zighera actually announced one for last winter. As explained in these columns last Sunday, the performance by the Zighera Chamber Orchestra went by the board because the only available score was in use in New York at the time.

The singer last evening was Evelyn Duncanson, soprano, and of her, as of Mr. Hassell and his orchestra, it may be said that she brought to her task earnestness and devotion. . . . We are, however, greatly indebted to Mr. Hassell for Boston's introduction to a singularly moving work and one without precise parallel anywhere.

WARREN STOREY SMITH, *Boston Post*

Mahler as a Potential Public Favorite

BY WILLIAM PARKS GRANT

I.

ONE of the conspicuous musical developments of the past decade has been the emergence of the music of Sibelius from obscurity to what might be termed popularity (in the best sense of the word) and with it a corresponding favorable critical re-valuation as to its importance. In 1930 the Sibelius repertory was fairly well confined to *Valse Triste*, *Finlandia*, and the piano *Romance in D-flat*, none of which are very important or characteristic of their composer. About that time the writer heard a perfectly competent professor of music history hold up Sibelius as an example of a composer who had "died," as far as importance of output was concerned, many years previously, along with Richard Strauss and Stravinsky, of whom his opinion is still generally the accepted one.

About 1931 appeared the first of the long series of phonograph recordings of Sibelius works, originally sponsored by the Finnish Government, later continued by the Sibelius Society. The public and critical reception of these recordings was more than favorable; soon Sibelius's name became a common one on concert programmes.¹ Although Olin Downes and Cecil Gray² had long since called attention to the importance and neglect of the Finnish master, it was now admitted generally that he had surely been badly undervalued and the music-world set in to make up for lost time. Sibelius rapidly passed Stravinsky, Richard Strauss, and the late Maurice Ravel as the name most frequently mentioned as "the greatest living composer." His symphonies were accepted on an equal footing with those of Mozart, Beethoven, and Brahms. Thus Sibelius has had the satisfaction of living long enough to see himself become a "classic," and, although the Sibelius repertory still has not been thoroughly explored, quite a number of his works are now frequently heard on our concert programmes. A cynic might observe that he has become so well known that even the newspapers, the Hollywood glamour-merchants, and *The Saturday Evening Post* know who he is. During the recent Russian-Finnish War his *Finlandia* was sometimes used as a signature-piece for radio news-bulletins (with little thought of the then-existing neutrality regulations), and news items about him often appeared in the daily papers.

¹ Although whisperings about conductors who "cannot read an orchestral score" are doubtless false, it is none the less pertinent to note how frequently the first recording of certain compositions has led to epidemics of performances of those pieces throughout the country. But it would be stubborn and foolish for a conductor to refuse to use recordings in studying new pieces.

² See *A Survey of Contemporary Music* (1924), pages 184 to 193.

II.

How can we account for this sudden rise in favor and importance? Two reasons suggest themselves.

First: Sibelius's music was made *available*. Beethoven and Mozart would not be the favorites they are today if artists restricted themselves to but half-a-dozen of their works and performed these only on rare occasions. The older readers can remember how Brahms, Wagner, Debussy, and Richard Strauss surmounted public and critical indifference and hostility because performers who had faith in them *insisted* on programming their works.³ Furthermore, Sibelius's works were made available in that form which permits many hearings and adequate familiarity — namely, phonograph records. This is surely the "acid-test," and these compositions wore well.

Second: In 1930 extreme dissonance was the most conspicuous feature of modern music. The ultra-moderns considered the increasing use of dissonance synonymous with originality, the use of a common triad hopelessly old-fashioned. A music-world weary of dissonance heartily welcomed this music which was so thoroughly individual, yet not merely eccentric, different, but not painful to the ears, enigmatic, yes, but understandable eventually. It was seen that the axiom that the path of musical progress and originality was the path of more and more dissonance was a false notion, that esoteric music could quite possibly be the work of a self-conscious charlatan, rather than "a new soul-experience" or "the music of the future." The very thing the world had wanted was found right under its nose, for Sibelius's name had long been familiar. Today, partly due to the Sibelius influence, extreme dissonance is decidedly "dated."

III.

If the music of Sibelius can achieve such a conspicuous rise in favor, the music of Mahler is capable of a similar accomplishment. It could quite possibly even eclipse the music of Sibelius in popularity because it is much easier to understand. The music of Sibelius is by no means easy of approach; it is stark, bleak, cold, ascetic, and enigmatic. But the music of Mahler is warm, rich, tender, poetic, friendly, human, and open. He takes us into his confidence; we get acquainted with him quickly. Sibelius is something of a "composer's composer"; he writes primarily for himself, like Beethoven in his later works. Mahler strove to make his music easy to understand for the layman of little musical experience and in this writer's opinion, succeeded, though it should by no means be inferred that his music is shallow. Surely, if Sibelius can become such a favorite, Mahler can at least equal him.

Paradoxically the music of Sibelius, who is considered a nationalistic composer, is much farther from the folk-song than the music of Mahler,

³ Even as late as 1910 a Wagner opera with Toscanini conducting brought but a poorly-filled house at the Metropolitan. If Toscanini were to conduct *Tristan and Isolde* at the "Met" today, standing-room would be sold out well in advance.

who is looked upon as an international and eclectic composer. Taken as a whole, Sibelius's output contains more than a few compositions of trivial value — most of them fortunately obscure; Mahler's output is more uniform in value, for there are no skeletons in the Mahler closet. Sibelius is doubtless more thoroughly original, as very little of his mature music shows the influence of another composer; yet Mahler, despite frequent evidences of the influence of Wagner, Beethoven, Bruckner, Schubert, and numerous others, still leaves the final impression — which is what counts — of being different from anything one has ever heard, for his music is unconventional, zestful, and refreshing, even though it is by no means modern.⁴ It is, however, an important — though neglected — link between the Wagnerian school and certain modern schools. It is quite possible that the neglect of Mahler has increased the difficulty of our approach to the music of Schönberg and his followers.

The question may next be asked: "If Mahler's compositions were given more frequent performances, can we be positive that they would increase in public favor?" Of course, no one can say definitely, but we do know that before the Reign of Force became dominant in Europe, Mahler's popularity made excellent progress in Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Holland, due to frequent performances. That he has never had an adequate hearing in most other countries is admitted even by his critics. So it is entirely possible that some day a Mahler performance may no longer be an unusual event.

In these times of strife and turmoil, it seems only natural that music of an escape-from-reality type will be more and more in demand. One of the composers whose music is best suited to supply such a demand is Mahler. Good examples of compositions of his which are steeped in such a mood are the *Second Symphony* and the exquisite song *Ich bin der Welt abhanden gekommen*.

A hesitating conductor might point out the length of Mahler's symphonies and the large number of instruments they require and shake his head. But length has not interfered with the popularity of Beethoven's *Ninth Symphony*, Wagner's operas, Handel's *The Messiah*, or Bach's *Passions* and *B-minor Mass*. Several fairly recent best-selling novels were conspicuous because of their length; one, made into a film lasting four hours, is being shown to crowded houses. Eugene O'Neill has written some nine-act plays which have been quite successful. No, contrary to common opinion, this is not entirely an age of brevity, but even if it were, Mahler's songs, which are not at all long, would be as much favorites as those of Schubert or Brahms, if given a fair chance.

The size of Mahler's orchestras is considerably more of a bogey-man, at least in a country not yet fully recovered from the depression and

⁴ It was worthwhile to point out here that *any* music, no matter how old, which is individual and unconventional, is always viewed with favor by the enthusiasts for modern music. Much of Bach's music was far ahead of his time; hence his ever increasing importance.

where a deficit is the normal result of the orchestra season. There are two answers to this. The first is that if the demand existed strongly enough, the large resources could be supplied. Wagner's *Ring* and Strauss's *Der Rosenkavalier* are favorites in the opera-house, even though the demands are large. The second answer may be found again in Mahler's songs, all of which call for a small orchestra. Whimsical, humorous, naive, tragic, introspective, and mystic by turns, most of these lovely works were originally written with orchestral accompaniment rather than piano, as is the case with almost all other songs. How often when a fine guest artist sings *Lieder* at an orchestra concert we realize that the accompaniment, originally for piano, sounds clumsy or unidiomatic when transcribed for orchestra. For such occasions Mahler's songs, woven so perfectly and so inevitably for voice and orchestra, would surely fill a real need.



HOWARD BARLOW BROADCASTS BRUCKNER'S *NINTH*

On June 9, The Columbia Symphony Orchestra under the direction of Howard Barlow broadcast Bruckner's *Ninth* over the Columbia chain. Mr. Barlow's reading did justice to Bruckner's last symphony. Those who heard the performance probably wonder why Mr. Barlow had not broadcast a symphony by this master before, for his interpretation proved beyond any doubt that one doesn't have to be known as a world famed Bruckner specialist to catch the spirit of this devout composer's music.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA ORCHESTRA PERFORMS BRUCKNER'S *FOURTH* (February 28, 1940)

It is our privilege to report today that Doctor Clapp and his musicians brought us Anton Bruckner's Symphony No. 4 with such warmth of tonal expression, with such understanding and interest in their music that the large audience was able to glory in the beauty, the color and the inventiveness of the composer's score rather than to become restive as might easily have been the case with so lengthy a work.

If nothing more, Doctor Clapp revealed by the performance how well he has trained his musicians, and also he disclosed how completely he has brought to them an understanding of and appreciation for the work of Bruckner, a composer who certainly should be heard frequently regardless of how long his compositions may be.

RON TALLMAN, *Iowa City, Iowa, Press-Citizen*

. . . After the intermission came the seldom heard Fourth Symphony of Anton Bruckner, subtitled "Romantic." It took more than a little courage for Dr. Clapp, the orchestra's conductor, to program a Bruckner symphony, and especially to program it for a non-professional orchestra. Bruckner is easy for neither player nor listener and, while the "Romantic" is not Bruckner at his intellectual peak or most difficult, it is, nevertheless, an excellent work with which to begin an acquaintance with him.

It is not my purpose to give a detailed analysis of the "Romantic" movement by movement. Suffice it to say that the four movements of the symphony are linked together by a subtle transformation of the theme stated by the horns at the opening of the first movement. The horn call was used to suggest the pastoral, the military, the hunt, the dramatic.

And to Dr. Philip Greeley Clapp, who has labored so long in the service of Bruckner and in the developing of an orchestra which can turn out so excellent a performance of a Bruckner symphony, especial thanks.

THOMAS SCHIERREBECK, *The Daily Iowan*

Triumph and Farewell: Bruckner's *Eighth* and *Ninth*

BY GABRIEL ENGEL

THE EIGHTH

THE resourceful generation of fresh thematic life out of a few given motivated sources; the exploitation of such cumulative content through a vital polyphonic idiom; the logical federation of a whole vast symphonic structure, culminating in a grandiose climax, the welding of the principal themes of all four movements into a single choir of triumph — these are some of the salient features which, already familiar in earlier Bruckner symphonies, attain supreme representation in the *Eighth*. In this symphony, at last, is unfolded in full grandeur the sublime Christian epic of human suffering, humility, and transfiguration through Faith that had been the gist of Bruckner's symphonic problem from the outset. Not the somewhat theatrical *Third*, not even the *Fifth*, that mighty, austere utterance of his middle years had pierced so deeply into his soul for its roots. The tragic implications of the *Fifth* were mere passing clouds beneath the radiant sun that shone steadfastly over Bruckner's tetralogy in major keys. The portentous opening movement of the *Eighth* ushers in a change in his spiritual world no less drastic than the sudden sunrise of the *Romantic*. The *Fourth* seems literally to have sprung from Bruckner's ecstatic happiness in Wagner's recognition; the *Eighth*, conceived immediately after Wagner's death, is an eloquent witness of the grim impress made upon Bruckner's spirit by that event. The rude shock of the cymbal clash climaxing the "Adagio of Premonition" in the *Seventh* was more than Bruckner's realistic record of the moment of his great friend's passing; it was also the herald of a rude awakening in his own creative world, a dawn less rosy, but affording a closer, more human view of life.

Three score years had passed him by. Neglected and obscure he suddenly felt himself more alone than ever before. Yet he was remarkably robust despite his sixty years. More than ever he was impelled by the urge for symphonic creation. The contemplation of Death, looming before him like a grim spectre, and the realization of abject solitude, conjuring up the panorama of a life-long struggle against adversity, determined the tragic, introspective content of his new symphony. C-minor, the key of Beethoven's own "Fate" Symphony, the key which Bruckner himself had adopted for his *First* and *Second*, beckoned to him out of the dim past with the promise of new, more significant revelations. Even the pointed rhythmic contours of the main theme of the *First* seemed once more to bristle with life unbounded, clamoring for expression. Thus reaching back to this initial work and gathering up in the course

of retrospect the essential wealth of all the intervening symphonies, Bruckner consciously made his *Eighth* an intensely personal expression, almost his spiritual autobiography in tone.

