4 The symphony after Beethoven after Dahlhaus

DAVID BRODBECK

Over the ten years or so before his death in 1989, Carl Dahlhaus returned time and again to the nineteenth-century symphony. Typifying his thinking is the following passage, which illustrates the 'quasi-narrative, "grand project"' approach that characterised Dahlhaus's historiographic style as a whole:

> The history of the symphony seems to be a history of the consequences that could be drawn from the models of the symphonic shaped by Beethoven (from the Third and Seventh symphonies, in the case of Berlioz; the Sixth, in the case of Mendelssohn; and the Ninth, in the case of Bruckner). Yet the historical development exhibits a breaking off at mid-century. Between the symphony's immediate afterlife [*Nachleben der Symphonie*] 'in the shadow of Beethoven', a circumstance of symphonic history in which extremes such as Berlioz and Mendelssohn could exist next to one another in a rare historical configuration, and a 'second age of the symphony', which ran from the 1870s to the beginning of the twentieth century, is a chasm of a quarter century that is only poorly filled by Gade, Raff, and Rubinstein. And in [this] 'dead era' of the symphony, the 'symphonic poem', which was developed by Liszt from the concert overture, emerges as the epoch-making genre of orchestral music in the grand style. Still, the break in continuity shows that in the history of the symphony . . . the aesthetic presence of an overpowering tradition in the concert repertoire not only could lay the foundation for, but also take the place of, the compositional development of the genre. The former happened at the end of the century; the latter, at the middle.[1]

Dahlhaus situates Beethoven in the centre of a 'circumpolar' history of the genre. Here is no development whereby 'each step is a result of a previous one and a prerequisite of a later one'; instead, all 'significant works' are understood to stand in a direct relation to one or another of Beethoven's symphonies and to reveal little more than 'fleeting connections' with any intervening works.[2] In other words, for Dahlhaus virtually every symphony *after* Beethoven – at least every one of any historical importance – was best understood primarily *in relation to* Beethoven.

This comprehensive narrative, told with the help of a relatively small number of carefully selected works, has not gone without critical comment

https://doi.org/10.1017/CCO9781139021425.005 Published online by Cambridge University Press

by Anglophone scholars.[3] But there has been nothing in Britain or the United States like the widespread critique of Dahlhaus's work that has characterised much German scholarship on the symphony during the last twenty-five years. Thanks to this body of work – and to a rash of recordings of symphonies by many of the century's lesser-known figures – we now have a much better sense of the symphonic landscape than we did before.[4] It lies well beyond the limits of the present essay to survey this vast expanse, and what I offer instead will to a large degree be a 'tale of two cities', Leipzig and Vienna. Inevitably my emphasis will fall on symphonies by German composers; still, the symphonic programmes that characterised both locales invite some consideration of symphonies by non-German composers as well. Limiting the geographical scope in this way also gives focus to questions pertaining to historical, social and political context, questions of a kind that famously find no place in Dahlhaus's *Problemgeschichte*. Yet they are well worth asking and will, in turn, raise certain doubts about his tale of the genre's slow decline, death and resurrection.[5]

After Beethoven

The late A. Peter Brown described Leipzig as the 'epicentre of symphonic compositions' in the period from the 1830s to the 1870s.[6] The presence in the city of several music publishers and important music journals, as well as one of Europe's leading conservatories, contributed to its preeminence, but pride of place in this account must fall to the Gewandhaus Orchestra. This venerable institution (founded in 1781) occupied the leading edge of a gradual trend away from the miscellaneous concert programming of the past, with its preference for 'entertaining' admixtures of instrumental and vocal pieces, concerted and solo numbers, not always played in their entirety, towards the new, more 'serious' approach that eventually came to define the modern symphony concert, with an overture and a concerto in the first half, followed, in the second, by a symphony (which gained in prominence by coming last and standing alone).[7] By the 1820s subscribers could look forward to hearing complete performances of all nine Beethoven symphonies on a regular basis; selected symphonies by Haydn and Mozart were heard frequently as well. Nevertheless, room was still found for three or four new symphonies every season.

'German music blooms so finely here', wrote Robert Schumann in his *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 'that, without ignorance, our city may venture

to compare its productions to those of the richest fruit and flower gardens of other cities'. He continued:

> Our concert music stands at the most brilliant summit of all. It is well known that a worthy home for German music has been secured in the now fifty-years-old Gewandhaus concerts, and that this institution accomplishes more at present than it ever did before. With a famous composer at its head, the orchestra has brought its virtuosity to still greater perfection during the last few years. It has probably no German equal in its performance of symphonies.[8]

The unnamed famous composer was Felix Mendelssohn, who conducted the orchestra from 1835 until his death in 1847. Although Mendelssohn's programmes were dominated by the music of the Viennese classical composers, he also instituted a series of 'historical concerts' (each devoted to a grouping of composers from the more distant past) and made certain to perform several contemporary works each year.[9] Within the subscription concerts, for example, Mendelssohn introduced no fewer than forty-five new symphonies, including three each by Louis Spohr (nos. 5–7), Johann Wenzel Kalliwoda (nos. 5–7) and Franz Lachner (nos. 5–7), two each by Niels Gade (nos. 1–2), Julius Rietz (nos. 1–2) and Robert Schumann (nos. 1–2), Franz Schubert's 'Great' C major Symphony and his own Symphony No