The tragic caste and unusual length of the opening section made inadvisable the traditional juxtaposition of a correspondingly grave, extended slow movement. Faced with the same problem in his *Ninth* Beethoven had interposed a fleet, stirring *Scherzo*, thus not only relieving the spiritual tension aroused by the first movement, but also freshening the listener's mind for the further weighty revelations of the slow movement to follow. Therefore Bruckner also decided to accord his *Scherzo* second place in this symphony.

The first movement in its original form was completed in the latter part of 1884 in Vienna. Before continuing on to the *Scherzo*, Bruckner experienced a miracle. The *Adagio* of the *Seventh*, given its premiere at Leipzig on December 30, was hailed by experts as a symphonic masterpiece. At once the elderly, shy professor of counterpoint became the most discussed figure in the realm of serious music. He had long since reconciled himself to a life of obscurity, sighing, "Surely I am the most incurable idealist to go on composing at all." Nevertheless his happiness in this wholly unexpected world-fame was unbounded. He re-experienced this brilliant triumph over long prevalent adversities in the fictitious person of the typical Upper-Austrian rustic "Michel," whom he subsequently named as the hero of the *Scherzo* of the *Eighth*.

Most, if not all, of the naive "Michel" story, was a mere afterthought, much as the narrative background Bruckner attributed to the *Romantic*. The original manuscript at the point of the first entry of the "Michel" motive bears the notation "Almeroth." Carl Almeroth, a lovable, genial Upper-Austrian provincial, was one of Bruckner's dearest friends. A native of the charming little town of Steyr, where Bruckner composed the *Scherzo* and later movements of the *Eighth*, he (and not the symbolic "Michel") was the character the composer intended to embody in this lumbering, sturdy, good-natured motive. Doubtless it occurred to Bruckner afterwards that Almeroth's nature was typically Austrian. Thereupon he evolved the rest of the "Michel" background for the symphony, carrying some of the incidents over into the *Finale*. As a valid commentary on the Promethean happenings mirrored in the score it is certainly inadequate. Not unless one is willing to concede Bruckner that peculiarly Mahlerian trait of symbolism is the miraculous transformation of "Michel" to "St. Michael," allegedly celebrated in the closing triumph of the symphony, in the least plausible.

Letters Bruckner wrote to the critic Helm and the conductor Weingartner years after the work was finished are the chief authorities for the details of the "Michel" legend. Said Bruckner to the former with special reference to the *Scherzo*, "My Michel typifies the Austrian folk-spirit, the idealistic dreamer, not the German spirit, which is pure *Scherz* [jest]." Thus unconsciously, perhaps, Bruckner made his "Michel" a

self-portrait. During the years (six in all) he spent in shaping and re-shaping the symphony the figure of "Michel" virtually came alive for him. If the setting of any passage containing the "Michel" motive proved particularly troublesome he would exclaim in vexation, "Look out, Michel! Better not annoy me too much!"

A representative portion of Bruckner's commentary on the *Scherzo* follows. "Michel, pulling his cap down over his ears, presents his head, crying, 'Punch away! I can stand it.'—Wearied by the shower of buffets he would like to sleep, but recurring blows keep him awake. He swings about him desperately, scattering his enemies, and emerges victorious through his persistence.—[Trio] Michel dreams of the country—He longs for his sweetheart—He prays—Sighing, he wakes to rude reality."

In the *Finale*: "Michel, from a place of concealment, steals a view of the pomp and ceremony [The meeting of the emperors]—He is pursued and captured by Cossacks—The trombones begin a funeral chorale for him—He squirms away and, chuckling, disappears high up in the flutes."

The absence of reference to "Michel" in Bruckner's remarks concerning the first and slow movements is added proof of the synthetic nature of the whole legend. One is reminded of his inability to "remember" the imagery underlying the *Finale* of the *Romantic*. Many poetic commentaries, some perhaps even contradictory, might be adduced to "illuminate" the content of the *Eighth*. So vast is its scope that cosmic imagery alone may conjure up an even remotely adequate verbal parallel. Like Beethoven's *Eroica* it defies and beggars explanation. It stems from the inmost depths of absolute music, the arcana of which no verbal abracadabra may pierce.

The very identity of the tonic is veiled as the opening theme is first presented in lightly sketched outline against a mystic background of string-tremolo tinged with sustained horn-tone. What a strange, yet masterly theme this is! Occupying scarce three full measures in animated tempo, it consists of the four source motives of the symphony, one of them the mere rhythmic pattern formed by the union of the other three. This rhythmic profile, closely akin to that of the unison outburst at the beginning of Beethoven's *Ninth*, at once commands the centre of attention. Set forth in relief through a series of uninterrupted recurrences it is the vehicle upon which the three tonal motives grope upward through modulations to the light of definite tonality. Since all the thematic life of the symphony is drawn from these motives, they are eminently worthy of analysis. They are (a) Two tones a second apart. This interval dominates the heroic passages. (b) Two tones a sixth apart. This interval, notably prominent in Bruckner's most heartfelt inspirations, governs those particularly expressive moments of the *Trio* (*Scherzo*), *Adagio*, and *Finale* given over to songs of yearning. (c) A lyric group of five closely-knit tones, the chief melodic element of the first theme-group and the source of numerous subsequent passages

filled with tender ecstasy. The first movement, *Adagio*, and *Finale* close with this motive. (d) The rhythmic framing of *a*, *b*, and *c*, already described. To the relentless persistence of this grim motive is due in great measure the deeply tragic undertone of the opening movement. Especially impressive is its appearance as pure rhythm (on a monotone in the brass) at the last climax of this section, the passage Bruckner aptly named "Death's Annunciation."

The lyric motive (*c*), at first the sole melodic phrase, at once spreads its wings. Inverted and augmented it bursts into flight, preparing the atmosphere for the "Bruckner Rhythm" (that irregular combination of two plus three quarter-beats particularly characterizing many of Bruckner's thematic ideas after the *Romantic*). Descending in a stream of impassioned phrases this first predominately melodic expression of the symphony resolves in a graceful cadence midst imitative echoes (woodwind) bearing the motive's original rhythmic contour.

The mode of thematic structure in this opening group, aside from the vastly richer motivated sources of the later work, is essentially that of the *Romantic*, a steadily rising edifice of uniform theme-blocks. Furthermore, this process in the *Eighth* goes on in a highly dramatic atmosphere. Levi, the great conductor who pronounced this work "the crown of nineteenth century music," was the first to recognize the perfect centralization of the gigantic framework embracing a world of subtle and delicate details of construction. Wellesz, an unexcelled authority of our own day, choosing the opening theme-group of the *Romantic* and Brahms' *Third*, has shown the superior sensitivity of Bruckner's symphonic creative process over that of his German contemporary. How much greater a disparity could he have shown between them had he chosen Bruckner's immeasurably more masterly *Eighth*!

In the *Romantic* the advent of "Bruckner Rhythm" is sudden, spontaneous. In the *Eighth* it is heralded in advance. We glimpse its profile in the course of the opening theme-group. When it emerges full-blown, shaping the pure lyricism of the second group (song-group), it calls for no intellectual readjustment on the listener's part. The preparation, however, was not of the traditional "bridge" variety, but a new sort of process, resulting from the self-evolving dynamism inherent in the motive *c*.

The second theme-group is a song of ardent aspiration, its nobility precluding all eroticism. Anxious questions rising from the strings receive only partially reassuring answers in the less impassioned woodwind voices. Lingerings sighs of doubt, skilfully drawn from an inversion of the song-theme, are stilled by the air of trust and solace spread by a fresh melodic structure previously unheard. Thus the intellectual factors swaying the first theme-group have been balanced by their emotional counterparts dominating the second.

There is an additional feature in the human make-up which determines man's heroic nature: the will — the spiritual force that makes

for human tragedy or triumph, depending on the degree in which its possession invokes resistance to adverse, destructive influences. This heroic element is the ruling quality of the third theme-group. A restless, staccato counterpoint in the strings provides the background for an increasingly animated interchange between horns and woodwind. Energetic motives, derived from the preceding theme-groups, enhance the power of the ensuing string-unison, striving upward toward a great climax by chromatic stages. Another striking motive, a broad downward-leaping seventh in trumpets and woodwind, adds to the growing agitation. Trumpet fanfares, obvious heralds of heroism are merely corroborative proof of the militant nature of this last group, bringing the exposition of the themes to a stirring conclusion.

The development section presents the titanic conflict of the three main factors: the mind, the heart, the will. The logical unfolding of such a struggle involves a climax of inextricably united elements, rendering ineffectual a traditional recapitulation of separate theme-groups. The air of suspense, mounting steadily through the violent encounters unfolded during the extended development, is maintained unabated throughout the recapitulation. Not until the last climax, at the very threshold of the *Coda*, is there a moment of relief, and then only a sombre one, described by the composer as the "ticking of the clock of Death." This intensification of suspense until the end is a formal doctrine already effectively formulated in earlier Bruckner symphonies, but never so convincingly as in the *Eighth*.

Two summits stand out along the rising skyline of the development. The first, the product of united thematic elements of the first two theme-groups, is finally scaled by means of a grandiose combination of these elements in inversion and augmentation. The second, attained just before the *Coda*, is that realistically dramatic moment which Bruckner in a new moment of foreboding, happily not realized until more than a decade later, described as his own "Death's Annunciation." The stark profile of the opening theme, grimly bereft of all musical quality save pulse, is a vivid tonal portrayal of the inexorable pounding of Fate upon Life's door. What avails it to continue the despairing struggle against a force beside which the united strainings (development section) of mind (first theme-group), heart (second theme-group) and will (third theme-group) sink to pigmied insignificance? The *Coda*, an epilogue of utter resignation, presents a sudden contrast, intensifying the tragic implications underlying the whole movement.

The *Scherzo*, like all these lighter, fleet-footed Bruckner movements in triple-rhythm, presents no formal problem. In a mystic atmosphere of whispered-string-tremoli pierced by horn-tone, the celebrated "Michel" motive (already discussed) lumbers good-humoredly into the changed, rustic foreground. Inverted the motive becomes still more droll. "Michel is sleepy," explained Bruckner. A delicious bit of instrumental realism is the stinging effect of plucked strings combined with humming, bee-

like horn-tones, portraying the rude manner in which "Michel's" sleep is disturbed by unpleasant outer influences. The *Trio*, in double rhythm (two-four) is to some extent "Michel's" *Traumerei*, filled with his daydreams of his rustic homeland. Is it not Bruckner's own dream of longing, reaching back from the imprisoning huddle of the metropolis, the home forced upon him by circumstances, to the wooded, mountainous freedom of his native Upper Austria? Fragments of yearning, folk-like strains, conjure up passing visions of the scenes of his childhood. The occasional arpeggiated voice of the harp, most rarely heard in Bruckner's orchestral family, intensifies the nostalgia of "Michel's" daydreams.

Three motives combine to produce the opening theme of the *Adagio*, the wonderful movement which arose, said Bruckner, "from looking too deep into the eyes of a girl." The first, a long-drawn sigh, reflecting yearning, and the second, a broad, diatonic descent, reflecting devout humility, form a question answered by the third, an upward mounting broken major-triad, bright with the promise of splendors about to be revealed. This sublime slow movement, the longest in symphonic literature, rises to unprecedented heights of devotional ecstasy over which the celestial voice of the harp hovers like a halo.

Upon a syncopated background of softly pulsing strings over a tonic organ-point of twenty measures, is unfolded the heartfelt initial melody. So naturally have familiar motivated elements been fused into this new melodic line that their presence, readily identifiable, nevertheless makes the impression of complete spontaneity. Out of an atmosphere of restrained melancholy, the latent depth of its pathos betrayed alone by the impassioned accents of the violin G-string's upper range, the prayerful theme mounts steadily, merging with the vision of splendor (referred to as the third motive). There follows now a song of fervent gratitude, a most natural supplement of the foregoing melody. Unmistakable in their inmost Brucknerian quality are the hymnlike fragments of chorale characterizing this passage. Ecstatic harp tones radiate from its melodic summit.

In the second theme-group the impassioned yearning and the devotional fervor dominating the two themes of the preceding group, respectively, are fused into an ardent song of hopeful longing. Against a background literally trembling with portentous expectation (string-tremoli) the full tuba choir proclaims the promise of Eternity. Again a hymnlike utterance, a resetting of the first part of this group, is the soul's grateful response to the message from Above. A brief interlude in triple rhythm prepares the scene for the return of the initial theme.

The restatement of themes already set forth, inevitable to symphonic form, is nowhere a severer test of the composer's resourcefulness than in the *Adagio*. Here, where the spirit of song must hold undisputed sway, the license that is the spice of the development section in sonata form is out of place. Certainly an atmosphere of deep contemplation and communion is ill-suited to the swift dramatic changes common to symphonic

first and last movements. Yet the necessary restatement of themes in the *Adagio* (in the manner of the classicists), the most skilful, elaborate ornamentation notwithstanding, involves some sacrifice of content to formal convenience. This was one of the vital weaknesses of traditional symphonic structure to the betterment of which Bruckner earnestly applied himself from the outset. No further evidence of his success in this respect is needed than the fact that his three last *Adagios*, the most extended slow movements in existence, nevertheless maintain the listener's interest so well throughout that they are universally recognized as great masterpieces. How Bruckner was able to accomplish this mighty feat can hardly be explained by emphasizing the richly varied motivation of his broad-winged themes. To point to the life-long, unswerving devotion to the grammar and poetry of polyphony that made it possible for him to recombine and reshape motives into thematic structures of constantly fresh interest is to advance a fact which, however, fails to pierce the essential truth, the inscrutable working of genius itself.

In the first restatement of the opening theme the bright, answering portion is intentionally omitted. The motives of yearning are reared to a tremendous climax, as though the whole cosmos were appealing for salvation. A world of subtle polyphonic detail is heralded by the echoing horn that follows closely upon the main melodic line. Reshaped and recombined the already familiar motives attain richer significance, revealing glimpses of loftier summits yet to be scaled by the indomitable spirit.

For the final restatement, embodying the triumph of the spirit, is reserved the thorough exploitation of the motive of splendor, thus far intentionally omitted. Here the horn fanfare of the first movement is reborn in a more heroic guise, unmistakably reminiscent of the Siegfried-theme. Bruckner explained this as a tribute to his great friend Wagner, as yet scarcely cold in his grave. The very Heavens seem to open to the overwhelming climax ushered in by this remarkable passage. The *Coda*, reminiscent of the beginning, presents for the last time the initial sighing motive over a sustained organ-point on the tonic. Gone, however, is the fleeting shadow of doubt that darkened the motive's first appearance. Yet the movement ends upon a note of devout humility. Resigned, but swayed by unshakable faith in Eternity, the glories of which it has beheld in revelation, it awaits the great release, the fateful signal of the "Clock of Death."

The unlimited thematic richness of the *Finale* shows that Bruckner had steeped his soul in the motivated life of this symphony more intensely than in any preceding work. In the increased subtlety and resourcefulness of its melodic derivations from the central motives already extensively exploited in the foregoing sections it is truly the crowning movement of the symphony. Bruckner did not merely compose the *Eighth* — he lived it. An inkling of the inspired abandon with which he set down this *Finale* may be gathered from the ejaculation "Hallelu-

jahl" written in his hand at the point of climax in the manuscript marked by the simultaneous entry of the main themes of all four movements.

Some of the "Michel" storied implications of the *Finale* have already been mentioned. Even Bruckner must have realized that the transplanting of his jolly legendary character into this scene of political pomp (the meeting of Franz Josef and the Czar at Olmütz) was stretching plausibility a bit too far. Nevertheless he naively conceals "Michel" where he may view the grand ceremony. Is not this "Michel" in reality the new Bruckner — as childlike as ever, but now a world-famous musician, a public figure in Austria, proudly bearing the decoration of the emperor's own order? His worship of rank and pomp can only be understood as closely akin to his devout participation in every detail of the church ritual. The emperor was to him a temporal symbol of divinity.

The harmonic foundation of the opening bars has a transitional effect, qualifying the abrupt change from *Adagio* to *Finale* character. Motives of a warlike nature serve as the backbone of the first theme-group. Prominent among these is a regular, rhythmic stamping, like the clatter of horses' hoofs suggesting the approach of squadrons of cavalry. Impressive instrumental coloring, horns, trombones, and tubas dominating, reflects the pomp of the occasion. Jubilant fanfares herald the great triumph now in sight. The "Michel" motive, wide-awake and armed for battle, is welded to the rest, lending the thematic scene freshness and jollity.

The second or song-group, rich in chorale fragments, is characterized by an air of prayerful devotion. This religious fervor is of a more impassioned nature than that of the chorale passages of the *Adagio*. It has a more rapid tempo and a vital supporting melodic line formed by a familiar motive descending inverted. The expressive voices of the solo horn and the violins in low register lend it increased pathos.

The third theme-group presents a remarkable paradoxical combination of underlying significances. Gracious melodies filled with the promise of peace spread reassuring wings over the disturbing burden of a martial rhythm in the strings. "A weak spot," some might say, "Remember, Bruckner was an organist." One is reminded of another example of "weak" instrumentation in the *Finale* of the *Seventh* which a great conductor of our own day "improved" by the transmutation of gut to brass. There has never been an orchestral master who could speak with greater authority than Bruckner on the most appropriate tonal setting of devotional subtleties. His "weak" scoring was dictated by an unerring instinct for the true instrumental color and an abhorrence of mere effect. Perhaps the conductors who tampered with Bruckner's scores half a century ago should not be judged too unkindly. In the theatrical shadow of Wagner most became Wagnerian. Bruckner, whose unique originality none could understand, they clothed in Wagnerian garb. It is high time the practice were condemned.

The contrapuntal skill with which the development is reared to an overwhelming climax, the simultaneous union of the principal themes of all four movements, beggars description. Heroic, warlike settings of familiar themes plunge the section into mighty conflict. The din of battle mounts, subsides, and mounts again to greater heights of fury. One moment we seem to be in the very midst of battle, next we catch its echoes from the distance. Chorale fragments are hurled into the breach to maintain unimpaired the heroic spirit. All depends on its ultimate triumph. The most impressive passage of the movement is the *Coda*, the overwhelming record of that triumph. A last powerful, austere presentation of the opening theme in the trombones; an equally heroic last appearance of the "Michel" motive in broad augmentation in the trumpets; and the tonal stage for the great triumph is set. The gloom of the initial key, C-minor, has been transformed (as in that other great symphony of Fate, Beethoven's *Fifth*) to the bright splendor of C-major. Now in the utmost imaginable splendor resounds the consummately welded choir of the symphony's four principal themes, a veritable apotheosis of Bruckner's polyphonic genius, rivalling in fitness that inspired march-Finale of Beethoven's *Fifth*, the inevitable peroration of the symphony's supreme homophonic master.

THE NINTH (FAREWELL)

During the five years he devoted to the composition and revision of the *Eighth* Bruckner enjoyed unusually robust health. It was not until his sixty-fifth year, the time of his first sketches toward a *Ninth*, that the chronic trend of a dropsic condition, the dread ailment which had carried Beethoven off at the summit of his creative power, evoked the foreboding that his days were numbered.

Thereafter his existence was swayed by a single longing: to be spared just long enough to finish his *Ninth*. With the inexorable advance of the disease this longing turned to prayerful obsession, in the despairing grip of which even his awe-inspired humility towards God underwent a singular transformation. The physician who regularly attended him at the Belvedere Palace (a belated, ironic luxury which the emperor had granted him near the end) has communicated some impression of the doomed man's religious attitude. Wrote Dr. Heller, "Often, I found him on his knees in profound prayer. As it was strictly forbidden to interrupt him under these circumstances I was compelled to listen to the most curious extempore interpolations in the traditional text. He would suddenly exclaim, 'Dear God, let me get well soon; you see I need my health to finish the *Ninth*.' A fervent, triple Amen and a number of resounding thwacks with both hands upon his calves announced the conclusion of his touching appeal."

The faith which plays a paramount role in the spiritual content of the *Ninth* is beyond formal creed and ritual. Its essence is a direct kinship between man and God. Being of a universal nature it requires a

universal medium of expression. This alone explains the almost total absence in the *Ninth* of Bruckner's characteristic chorale idiom.

Far more apt a name for this symphony is "Farewell" than "Unfinished," for when the last note of the *Adagio* has died away there remains no expectation of further revelations to come. Those familiar with this close only in the Wagnerized "Loewe" version may regard such a view sceptically. There Bruckner's intention has undergone a drastic change echoing the end of *Parsifal*, its air of resignation suggesting a sinking back to earth. In the original manuscript Bruckner's *Adagio* is marked by no such descent. Ascending ever higher it merges in an ecstasy of affirmation with Eternity. Though the futile, tortured strivings of his last hours to formulate a suitable *Finale* show that Bruckner himself considered the symphony unfinished, posterity has come to view its three movements as a consummate framework for one of the noblest, most inspiring revelations in tone.

The very opening bars present a synopsis of the symphony's content. Brooding contemplation of the ultimate mystery, Death and the Hereafter, is suggested in this celebrated passage. Like a solemn chant is the initial motive, softly intoned by a choir of eight horns against a portentous background (tremolo). The grimness of its sombre rhythm is accentuated by hollow, choked trumpet-tones. Its mournful pathos midst austere majesty suggests man's last backward glance from the threshold of the Unknown. One terrifying instant of perplexity, and then the parting soul leaps aloft to meet the dazzling revelation of Eternity. Words cannot describe the splendor here attained by the horns, which have burst their unison fetters to form a golden halo of harmony. Descending they sound like jubilant angel voices bearing a wondrous message down to earth. Their cadence is the spreading of its gracious burden over all mankind. Such is the mystic underlying significance of this richly motivated introduction to the first theme-group. Yet the presentation of these motives has achieved a symphonic purpose far more important than the mere formulation of a musical passage, however beautiful. It has released the elemental forces from which the main theme is to evolve.

The breathless pause at this point is a vivid record of personal reaction, the reaction of one who has beheld a miracle and is completely overwhelmed. As sometimes in a poem a fresh stanza will issue from an echo of the preceding verse, so the transfigured cadence of the opening passage lingers on in the episode that follows. Enharmonic transformations on ascending planes of tone and volume reflect the growth of tremendous tension in the face of a new, awe-inspiring disclosure. Downward leaping octave-intervals and descending groups of three quarter-notes anticipate the dominant features of the approaching theme. An ominous roll in the timpani intensifies the air of agitation. The thundering unison that bursts forth with cosmic power from the summit of this dynamic interlude suggests the very Voice of the Almighty. Was not this

the Voice of the trumpet-theme of the *Third*, speaking in the same key and rhythm, though subdued and diminished by infinite distance? Yet there It was but the Herald of a miracle to come. Here It is the Revelation Itself. Thematically it consists of two parts, a gigantic descent by octave-leaps and a broad, diatonic return aloft, gradually accelerated. The whole cosmos trembles with the irresistible force of its reverberations (timpani-roll), while plucked strings sound waning fragments of familiar motives, gradually releasing the overwhelming tension.

Out of one of these fragments, a descending sixth, is born the song-theme introducing the second group, a prayerful melody in the violins, unmistakably Brucknerian in the pure spirituality of its yearning. A gracefully encircling figure enhances its charm and expressiveness. Like the corresponding song-theme of the *Seventh* it is supplemented by an inversion of itself. Directed aloft it now points the way to a summit of jubilant ecstasy, the goal of the entire prodigally polyphonic song-group.

The character of the third theme-group is without precedent in Bruckner's symphonies. Hitherto it had been the vehicle of heroic elements, destined to sustain the conflict during the development. In the *Ninth*, however, the third theme begins on a note of infinite world-weariness, a longing for ultimate peace so overwhelming that it seems to span the whole universe. Though it culminates in a song of lofty aspiration, its kinship to the main theme of the song-group is not a close one, despite a slight physical similarity due to a community of motivated sources. Spiritually the later theme is a more impassioned expression. It might even be described as a broad paraphrase of the former, conceived in free fantasy. Thus on a note of high optimism the exposition is brought to a close.

The development presents a thorough exploitation of the themes and their motives on a gigantic scale. Its plan, like that in the opening movement of the *Eighth*, is an ascent over a gradually rising range of mountain-tops to a supreme summit. Darkness, the gloom of the earthbound, hovers over the first of these peaks. Occasional glimpses of radiance caught through the clouds intensify, by contrast, the dominant gloom. The motives employed are exclusively those of the introduction to the first theme-group.

In the next paragraph the grand unison theme of the first theme-group is the center of attention. It now becomes the material for a huge tonal structure, skilfully enriched with all the resources of the polyphonic master. The austerity of this passage is enhanced by the persistent reappearance of the gloomy opening motive in march-like guise. In the overwhelming climax attained by the exploitation of these elements the formal recapitulation is outstripped and absorbed. No formal consideration can hinder the onward and upward sweep of this dynamic, self-evolving expression. There is no let-up until that barrier-like moment of supreme tension, necessitating an abrupt pause. "For breath,"

explained Bruckner. Yet these full pauses of his at such moments are so inevitable, that this laconic explanation, true enough as far as it goes, must be regarded, along with the rest of his "explanations," as but an infinitesimal formulation of a cosmic underlying truth. The awe-inspired melodic fragments which first venture to open their timid lips after this pause, like those in the opening theme-group, reflect the tremendous impressiveness attained in the foregoing passage. Thematically there is in the augmented triplets a marked resemblance to certain parts of the *Adagio* of the *Fifth*. Actually they are directly derived from the unison-theme in the first theme-group. Not before the re-entry of the song-group does the listener become conscious of the identity between the climax of the development and the recapitulation of the first theme-group, already accomplished. From the shadow of the third theme's world-weariness issues the *Coda*, the most austere passage of the whole movement. The mournful, brooding initial motive and the startling upward-leap that followed it constitute this last paragraph's thematic bases. Increasingly terrifying in its grimness, it abandons the soul at the threshold of the Unknown.

[As in the *Eighth* (and for the same reason) Bruckner placed the *Scherzo* second among the movements of the *Ninth*.]

What could be more eloquent of his spiritual fortitude than this last *Scherzo*, created in a moribund atmosphere of searing physical pain? It is from every viewpoint his most vital expression in the lighter vein, surpassing all his earlier *Scherzi* in rhythmic variety, harmonic charm, instrumental color, and perfection of welding.

"When they hear that," chuckled Bruckner, "they won't know what to make of it; but by that time I'll be in my grave." He referred to the daring features with which the movement literally bristles. The heated arguments aroused among experts by the very opening harmony proved the accuracy of his forecast. Some claimed that it was derived from the celebrated harmonic outburst at the beginning of *Tristan*. Others insisted that it was a new discovery, *sui generis* in the grammar of tonal combination. Certainly none doubted the originality of its effect, framed in the unique rhythm that made it the veritable echo of Bruckner's gleeful laughter of anticipation. The source of this rhythm is in the opening theme-group of the symphony, where it appears as a supporting element in the trumpets during the grand unison theme. Its cachinnation dominates the entire movement, even the *Trio* section. There it acquires a new, taunting significance through inversion. It runs a mad, cross-country chase over every nuance of the *Scherzo*-mood from elfin playfulness to robust jollity. Alluring "Laendler" fragments burst from the spirited dance, imparting to it a distinct Upper-Austrian, folk-like flavor.

The *Trio* is a nimble, airy sequel, exploiting in lightning tempo an inverted portion of the opening scherzo-theme. A brief, witty, motive (that of the laughing rhythm inverted) dogs the heels of this whirling

creation, teasing it mercilessly as it seeks to retard its giddy flight. Irresistibly mischievous also are the singular supporting harmonies and the vivid instrumental coloring, plucked strings and solo flute venturing fleet arpeggiated interpolations. Even midst this carefree, rhythmic abandon there is a moment for pure song. A nostalgic memory of youthful bliss forever vanished finds expression in a melody of ardent yearning poignantly framed in the sorrowing voice of the oboe. The traditional return of the *Scherzo* portion rounds out the movement.

The *Adagio*, in some respects the most human as well as the most austere of Bruckner's slow movements, opens with a motive of infinite yearning midst utter loneliness. In the impassioned voices of the violins this motive, a rising minor ninth sinking back chromatically into a descending octave, seems the very essence of melancholy pathos. It suggests the weary, earth-bound soul, poised before its flight into the Unknown, putting the ultimate question, "Is Death the end?" Brooding sighs issue from its perplexed cadence, ascending insistently toward the light of Revelation. They culminate in a radiant E-major tonic harmony, a glimpse of the splendor of the Hereafter.

Portentous implications latent in the opening motives are stressed in the further exposition of this first theme-group. Terrifying in its austerity is the climax, a veritable apotheosis of the interval of the ninth. A series of boundlessly poignant outcries by the horns is answered by savagely blaring trumpet-fanfares against an orchestral background seething with agitation. This passage was significantly described by Bruckner as the "Motive of Fate." It is the symphony's most impressive embodiment of the startling upward-leap in the horns at the beginning of the first movement. There the span was but an octave, stern and inscrutable in its sharply rhythmic framework and unmixed instrumental coloring. Raised to a ninth, its eloquence enhanced by polyphonic setting, it plays an outstanding role in the thematic life of the *Adagio*. In major guise it is the exalted chorus of Fate beckoning from the gateway of Ineffable Glory.

A natural sequel to this is the ensuing, noble, placid melody which Bruckner named the "Farewell from Life." Its gravity is accentuated by a portentous roll in the timpani and a tremolo in the deepest strings. Austere chains of harmonized sixths in horns and tubas betray its unmistakable Brucknerian character. One beautiful theme follows the other in this sustained song theme-group, spreading burdens of wondrous solace, faith, and gratitude. The degree of pure lyric ecstasy here attained is matched only in the soaring section of the *Adagio* of the *Seventh*. In its sustained character, however, the singing quality of this last *Adagio* is supreme.

Until his last hour on earth Bruckner worked desperately over his futile sketches towards the *Finale*, which he was destined to abandon, a mere sphinxlike fragment. The quavering, incoherent pen-strokes on his note-paper near the end (the present writer is the proud possessor of

one of these precious pages) are eloquent of the unconquerable determination which still swayed his soul when his body had almost ceased to live and even his mind was fast merging with the super-earthly haze of mortal dissolution. Scattered words from the Lord's Prayer, decipherable among the pathetic scrawl, indicate the unshakable faith of the man in whose life and work the power of prayer had played so important a part.

Hugo Wolf was one of the last to see him alive. Though the faithful "Kathi" (Bruckner's house-keeper) told him at the door that the master was no longer rational, he begged permission to look at him once again. He tip-toed gently to the half-open door of the sick-chamber. In a simple bed, deep among a heap of pillows, lay Anton Bruckner. His face was extremely pale, his features shrunken, his lips transfigured by a smile. His gaze was fixed immovably upon the blanket which he struck rhythmically with his fearfully emaciated right hand, as though he were with his outstretched forefinger beating time to a music he alone could hear. Perhaps it was the *Finale*, which the master, already severed from all that was earthly, was taking with him to Eternity.

The American sculptor Kilenyi, when designing his celebrated Bruckner medal, was moved by the spiritual kinship between Dante and the composer to endow his conception of Bruckner's features with Dantesque character. Surely the writer may be pardoned if he carries this analogy into the realm of poetry by applying to Bruckner a portion of Michael Angelo's sonnet-tribute to Dante.

"Into the dark abyss he made his way;
Both nether worlds he saw, and in the might
Of his great soul beheld God's splendor bright,
And gave to us on earth true light of day:
Star of supremest worth with its clear ray,
Heaven's secrets he revealed to us through our dim sight,
And had for guerdon what the base world's spite
Oft gives to souls that noblest grace display."



MAHLER'S *ADAGIETTO* PERFORMED BY NEW YORK
UNIVERSITY ORCHESTRA (December 19, 1938)

I am sure you will be interested to know that the rather youthful members of our orchestra played the *Adagietto* with the utmost fervor and intensity, and that their audience was apparently deeply stirred by their rendition.

MARTIN BERNSTEIN, Associate Professor, *New York University*

GOLSCHMANN ON BRUCKNER

... After the enthusiastic response of our public both Friday and Saturday, it is difficult to understand why Bruckner is not played more often. If there was a surprise for the public, it was to discover that the supposedly very "severe" Bruckner could be so enjoyable, even at first hearing. December 5, 1939.

VLADIMIR GOLSCHMANN, Conductor, *St. Louis Symphony Orchestra.*

Overtones

BRUCKNER SYMPHONIES GETTING MORE ATTENTION

Barbirolli and Eugene Ormandy Especially to be Congratulated

BY PITTS SANBORN

The following article appeared in the New York *World-Telegram* on February 3, 1940.

Just as MacDowell's music for the piano has come in hereabouts for a sudden revival this winter, so have Bruckner's symphonies. For years Bruckner seemed to be winning the local battle against prejudice. Willem Mengelberg, Leopold Stokowski, Bruno Walter, Otto Klemperer, Arturo Toscanini were prominent conductors who led his symphonies here. Then came a lapse.

Lately however, both John Barbirolli and Eugene Ormandy have turned their attention to the eccentric Viennese composer of symphonies attaining the sanctified number of nine, and be it stated at once that Mr. Barbirolli won a particularly long feather for his conductorial cap by his sympathetic handling of the Seventh of them in its integrity.

Mr. Ormandy in the case of the Bruckner Fifth, in B-flat, a performance that to my regret I was unable to hear, did some editing. A note in the program of the visiting Philadelphia Orchestra outlined this phase:

"Mr. Ormandy plays the Fifth Symphony from a score which is, in a way, of his own editing. After Bruckner completed the work he allowed two of his followers, Franz Schalk and Ferdinand Loewe, to revise it. He was, indeed, too good-natured to say 'No' to quite drastic changes. That edition was eventually published and it is the one commonly used.

"But Bruckner, before his death [Note well, not after!], expressed a preference for his own unedited score. The original version, a few years ago, was issued by the Bruckner Society of Vienna. Mr. Ormandy has compared the two and has, for this performance, retained some of the Schalk-Loewe amendments and made various orchestral adjustments of his own where they seemed best to serve the purposes of Bruckner."

Now, the editing of Bruckner's scores is doubtless a question that only a specialist can treat of with complete authority, but, for the sake of the vast number who are not intimately acquainted with them, it may be pointed out that Bruckner, throughout much of his career, at any rate, seemed not only to acquiesce in such editing as Schalk, Loewe and Nikisch did, but actually to welcome it. As conductors those men steadily championed his works, and Schalk and Loewe, at least, had been among his devoted pupils at the Vienna Conservatory.

What, however, is more important for us than matters of pedantry

and purism is the fact that symphonic conductors in America are turning once more to Bruckner. There is something curiously anachronistic about any prejudice that lingers against his symphonies on the part of American audiences. In Austria and Germany they have been for decades as securely established as the symphonies of Beethoven and Brahms, and it seems positively comical that anybody at this date should regard them as caviar.

Naturally it is permissible to dislike one or all of them. Aphthorp used to cite a Boston man who declared he was "born hating Weber," and I have heard a man in our own town, perhaps with an echo of the Bostonian asseveration, say that he was "born hating Chopin."

And if you want more, consider in what terms Tschaikowsky in his day and Sibelius more recently have paid their respects to Wagner. Didn't Tschaikowsky observe that a ballet by Delibes was worth far more than *Der Ring des Nibelungen*?

In a letter to Mme. von Meck he speaks of the Delibes ballet *Sylvia*: "I knew it before from the piano arrangement, but in the wonderful performance of the Vienna Orchestra it completely charmed me, especially the first part. My own *Lake of Swans* is simply trash in comparison with *Sylvia*. In short, I have known nothing in the last few years that has charmed me so much except *Carmen*. Perhaps Russia and the rest of Europe will soon have a new word to say. But in Germany music is positively on the decline, and Wagner is a great representative of the decadence."

Thus, that a few persons may honestly dislike Bruckner is no excuse for assuming an ineradicable prejudice in the majority. As a matter of fact, what the majority needs to arrive at a real appreciation of Bruckner is a greater number of adequate performances. Then he will probably be accepted as frankly and freely as are Schubert and his artistic foeman, Brahms. It is positively grotesque that in the United States anyone should even think of Bruckner as a musical (or unmusical) freak.

Mr. Ormandy deserves particular thanks for setting Bruckner's Fifth before us, edited or unedited. The symphonies we are usually invited to hear are the Fourth, Seventh, Eighth and Ninth, to the neglect of the others. The Ormandy example should be followed of dipping into a neglected shoal. And, be it remarked, that to the best knowledge and belief of the present writer Bruckner's First Symphony has never so far been performed in this country at all!

NOTE: The first performances of Bruckner's *First* by a major orchestra in the United States were given by the Chicago Symphony under the direction of Frederick A. Stock on February 1 and 2, 1940.

WALTER SEES BRUCKNER AS A PROPHET

BY LOUIS BIANCOLLI

The following is part of an article published in the New York *World-Telegram* on February 10, 1940.

Mr. Walter agrees with those who call Bruckner The Fourth B. He believes in the power and uniqueness of his genius. He regards Bruckner as a prophet, a seer. He has defended him eloquently in four languages.

Tonight he takes over the NBC Symphony Orchestra for five concerts. On his program is the Romantic Symphony, No. 4, of Bruckner. Listening to Mr. Walter on Bruckner and art is post-graduate work in higher thinking. All the writer did was listen and learn the other day at the Dorset.

Mr. Walter said that Bruckner was the rare combination of peasant and prophet, that in so far as he belongs to the earth he is a peasant and in so far as he belongs to the spirit he is a prophet. Reconciling this duality in art was Bruckner's great problem.

He had to find for himself the organic form into which the dimensions of his personality would fit. For that reason we are obliged to adjust ourselves to a new form in art, a form capable of holding the enormous range of Bruckner's humanity. Which explains why it takes time and effort, years of reverent study and communion with the essence of Bruckner, for a conductor to reach full understanding.

“Bruckner is very near to my heart,” Mr. Walter said; “it took us a long time to get acquainted with each other. In fact, I can say that I began to feel at home in Bruckner only after my fiftieth year. I may add that each year I get closer to him.

“I derive personal excitement in conducting a Bruckner symphony. More than excitement; it is a kind of fulfilment. On the contrary, it does not exactly excite me. It is a sort of affirmation of so very much that is in me.”

He said Bruckner's music rests on a rock-bottom security, a childlike piety and assurance of the will of God. This made him a prophet. Inspiration gave Bruckner the language to speak his prophecy. As with every prophet, the power to feel the message and the power to speak it went hand in hand.

Mr. Walter does not regard Wagner as a prophet. Beethoven he does, in another sense. For him the great “cosmoses” in music are Bach, Beethoven, Wagner, like Shakespeare and Michelangelo in other fields. Mozart, who is also close to his heart, he calls “a saint in music.”

“People think of me as a kind of specialist in Mozart,” Mr. Walter said; “I reject that. I am just a musician. Yet in a very special way

Mozart is very dear to me. I mean his miraculous capacity to say incredibly much with incredibly small means."

He confessed he "shrinks" from the use of comparatives and superlatives in art. He refuses to regard geniuses as "greater" or "greatest." One genius can never be the measure of another, according to him. Every genius creates his own yardstick and measures himself by it.

"The question, 'What is genius?' can be answered as follows," he believes: "A creative power of such wide range that it creates a standard or criterion of its own. I might go further. With the greatest of creative minds even the individual masterpiece cannot be used as the measure of another creation of the same mind. We must not judge Wilhelm Meister by Faust or vice versa.

"The reason is that the genius is forever renewing himself. This is the determining factor. When some people expressed disappointment in the Pastoral symphony, Beethoven asked angrily, 'Did they expect another C minor? This is something entirely new.'

"One test in distinguishing talent from genius is this great and varied productivity. Each work seems a new step, a renewal of the artist, a second birth."

After the creative impulse Mr. Walter feels that it is given only to the genius to work out the original inspiration, but the impression left by the completed work of art must be one of "painless effortlessness." He is fond of quoting Nietzsche, who observed of Carmen that it was "music without sweat."

"Schiller once said that the gods put sweat before perfection," Mr. Walter recalled; "that is true. Effort and industry must go into art. But we must not feel it. The finished product must be graceful, free, natural, complete, without trace of labor. We must not see the beads of perspiration. Such is art."

REACHING FOR THE STARS

BY NORA WALN

The following is taken from Nora Waln's novel, *Reaching for the Stars*, and is published here by permission of the author and of Little, Brown & Co.

The Friends of Music had their own Singverein, an amateur choir of high artistic standard which was started in 1858; also a music school of which Hugo Wolf, Gustav Mahler, Joseph Joachim, Hans Richter, and Arthur Nikisch were pupils. Anton Bruckner was one of the teachers. The aim of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde from the day of its foundation was to make music on a grand scale. The friends of music, gathered in Vienna from every German land; made every concert while we were there an event.

The Philharmonic Orchestra gave us beautiful music. The "Musica

Viva" and "Ravag" are not forgotten. There was so much that is memorable that twenty volumes would be needed to tell about it adequately. The concerts that return most often to my mind are the following: "Missa Solennis," conducted by Toscanini; a performance of a symphonic poem, "Penthesilea," written by Hugo Wolf when he was twenty-three, given by the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde under the baton of Kabasta; the Philharmonic, led by Klemperer, first violinist Herr Rose, playing Bruckner's Fifth Symphony; and that triumph of Walter and orchestra with Gustav Mahler's magnificent composition beginning with a funeral march and ending with a joyous rondo.

In Vienna I heard such music as I had never heard before, and can never hope to hear again. This was the music at the German sunset of that day of European civilization which was called at its dawn "the Renaissance"; was known at its high noon as "the age of reason"; and moved to its twilight through "the liberal experiment." Night had fallen on Germany when we arrived there. We reached Austria while the sun was yet coloring the clouds with brilliant light.

In music, in architecture, and in the spirit of the people living there, Vienna fulfilled my dreams.

In the realm of mind and spirit, Germany was a garden of the earth. For a hundred and fifty years the stars sang to these people. Armed strife, famine, and pestilence followed in the wake of their Reformation; but when dogmatic rigidity gave way to the practice of Christian love, Johann Sebastian Bach was born to them, gifted with petic genius to distill from their pain lessons in tolerance and compassion. Beethoven composed eternal symphonies while Napoleon conquered and lost in the material world. When Disraeli was busy adding "Empress of India" to the Queen of England's titles, Liszt was arranging a choir score for Herder's "Prometheus." And through one of their number, a German-Jew, they were given *Das Lied von der Erde*—the saddest, most beautiful music with which heaven has ever blessed mankind.

SUGGESTION TO BOSTON SYMPHONY

Why Not Excerpts of Unknown Bruckner, Mahler Works?

BY WARREN STOREY SMITH

This article is a reprint from the *Boston Post* of December 3, 1939.

Those few supporters of a seemingly forlorn cause, who believe that Gustav Mahler is the most unjustly neglected of symphonists, will receive with mixed emotions the announcement that Dr. Koussevitzky will conduct at this week's Symphony Concerts the Adagio-finale from that composer's Ninth Symphony. Surely a quarter-loaf is better than none, but why is Mahler treated in a way that Brahms or Tchaikovsky would not be treated by any conductor of a symphony orchestra today?

Is it because they wrote better symphonies? In the opinion of this reviewer, they did not; but they had the sense to write shorter ones. Mahler's music possesses all the elements of popularity, save a comfortable terseness.

However, one must always be grateful for small favors, and since Dr. Koussevitzky is in a mood to play Mahler in fragments, here are some suggestions. The Second Symphony, unheard here since 1918, is a long and elaborate work, requiring in the Finale a large chorus and enlarged orchestra. The Symphony as a whole would have to be done, as Dr. Muck did it, at a special concert, but the Andante and Scherzo, two of the most delectable movements in symphonic literature, might well be performed by themselves. Mr. Stock in Chicago has been known to play the two central movements from the Seventh Symphony, a work wholly unknown here; and it would be better by far to hear the Third and Fourth piecemeal than never to hear them at all.

Again, if Mahler in sections, why not Bruckner also, since his symphonies, too, run to inordinate lengths? In Holland last summer your correspondent heard that master's Second which has not been played in Boston, although it dates back to the early '70s. The two middle movements, an Adagio of great beauty and a charming Scherzo, could easily be separated from their context, if the whole Symphony seemed impracticable in this land of impatient listeners. And any move to freshen the fast staling and constantly narrowing standard repertory should be welcomed.



BRUCKNER'S *TE DEUM* AT OBERLIN

One of the oldest singing societies in northern Ohio, the Oberlin Conservatory Musical Union, joined forces with the Oberlin Conservatory Orchestra last night at Finney Chapel for a concert under the direction of Prof. Maurice Kessler. Nearly 300 student musicians participated in the program, which featured a performance of the rarely heard "Te Deum Laudamus" of Anton Bruckner.

Here is a work of large scale and serious import which should be better known here, and probably would be, had not Bruckner's talent been somewhat eclipsed by the greater brilliance of Wagner and Brahms. Bruckner's religious and dramatic impulses seem to run parallel with the result that the more devotional this work becomes the more intense and vivid are its climaxes. The great "In te, Domine speravi" works up to one of the most powerful conclusions any work of this sort could have, and probably represents Bruckner at his best.

But if the music itself was a revelation of Bruckner's genius, the manner in which it was performed was also a revelation of the unusual competence of this group of students and of Kessler's ability as a conductor. I was prepared to find excellent musicianship in his work and sincere penetration of the music at hand. But that he could so completely communicate his mature conceptions with this student material came as a total surprise. Not only did he carry the group with him in a fluent, balanced and well-proportioned interpretation, but he obtained some dynamic shading that professionals could be proud of.

The Bruckner work came last on the program. Preceding it were the Bach Cantata based on Luther's chorale, "Ein'feste Burg ist unser Gott," and the Adagio from Bruckner's string quintet. The cantata began with a brass choir playing the chorale from the balcony in the rear of the hall. The orchestra is blessed with an unusually

large number of cellos and basses for a school organization, and this gives it gratifying solidity.

Vocal soloists were Janet Enycart and Jane Ann Edwards, sopranos; Margaret Tobias, alto; Frank Numbers, tenor; Richard Atkins and Arthur Wyman, baritones. Among the instrumentalists who did outstanding work were Robert Koff, violin; Dorothy Mudge, cello; Margaret Ruby, English horn; Gordon Jones, cemballo, and Leo Holden, organist.

HERBERT ELWELL, *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, December 11, 1939.

MY DEAR MR. GREY:

January 18, 1940.

This work as well as the Adagio from the Quintet convinced my audience completely of what I had said many times concerning Bruckner and I am going to conduct more of his works in the near future. Following our performance and specifically reflecting upon the Adagio, Dr. Ernest H. Wilkins, President of Oberlin College, wrote the enclosed poem and dedicated it to me. I think it would be appropriate to have it appear in the next number of Chord and Discord, and with this in mind, I have Dr. Wilkins' approval and his permission to send it to you.

I wish that I could tell you of the enthusiasm of my students in the Chorus and Orchestra, of their complete cooperation in this performance, of their sincerity and seriousness in helping me towards the realization of my ideal. It was an experience I shall never forget, as long as I live.

Sincerely yours, MAURICE KESSLER

Note: *Te Deum* and the *Adagio* from Bruckner's *Quintet* were performed under the direction of Mr. Maurice Kessler, at Oberlin College, on December 10, 1939.

THERE SHALL BE PEACE

There is a light that is but darkness vanished;
 There is a song released when storm is o'er;
 There is a joy that follows sorrow banished,
 As death recedes and life is life once more.
 Yet light's true fullness is in noontide splendour,
 Beauty aglow, truth wondrously revealed;
 The richest melody, now strong, now tender,
 Only the overflowing heart can yield;
 There is a joy that surges from the treasure
 Of joy found possible beyond belief,
 Beyond the bounds of all contrasting measure,
 Beyond the memory of ancient grief.
 There is a peace that is but the cessation
 Of the crashing carnage of insatiate war,
 That is but in war's absence — every nation
 Holding it's breath lest all be as before.
 There shall be peace, all casual peace transcending,
 Radiant with love and resolute for right,
 Creative, world-encircling, never ending:
 There shall be peace of joy and song and light.

Written after the performance of the Adagio of Bruckner's *String Quintet* by Dr. Ernest H. Wilkins, President Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, and dedicated to Maurice Kessler.

BRUCKNER QUINTET IN CINCINNATI

On January 7, 1940, the Bruckner *Quintet* was performed at a private musicale at the home of Mrs. Helen V. B. Wurlitzer. The Bruckner Society of America Inc. believes this to have been the first performance of the *Quintet* in Cincinnati. The performance was one that revealed a thorough understanding of the work on the part of the artists: Leo Brand, I violin; Ernst Pack, II violin; Herman J. G. Goehlich, I viola; August Loendlin, II viola; Arthur Bowne, Cello. For an encore Bruckner's *Intermezzo* was played by the same group.

NBC ORCHESTRA, WALTER CONDUCTING, BROADCAST
BRUCKNER'S *FOURTH* (February 10, 1940)

... The slow section, with its funeral rhythms, is vaguely reminiscent of Beethoven's "Eroica," as the second subject of the opening movement is reminiscent of an important theme in Schubert's B-flat piano trio. On the whole the spirit of Schubert hovers over Bruckner, even to the influence of the former's fondness for "heavenly length," and the structural looseness of his essays in sonata form. In orchestration Bruckner cannot escape, indeed he embraces, the influence of Wagner.

Mr. Walter's reading of the "Romantic" was one that compelled one's interest throughout. It was justly paced, it exploited to the full the breadth and beauty of the themes, and in the final brassy apotheosis it achieved a radiant and majestic climax. The orchestra played superbly, the horns in particular.

SAMUEL CHOTZINOFF, *New York Post*

... These were fortunate choices. Mr. Walter knows well the traditions and the psychological characteristics of these two symphonies, which stem from the Austrian territory and Austrian spirit of earlier days at the same time that they reflect the powerful individualities of their respective composers. And Mr. Walter and his orchestra appeared rarely in the vein.

The glory of the "romantic" symphony is the first movement, so long drawn out, yet packed with inspiration and of a glowing richness of musical imagery and indeed, it is "romantic"! The opening horn calls are in themselves an evocation of the romantic. Their reappearance in the later pages of the first movement and the way in which they haunt the composer's mind in fashioning certain of the motives of both the second and last parts of the work, do much to hold the entire symphony together and to give it the prevalence of mood which is implied by its popular sub-title.

... Walter was warmly welcomed by the visible audience in the studio H-8 and no doubt that welcome was echoed millions-fold by the multitudes who listened in.

OLIN DOWNES, *New York Times*

... However, the warmth of Mr. Walter's response to this gargantuan work, his feeling for the fortunate tempo in each of its four movements, gave one the impression that it was the most assimilable of his symphonies. Its themes almost aroused the pleasure of recognition as they came back, and in the intimacies of the slow movement, a conviction that the composer was actually a poet as well as aspiring to be philosopher.

IRVING KOLODIN, *New York Sun*

... The "Romantic" symphony, like the other works in this form from this still debated pen is generous in its length and not economical in its structure and its use of thematic material, but this rehearing suggested that the length is a matter of largeness of scale and thought as well as of temporal extent.

... The immanent spirit of the performance, its color and justly wrought proportion of the tone of the various participating choirs, tempi which contributed to the realization of the expressive moods of the work, were among the elements which contributed to the convincing nature of this interpretation. The music was throughout vividly revealed, in its measures of extensive lyricism, in the atmosphere of the scherzo, with its inevitable suggestions of the hunt, or in the imposing proclamation of the unison fortissimi of the brass choir.

... There was a warm ovation for the conductor after the eighteenth century work and a still more extensive one after the Bruckner symphony.

FRANCIS D. PERKINS, *New York Herald Tribune*

Bruno Walter's first appearance of the season as conductor of the NBC Symphony Orchestra's Saturday night broadcast was an outstanding feature of the week end.

Mr. Walter's program comprised two numbers, the D major Symphony, B. & H. 86, of Haydn and Bruckner's Fourth Symphony (Romantic). Though the Haydn work was read with understanding and sympathy, the great experience of the evening was the performance of the Bruckner.

For once there could be question of structural weaknesses and unmeaning repetitions. For once the listener could realize completely that Bruckner's purpose and idiom

are so distinctly his own that to attempt to estimate his work by the rules that apply, for instance, to his arch-enemy Brahms, is inept and futile.

Mr. Walter's whole heart and soul were in his exposition of the symphony, and so transporting, so other-worldly, was the result that one felt impelled to exclaim "There is only Bruckner and Bruno Walter is his prophet!"

PITTS SANBORN, *New York World-Telegram*

GUSTAV MAHLER — *LIEDER EINES FAHRENDEN GESELLEN*

Zighera Chamber Orchestra, Bernard Zighera, Conductor: Cleora Wood, Soloist. Boston, January 8, 1940.

... Another high point of the concert was the co-operation of the Boston soprano, Cleora Wood and Mr. Zighera in Gustav Mahler's "Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen." The first song, which contrasts the feelings of the rejected lover with the merry wedding music which sounds between his despairing comments, was dramatic in its effect. But the initial gaiety of "Ging heut morgen ueber's Feld" and the tragic accents of "Die zwei blauen Augen" were most sensitively and movingly conveyed by both Miss Wood and Mr. Zighera. As usual Miss Wood sang meticulously with clear tone and high pianissimi that were of rare beauty. But the care she expended on voice production by no means prevented her interpretations from being charged with emotion.

EDWARD DOWNES, *Boston Evening Transcript*

... To the writer, the high point came in the cycle "Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen" ("Songs of a Wayfarer") by Gustav Mahler. The soloist for these was the Boston soprano Cleora Wood, whose singing of them a year ago is still fresh in memory.

Mahler's originality of writing for orchestra, and his talents for contrasting voice and instruments are a distinctive characteristic of this early work. Even more important is the sheer beauty of the Mahlerian melody. So perfectly does Mme. Wood sing the music and interpret the text, it seems almost as if the songs might have been written for her.

JORDAN HALL, *Boston Globe*

... When Miss Wood first sang the Mahler songs with this group, we felt that she had penetrated to the core of both text and music. Last night she confirmed earlier impressions of her artistic approach to them. There was dramatic feeling for the text of Nos. 3 and 4 which made their performance outstanding. The audience gave Miss Wood, Mr. Zighera, and the orchestra an ovation.

Christian Science Monitor

... Mahler's pre-symphonic music shares sincerity with his longer works and has in addition great charm. The "Songs of a Wayfarer" are perfect examples of late romanticism, the kind of vocal music that found its highest expression in Hugo Wolf. In these Miss Wood was the admirable soloist and took the role of the love-sick wanderer in her stride.

ALEXANDER WILLIAMS, *Boston Herald*

PREMIERE OF BRUCKNER'S *FIRST* IN CHICAGO UNDER STOCK'S DIRECTION

February 1 and 2, 1940

More years ago than I care to estimate, I heard my first Bruckner symphony. I have forgotten which one it was. But I do recall perfectly that it was offered by the Chicago Symphony Orchestra as simply as though it were a work of Beethoven or Brahms. The elements of greatness were in it — it needed no fanfare of sensational publicity.

Through the intervening years an identical policy in the presentation of Bruckner's works has prevailed. It has resulted in a slow but thorough shaping of the attitude of music lovers towards the genius of St. Florian. In this first week of February 1940, we of Chicago may at last acknowledge fairly that we not only sense the splendor of Bruckner's *First Symphony* (heard under Dr. Stock's spirited direction for the first time in this city) but that we look forward with anticipation to future reappearances of Bruckner compositions on the programs of the Orchestra. In other words, we know now beyond peradventure, that we really like Bruckner.

MARY R. RYAN

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN SYMPHONY PERFORMS
BRUCKNER'S SEVENTH (ADAGIO)

(January 21, 1940, Hill Auditorium, Ann Arbor. Thor Johnson, Conductor)

The first performance of the day, so far as Ann Arbor is concerned, was that of the majestic slow movement from Anton Bruckner's Seventh Symphony. This movement, sometimes spoken of as funeral music, is lofty and dignified, noble and uncompromising in its treatment of sorrow. There is nothing in it of the pessimism or self-indulgent grief of the dirge; the calmness and yearning of the opening theme, the wistfulness of the lyrical second theme, are based on hope, not on resignation. The splendid sonorities which Bruckner achieves through his rich use of the low brass, alternating with the strings, are the more distinctive for the half-diatonic, half-chromatic mellowness of their coloring.

By its very breadth and spaciousness this music can easily appear dragged-out and repetitious. Mr. Johnson's conception very properly took account of the movement as a whole; he was careful to keep the music flowing, to treat it dynamically rather than to dawdle and sentimentalize over every phrase and every section. The magnificent C major climax was approached with ever-increasing intensity and overwhelmingly achieved, after which the sombre majesty of the concluding measures formed a beautifully satisfying conclusion. The response of the audience was spontaneously enthusiastic and gave evidence of a strong interest in future Bruckner performances.

WILLIAM LICHTENWANGER, Music Editor, *Ann Arbor Daily News, Michigan*

JOHN CHARLES THOMAS SINGS *LIEDER EINES FAHRENDEN GESELLEN*

... With Mr. Carroll Hollister as accompanist, Mr. Thomas sang songs by Schubert, Brahms, Mahler and Wolf. Though one may have wondered at the absence of Schumann from this good company Mr. Thomas sang Mahler's "Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen" so well that one did not mind the substitution of the still controversial symphonist for the undisputed master of German song. Richard Strauss, too, might have contributed a song or two to yesterday's list. But since the afternoon was Mr. Thomas' and not this reviewer's it behooves us to take what we can get and inquire rather into the baritone's art than his choice of material. . . .

SAMUEL CHOTZINOFF, *New York Post*, February 26, 1940.

AN INTERVIEW WITH BRUNO WALTER

The following is a portion of an article which appeared in the *New York Herald Tribune* on March 31, 1940:

One of his major offerings next winter will be Gustav Mahler's "Das Lied von der Erde," which he presented with the Philharmonic in December 1934. His programs also can be expected to include at least one symphony by Anton Bruckner of whose music Mr. Walter has long been regarded as one of the foremost interpreters. When he first came here, he recalled, in the early '20s he found that Bruckner was kind of a bogey for the general public. In the meantime, however, he has noticed a steady growth in the appreciation of the Austrian composer's music. When he conducted the fourth symphony in this season's first program with the N. B. C. Symphony Orchestra on Feb. 10, he received a remarkable amount of enthusiastic letters from radio listeners throughout the country.

Mr. Walter remembered a similar steady growth in the general appreciation of Bruckner's music in the composer's own country. A like development marked his own attitude toward Bruckner, whose interpreter, he thought, must grow old in order to gain a complete understanding of his work. "As a young man," said the conductor, "I could not get near to him. I was deeply attracted by his inspiration, but puzzled by his form. My relation to Bruckner has steadily grown; it becomes more and more close every day." He commented eloquently on the tranquility of mind expressed in Bruckner's vast musical form; his following of an inner vision rather than thinking of nervous people. He is a composer who stands solidly on his own feet, not seeking out audiences, but saying, as it were, "You must come to me."

He does not favor cutting Bruckner's symphonies, feeling that such omissions are

injurious to their form; that complete performances seem actually shorter than those abridged to save a few minutes. The interviewer recalled a similar impression made upon him by Maurice Evans's uncut production of "Hamlet." Mr. Walter also favored the composer's original versions over those edited by Ferdinand Loewe and Franz Schalk. In the adagio of the seventh symphony the original score has no percussion instruments, giving it a distinctly organlike character, but the revisers added a "criminal beat of cymbals." In the ninth symphony Loewe regarded several measures of silence merely as so much empty space, and wrote in some music.

BRUCKNER'S *QUINTET* AT FINE ARTS FESTIVAL

(UNIVERSITY OF IOWA) July 17, 1940

Music held the stage at the memorial union Tuesday evening for the third successive night of the fine arts festival as faculty and student musicians presented a well-balanced and enthusiastically received program of chamber music.

The Bruckner quintet, played by Prof. Arnold Small and David Robertson, violins, Otto Jelinek and Mrs. Julia Mueller, violas, and Prof. Hans Koebel, cello, is a sometimes vigorous, sometimes melancholy and always interesting work. In the hands of these artists its well-rounded melodies sang out brilliantly and in the moments of its less melodious portions, the musicians played with an understanding and capability that evaded the discordant aspect which the music so easily might have acquired.

Particularly appreciative was the playing of Professor Small, who handled the diversified first violin part with true artistry, giving to the music the brightness, the highlighted eminence that it required.

RON TALLMAN, *Iowa City, Iowa, Press-Citizen*



BRUCKNER CHRONOLOGY

- 1824: Born, Sept. 4, Ansfelden, Upper Austria.
- 1835-7: First systematic musical instruction (harmony and organ-playing) under J. B. Weiss, at Hoersching.
- 1837-40: Choir-boy at St. Florian.
- 1841-5: Village-schoolmaster's assistant at Windhag and Kronsdorf.
- 1845-56: Teacher at St. Florian.
- 1851: Appointed organist at St. Florian Monastery.
- 1855-61: Studied counterpoint under Simon Sechter.
- 1856-68: Cathedral organist at Linz.
- 1861-3: Studied form and instrumentation under Otto Kitzler.
- 1865: Attended world-premiere of *Tristan* (Munich); beginning of friendship with Wagner.
- 1868: Appointed professor of harmony, counterpoint, and organ-playing at Conservatory of Vienna; made Vienna permanent residence.
- 1869: Concertized in Paris and Nancy as organ virtuoso.
- 1871: Concertized in London.
- 1875: Appointed lecturer in harmony and counterpoint at University of Vienna.
- 1876: Attended world premiere of *Ring* at Bayreuth.
- 1882: Attended world premiere of *Parsifal* at Bayreuth.
- 1886: Decorated by the Emperor with the medal of the "Franz-Josef Order."
- 1890: Retired from academic duties with honorary pension.
- 1891: Granted honorary doctor's degree by University of Vienna.
- 1896: Died, Oct. 11, Vienna; burial, St. Florian.

BRUCKNER'S PRINCIPAL COMPOSITIONS

- Symphony No. 0* (D Minor) 1862-4
Overture (G Minor);
 "Study Symphony" (F Minor) 1863
I Mass (D Minor) 1864
I Symphony (C Minor) 1865-6
II Mass (E Minor) 1866
III Mass (F Minor) 1867-8
II Symphony (C Minor) 1871-2
III Symphony (D Minor) 1872 (First version)
IV Symphony (E-flat Major) 1874 (First version)
V Symphony (B-flat Major) 1875 (First version)
Quintet (F Major) 1879
VI Symphony (A Major) 1879-81
VII Symphony (E Major) 1881-3
Te Deum (C Major) 1883-4
VIII Symphony (C Minor) 1884-6 (First version)
IX Symphony (D Minor) 1891-4
150th Psalm, 1892.

BRUCKNER WORLD PREMIERES

Conductor's names in parentheses.

SYMPHONIES

- I — 1868, Linz (Bruckner) First version.
 1891, Vienna (Richter) Second version.
 II — 1873, Vienna (Bruckner) First version.
 1872, Vienna (Bruckner) Second version.
 III — 1877, Vienna (Bruckner) First version.
 1890, Vienna (Richter) Second version.
 IV — 1881, Vienna (Richter)
 V — 1894, Graz (F. Schalk)
 VI — 1883, Vienna (Jahn) Adagio and Scherzo only.
 1899, Vienna (Mahler) Complete.
 VII — 1884, Leipzig (Nikisch)
 VIII — 1892, Vienna (Richter)
 IX — 1903, Vienna (Löwe)
 Quintet — 1881, Vienna (Winkler)

MASS

- I — 1864, Linz (Bruckner)
 II — 1869, Linz (Bruckner)
 III — 1872, Vienna (Bruckner)
Te Deum — 1885, Vienna (Bruckner) without orchestra.
 1886, Vienna (Richter) with orchestra.

PIONEER BRUCKNER PERFORMANCES IN AMERICA

SYMPHONIES

- I — 1938, Brooklyn (Kosok)
 1940, Chicago (Stock)
 II — 1902, Philadelphia (Scheel)
 1903, New York and Chicago (Thomas)

- III — 1885, New York (Seidl) First published version.
1901, Chicago (Thomas) Second published version.
- IV — 1887, New York (Seidl)
1897, Chicago (Thomas)
- V — 1901, Boston (Gericke)
- VI — 1912, New York (Stransky)
- VII — 1886, Chicago, New York, Boston (Thomas)
- VIII — 1896, Chicago (Thomas)
- IX — 1904, Cincinnati and Chicago (Thomas)
- Quintet — 1899, Chicago (Spiering)

MASSES

- I — 1900, Chicago (Middelschulte)
- II — 1936, New York (Raymond Nold — Church of Saint Mary the Virgin)
- III — 1900, Cincinnati (Arthur J. H. Barbour)
1931, New York (Bodanzky)
- Te Deum — 1892, Cincinnati Festival (Thomas)

BRUCKNER ON THE AMERICAN RADIO
(First Nation-Wide Broadcasts)

- VII Symphony*: New York Philharmonic (Toscanini) Mar. 8, 1931 and Jan. 27, 1935 CBS
Boston Symphony (Koussevitzky) Mar. 7, 1936 NBC
Cleveland Orchestra (Rodzinski) Mar. 16, 1938 NBC
- V Symphony*: New York Philharmonic (Walter) Jan. 15, 1933 CBS
- VIII Symphony*: New York Philharmonic (Walter) Oct. 29, 1933 CBS
- Quintet (Adagio)*: N. Y. Philharmonic (Lange) Feb. 11, 1934 CBS
- IX Symphony* (original version, American premiere): New York Philharmonic (Klemperer) Oct. 14, 1934 CBS
- Te Deum*: Eastman School of Music (Genhart) 1937 CBS
- IV Symphony*: NBC Orchestra (Steinberg) Mar. 4, 1939 NBC
NBC Orchestra (Walter) Feb. 10, 1940 NBC



MAHLER CHRONOLOGY

- 1860: Born, July 7, Kalischt, Bohemia.
- 1866: First musical instruction (piano).
- 1875-8: Attended Conservatory of Vienna.
- 1877: Friendship with Bruckner begun.
- 1878: Arranged Bruckner's *Third* for piano. (This was the first Bruckner symphony ever published, in any form.)
- 1880: First professional employment. (Conductor Summer Theatre, Hall, Upper Austria.)
- 1881: Opera conductor at Laibach.
- 1882: Opera conductor at Olmuetz.
- 1883: Heard *Parsifal* at Bayreuth. (This was the earliest inspiration for his *Second Symphony*.)
- 1884: Opera conductor at Kassel.
- 1885: Opera conductor at Prague.
- 1886-8: Opera conductor at Leipzig.

- 1888-91: Opera conductor at Budapest.
 1891-7: Opera conductor at Hamburg.
 1892: Conductor, German Opera troupe in London.
 1897-1907: Conductor and Artistic Director at Viennese Imperial Opera.
 1902: Married Alma Maria Schindler. Children: Maria Anna, 1902-7; Anna Justina, 1904-.
 1907: Conductor at Metropolitan Opera House, N. Y.
 1908: Conductor of Philharmonic Society of N. Y. (Until shortly before his death.)
 1911: Died, May 18, at Vienna; burial at Grinzing (Viennese suburb).

MAHLER'S PRINCIPAL COMPOSITIONS

SYMPHONIES

- I in D Major ("Titan") 1888.
 II in C Minor ("Resurrection") 1894.
 III in D Minor (1896).
 IV in G Major ("Ode to Heavenly Joy") 1900.
 V in C-sharp Minor (1902).
 VI in A Minor ("Song of the Night") 1905.
 VIII in E Major ("Symphony of a Thousand") 1907.
 IX in D Major (1909).
 X (Unfinished) 1909.

SONG-CYCLES AND SONGS

- Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen (1884).
 Lieder und Gesänge aus der Jugendzeit, Part I (1885).
 Same, Parts II and III (1892).
 Kindertotenlieder (1902).
 Five Songs from Rückert (1902).
 Das Lied von der Erde (1908).

CANTATA

- Das Klagende Lied (1898).

MAHLER WORLD PREMIERES

SYMPHONIES

- I — 1889, Budapest (Mahler).
 II — 1895, Berlin (Richard Strauss) 3 movements.
 — 1895, Berlin (Mahler) Complete.
 III — 1897, Berlin (Weingartner) 3 movements.
 — 1902, Krefeld (Mahler).
 IV — 1902, Munich (Mahler).
 V — 1904, Cologne (Mahler).
 VI — 1906, Essen (Mahler).
 VII — 1908, Prague (Mahler).
 VIII — 1910, Munich (Mahler).
 IX — 1912, Vienna (Walter).

Das Lied von der Erde — 1911, Munich (Walter).

Das Klagende Lied — 1901, Vienna (Mahler).

Kindertotenlieder — 1905, Vienna (Mahler).

PIONEER MAHLER PERFORMANCES IN AMERICA

SYMPHONIES

- I — 1909, New York (Mahler).
 II — 1908, New York (Mahler).
 III — 1922, New York (Mengelberg).
 IV — 1904, New York (Damrosch).
 — 1911, New York (Mahler).
 V — 1905, Cincinnati (Gericke).
 VI — Still unperformed in America.
 VII — 1921, Chicago (Stock).
 VIII — 1916, Philadelphia (Stokowski).
 IX — 1931, Boston (Koussevitzky).
 Das Lied von der Erde — 1921, New York (Bodanzky).
 Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen — 1915, Boston (Draper).
 Das Klagende Lied — Still unperformed in America.

MAHLER ON THE AMERICAN RADIO

First Nation-Wide Broadcasts

- V Symphony*: 1932, N. Y. (Walter). — CBS
I Symphony: 1933, N. Y. (Walter).
II Symphony (2nd movement): 1934, Philadelphia (Reiner).
II Symphony (complete): 1934, Minneapolis (Ormandy).
IX Symphony: 1936, Boston (Koussevitzky). — NBC
Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen: 1940, New York (Rapee; Soloist: Jan Peerce).

RADIO CITY MUSIC HALL (ERNO RAPEE, CONDUCTOR; JAN PEERCE,
SOLOIST) BROADCASTS *LIEDER EINES FAHRENDEN GESELLEN*

On March 10 Mahler's *Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen* were sung by Jan Peerce and broadcast over a nationwide hook-up by the National Broadcasting Co. Mr. Peerce revealed a thorough understanding of the song cycle. His diction was, as always, exceptionally clear, which, though of great importance, is not one of the distinguishing characteristics of too many singers. Peerce succeeded in communicating the mood of each song to his listeners. The performance gave additional evidence not only of the singer's fine voice but the none too common attribute — intelligence. The orchestral portion was well done. Perhaps Mr. Rapee will include Mahler songs on his Sunday programs from time to time.

ADAGIO (Bruckner's *Quintet*) BROADCAST OVER WOR,
WALLENSTEIN CONDUCTING

On September 17, 1940, *Symphonic Strings* under the direction of Alfred Wallenstein broadcast the slow movement of Bruckner's *Quintet* over Station WOR. This was not the first time that Mr. Wallenstein conducted this excerpt. The rendition was so beautiful that music lovers — especially Brucknerites — cannot help but hope that Mr. Wallenstein will see fit to shorten the intervals between broadcasts of excerpts from Bruckner's works.

Symphonic Chronicle

A Record of Critical and Popular Reaction

ANTON BRUCKNER: SEVENTH SYMPHONY

St. Louis Symphony Orchestra, Vladimir Golschmann, Conductor. First performances in St. Louis, December 1 and 2, 1939.

... It was a first performance in St. Louis—although no one could say why. Bruckner's avowed Wagnerism means no more than that he knew drama was at the heart of the symphony. If Wagner's music dramas are "visualized symphony" this is "eye-blinded drama." An old story in music. All symphonists know that fact.

Not for more than twenty years has St. Louis heard any Bruckner. Mr. Golschmann's presentation might have been preluded, reasonably, by Mendelssohn's comment on his revival of Bach. What happened was that we were introduced, not to a Wagnerian, but to a Schubertian world. . . .

Out of life flow these melodies. Bruckner may be what you will, but the melodies are compelling. They make you share his strange visions, his mysticism. Frankly, he happens to be verbose, as other romantics—Wagner, Schumann, Beethoven, even. He is "long" or "long winded" to our modern ears, which have made us, more than any people of historic record, the slaves of time. No matter. Although a European and a Catholic, he is far closer in spiritual and imaginative kinship to our American Walt Whitman than to Wagner. Just as musically he is much closer to Schubert's C minor than to any of Wagner's works. . . . *Globe Democrat*

... Mr. Golschmann's chief contribution of the day was the first presentation here, in the fifty-five years of its existence, of Bruckner's Symphony No. 7 in E major. This proved a valuable addition to the repertoire and was played with the requisite sonority and drive.

Bruckner, who was a great composer who needed an editor, has been the subject of the most frenzied worship by a small but militant group of devotees. They maintain that he is the most neglected of great men, with the possible exception of Mahler. However that may be, his music is rich in invention and occasionally quite splendid in effect. . . .

Star Times

GUSTAV MAHLER—FINALE: NINTH SYMPHONY

Boston Symphony Orchestra, Serge Koussevitzky, Conductor. December 8 and 9, 1939.

... There are two sides to the question of performing isolated movements from symphonies; as a general practice it is not to be recommended. Few would pass by the pleasure of listening to the great Schubert Symphony, yet could not that masterpiece, presented at the Symphony concerts only last April, have been postponed so that all of Mahler's Ninth might be played?

Mahler's music cannot be discussed logically or calmly. Either you are emotionally stirred or you are bored. Though divorced from its context, the sublime finale made its effect yesterday. A spiritual affinity exists between the Ninth Symphony and Mahler's later, perhaps greatest composition, "The Song of the Earth." Each is "other-worldly," the voiced emotion of a tired man who welcomed an end of life, music of a transcendental radiance akin in more respects than that of mood to the last quartets and piano sonatas of Beethoven. . . .

C. W. D., Boston Globe

... Mahler is said to have had premonitions of his rapidly approaching end when at work on his Ninth Symphony and it is true that the finale of the work is steeped in a mysticism that might easily indicate a pre-occupation with another world which, to him, was becoming increasingly real. . . . He (Koussevitzky) directed the flow of Mahler's melodic inspiration with a passion and an insight that communicated the composer's vision to the audience. It was particularly in the ethereal closing pages of the work, where Mahler's music has become almost disembodied thought, that Koussevitzky cast a spell upon his listeners from which they were loathe to waken. . . .

E. D., Boston Transcript

... Since Schubert's Symphony was played at Symphony Hall no longer ago than last April and is very well known besides, and since Mahler's Symphony (as a whole or in part) had not been heard

here since the spring of 1936 and is a work that richly deserves to be better known, it would seem to have been the part of logic and reason to play the whole of this Symphony and one movement of Schubert's. But that is not how things are arranged nowadays. The pieces that are already most familiar receive the most performances. As someone has paraphrased the Biblical injunction: "that that has gets."

It could be further argued that, although the Mahler Finale stands isolating better than would the other three movements, it is not, all things considered, the most effective of the four. Like the last movement of Mahler's "Song of the Earth," this Adagio is a farewell to life, written when the composer knew that his days were numbered. Also like parts of "The Song of the Earth," it voices a mood otherwise unknown to symphonic music and sends one to the last quartets of Beethoven for analogy in any other field of music. . . .

WARREN STOREY SMITH, *Boston Post*

ANTON BRUCKNER: SEVENTH SYMPHONY

Philharmonic Symphony Society of N. Y., John Barbirolli, Conductor, January 10 and 12, 1940.

Of the tripartite program offered by the Philharmonic-Symphony in Carnegie Hall last evening, though the second number was Beethoven's C major piano concerto with Sergei Rachmaninoff as the soloist, the paramount and unforgettable feature happened to be the Seventh Symphony of Anton Bruckner.

It was good to hear this magnificent work at all—Bruckner is again becoming a rarity in New York—and it was better still to hear it so excellently performed. John Barbirolli conducted as though he loved the symphony and his whole heart were in his task. He caught and transmitted the big design of the work, its heroic sweep and grandeur. Would that he might now do for us Bruckner's Eighth!

Listeners not especially familiar with the Seventh were perhaps surprised to observe that the Scherzo with its haunting F major Trio, is hardly less engrossing an achievement than the famous Adagio that precedes it.

And they may also have been surprised to detect a brief resemblance in the Adagio to a passage in the opera *Thais*.

Yet it is exceedingly improbable that Massenet, though writing in the next decade, had any acquaintance with this symphony.

PITTS SANBORN, *World Telegram*

ANTON BRUCKNER: FIRST SYMPHONY

Chicago Symphony Orchestra, Frederick A. Stock, Conductor, February 1 and 2, 1940.

NOTE: This was the first performance of this symphony in Chicago and by a major orchestra in the U. S. The first performance was given by the Brooklyn Civic Orchestra in Brooklyn, N. Y., under the direction of P. Kosok. Nov. 12, 1938.

A major symphonic work three-quarters of a century old received its first Chicago performance only last evening. The work is Anton Bruckner's first symphony. The performers were Frederick Stock and the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, the place, Orchestra Hall.

Splendor of orchestral dress and wealth of idea are the symphony's outstanding characteristics. As in his more familiar works, Bruckner here does wonders with the brass choir, achieving a mystical religious quality by the simple grandeur with which he makes these instruments speak.

Yet the themes themselves, so far as we can consider them independent of their beautiful vesture, are provocative enough to free Bruckner from the suspicion that he was using an extraordinary knowledge of instrumentation to conceal poverty of melodic invention. There is a soaring, ecstatic quality in the adagio's first subject and a bucolic vigor in the theme of the scherzo.

EDWARD BARRY, *Chicago Tribune*

Mr. Stock and the Chicago Symphony added Bruckner's first symphony to their repertoire with the concerts of Thursday evening and Friday afternoon.

The work was written in the composer's forties and revised when he was sixty-five. There is nothing in it that is immature, uncertain or heterogeneous and one thing that the performance made clear was how little, for all Mr. Stock's diligence, we really know Bruckner in America, or in Chicago, where America knows him best.

The C minor symphony is bold, of large design and simple design, in the typical Bruckner manner. It is also beautiful in Bruckner's intimate and original way.

What is unfamiliar in it is not what is new, for all that is new in it is characteristic of the composer as we know him in his later symphonies. What is truly unfamiliar is what Bruckner has to say, for unquestionably music was personal discourse with him.

The simplicity of Bruckner's structural sense permitted him an elaborateness of procedure which at first acquaintance seems both labored and precious. These qualities were foreign to his nature and they must be foreign to his music. He was, after all, a teacher, and technicalities were his daily bread. If he did not compose like a professor at least he could not help thinking like one, and the erudition of his style in large part sprang from a graciousness in a soul that knew no disguise.

The first symphony, then, has Bruckner's typical breadth, insistence and deliberateness of spacing combined with energy of statement. Its thematic material constantly reaches to a chromatic excess or else resorts to invigorating octaves. Its instrumentation is resplendent without being showy. Everything it contains is noble; all its workmanship is masterly.

In essence it remains aloof; Bruckner has said exactly what he meant to say, and as I say his cast of thought makes the telling intimate, yet what he tells is wholly impersonal, in the manner of a sage or a visionary.

Mr. Stock gave a magnificent performance of the work and it was received with the greatest admiration and interest. . . .

EUGENE STINSON, *Chicago Daily News*

. . . Like most works of import, the Bruckner "First Symphony" needs frequent hearing before one can thoroughly grasp its inner meaning and the magnitude of its musical value. Frederick Stock made it possible for us to appreciate the noble beauties and harmonies so soulful and so filled with melodies that grow with greater glow shadowed by gray draperies that open to disclose multicolors that even gloom cannot hide. . . .

HERMAN DEVRIES, *Herald American*

GUSTAV MAHLER: FIFTH SYMPHONY

Boston Symphony Orchestra, Serge Koussevitzky, Conductor, Boston, March 1 and 2, 1940.

If the Fifth Symphony of Gustav Mahler has a few more such cordial receptions as

it enjoyed at the Boston Symphony concert yesterday afternoon it will cease to be "debatable" music. As this reviewer observed the last time it was heard here, just about two years ago, "Little by little the music of Mahler makes its way." Even those who are less than whole-souled Mahlerians could hardly begrudge the popular success yesterday of both score and interpretation.

An odd fact about listening to Mahler is that the more you hear the less you are pre-occupied by what first seems to be the "banality" of his melodies, the square-cut rhythms and the thundering sonorities he obtained from a very large orchestra. As you become acquainted with Mahler, dominating impressions are first wonder at the complex mind which produced so involved, so technically difficult a music, then admiration and affection for the noble cast of his romantic imagination. And after a while even the exhausting concentration demanded is less and less a matter of effort.

Mahler was perhaps the last creative artist whose spirit was shaped by the visionary ideals of the nineteenth century (a period, incidentally, that has taken many an undeserved hard word); his music can be grasped only through understanding of those ideals. If you seek merely for technical skill, impersonal correctness, mastery of form, for sophistication or cleverness in Mahler, bewilderment and disappointment are your inevitable reward.

Only when one has some idea of the emotional side of Mahler is it possible to recognize his sense of grotesquerie was not clumsy humor, that his long-drawn slow movements, his lush melodies and intricate harmonies were not a manifestation of pompousness. All these were simply the natural way of expression for a son of the nineteenth century whose heart was as full of warmth as his mind dwelt upon beauty. Mahler had, of course, his weaknesses, most conspicuously the length at which he wrote.

Yesterday's performance was a marvel of romantic fervor. Perhaps Mr. Koussevitzky dragged the *adagio*; what did that matter in the total effect? The orchestra served both Mahler and Koussevitzky well; count the performance an event of the season. When, by the way, are we to hear again "The Song of the Earth," Mahler's greatest masterpiece?

C. W. D., *Boston Globe*

. . . Certainly the Fifth Symphony, by which he was represented yesterday, par-

takes of the grandiloquence that characterized both "Ein Heldenleben" and the "Symphonia Domestica" of Strauss, between which it stood in point of composition. Through the Eighth Symphony this tendency toward bigness was to progress, until in that so-called "Symphony of a Thousand," expansion of means could hardly go farther. Yet it was Mahler himself who, in "The Song of the Earth" and the Ninth Symphony, started the reaction against what Henry T. Finck used to deride as Jumboism in music.

A true child of its time, then, is this "Giant" Symphony, which starts in the gloom of C-sharp minor and ends in the brightness of D major, a key that with Mahler was always synonymous with exuberance of spirit. Now that music has gone as far from this largeness of utterance as it conceivably could, witness Stravinsky's "Card Game," as the *reductio ad absurdum* of the contrary tendency; audiences might either be repelled or attracted by it. Judging from the reception accorded yesterday's performance, as well as the two others under Dr. Koussevitzky's direction, it is decidedly a case of attraction.

WARREN STOREY SMITH, *Boston Post*

ANTON BRUCKNER: FIFTH SYMPHONY

Philadelphia Orchestra, Eugene Ormandy, Conductor. Philadelphia, January 5-6, 1940; New York, January 23, 1940.

... Mr. Ormandy erred in the first place by placing the symphony last on his program, following the intermission, and prefacing it with two of his own transcriptions of Bach's chorale-preludes, "O Mensch, bewein' dein Suede gross" and "Wachet auf, ruft uns die Stimme," and with Brahms's first piano concerto in D minor. The religious nature of Bach's music and the slow moving pace of two movements of the Brahms concerto already satisfied the audience's desire for profound music, so that by the time the Bruckner symphony emerged, with its devotional atmosphere, the mind was too fatigued to absorb it fully, even in the abbreviated form in which it was vouchsafed.

That Mr. Ormandy should have erred thus is all the more to be regretted, since he disclosed a genuine sympathy with the Brucknerian idiom and achieved some moving, if all too fleeting, moments in his conception. The orchestra played su-

perly investing the music with consistent tonal richness and glowing transparency of texture.

... Mr. Serkin was received with great warmth by the sizeable audience, the greater part of which remained to applaud liberally after the Bruckner Symphony.

JEROME D. BOHM, *Herald-Tribune*

An interestingly devised program by Eugene Ormandy gave a prominent place to the Fifth Symphony of Anton Bruckner at the concert of the Philadelphia Orchestra in Carnegie Hall last evening. And a most welcome bit of programme it was, for Bruckner goes altogether too long with scant attention from our leading symphonic batonists.

The version of the work used by Mr. Ormandy was the result of the collaborative revising efforts of himself plus those of Schalk and Loewe, and because the symphony is of exceeding length Mr. Ormandy found it wise to omit certain repetitions.

The piece abounds in the beauty of speech. Though it is shot through with sudden contrasts, so much so that at times it seems almost episodic in nature, the marvelous juxtaposition of thematic ideas, steeped as they are in brave and expressive phraseology, is not the least rewarding of its many arresting features.

Niemann tells us that this is a symphony based on a "program of religious significance, manifested by his (Bruckner's) choice of chorales for thematic material." Perhaps so, but that would not fully explain the wealth of purely human emotions turbulently striving and straining for utterance in the complex pattern of the composition.

A sympathetic performance was the portion of the large gathering in the auditorium last evening. There may have been moments of rhythmic indecision—strange doings for such an ensemble as the Philadelphians—but the general results spoke well for frequent hearings. . . .

Applause was the order of the evening.

R. C. B., *World Telegram*

To play Bruckner requires a certain amount of courage; . . . For some reason conductors are fond of playing them (Bruckner's Symphonies). . . .

Of course, Bruckner is sometimes genius, else he would not have survived this long. The trouble with his flashes of inspiration is that one is so enchanted

with the momentary beauty and rightness of his music that one is apt to blame oneself for doubting the long, uninspired stretches, the childish reiteration, the blattancy, the unaccountable sallies, the pedestrian, pretentious ideas.

Mr. Ormandy judiciously pruned the Fifth Symphony, but the matter goes deeper than mere curtailment. However, it seems hardly possible that so many conductors are wrong about Bruckner, and the next performance of one of his symphonies will find this reviewer again

a doubter anxious and eager to be turned into a believer.

SAMUEL CHOTZINOFF, *N. Y. Post*

. . . Mr. Ormandy made cuts, omitting some repeats, and this perhaps would be disturbing to lovers of the composer. But on the credit side was a spacious, eloquent performance. Mr. Ormandy appears to believe in Bruckner and directs him accordingly. The orchestra responded with brilliant playing.

HOWARD TAUBMAN, *New York Times*

IN MEMORIAM

Harriet B. Lanier	1931
Mrs. Joseph Leidy	1933
Max Loewenthal	1933
Egon Pollak	1933
Jakob Wassermann	1933
Otto H. Kahn	1934
H. T. Parker	1934
Ludwig Vogelstein	1934
Emanuel de M. Baruch	1935
Max Smith	1935
Josef Stransky	1935
James P. Dunn	1936
Ossip Gabrilowitsch	1936
Henry Hadley	1937
Mrs. A. S. Hubbard	1938
Emma L. Roedter	1938
Major Theodore Bitterman	1938
Lawrence Gilman	1939
Artur Bodanzky	1939



The Bruckner Society of America, Inc.

A membership corporation
organized under the laws of the State of New York
697 West End Avenue,
New York, N. Y.

OFFICERS

DR. MARTIN G. DUMLER, MUR. DOC.
President
1607 Dexter Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio

FREDERICK W. JONES
Vice-President

ROBERT G. GREY
Executive Secretary

HARRY NEYER
Secretary

EXECUTIVE MEMBERS

MARTIN G. DUMLER
SOLTON ENGEL
ROBERT G. GREY

FREDERICK W. JONES
JULIO KILKENY
ERNEST LERT

HARRY NEYER

DIRECTORS

MATTHEW G. BACH
MARTIN G. DUMLER
SOLTON ENGEL
MRS. P. M. FLAUM
ROBERT G. GREY

FREDERICK W. JONES
JULIO KILKENY
ERNEST LERT
JOACHIM H. MEYER
HARRY NEYER

HONORARY MEMBERS

Percy Goetschius
Eugene Goossens
Willem Van Hoogstraten
Erich Kleiber
Otto Klemperer
Serge Kousseritzky
A. Walter Kramer
Charles Kullmann
Leonard Lieblich

Compton Mackenzie
Fritz Mahler
Thomas Mann
Margaret Matzenauer
Willem Mengelberg
Dimitri Mitropoulos
Eugene Ormandy
Fritz Reiner
Roman Rolland

Artur Rodzinski
Warren Storey Smith
Frederick A. Stock
Albert Stoessel
Olga Samaroff Stokowski
Enid Szanthe
Frank Thies
Arturo Toscanini
Bruno Walter
Stefan Zweig

FOUNDER MEMBERS

Edwin Aderer
Prof. Frans Boas
Mrs. Isaac Brereton
R. W. Bretall
Prof. Philip Greeley Clapp
William N. Cohen
Jack Diether
Solton Engel
Mrs. Solton Engel
Mary E. L'Engle
Mrs. P. M. Flaum

Mrs. I. K. Friedman
Lolita Cabrera Gainsborg
Mrs. Robert G. Grey
Dr. John Haynes Holmes
Mrs. Frederick W. Jones
C. O. Kalman
Mrs. Ella M. Kranacker
Mrs. Edward W. Lane
Dr. Ernest Lert
Ebba Mathiasus
Mrs. Frederick A. Muschenheim

Morris Nathan
Dr. I. Scotty Schapiro
Edward J. Shaw
Mrs. Otto L. Schmidt
Jack Silverstein
Prof. H. H. L. Schulze
Dr. Carleton Sprague Smith
Frederic R. Stettenheim

Gabriel Engel,
Editor

CONTRIBUTIONS

Regular members—contributors under \$5.00 per annum.

Founder members—contributors of \$5.00 or more per annum.

Contributions to the Society are deductible under the Federal Income Tax Law.

NOTE: No officer or director receives any remuneration for services rendered as officer or director.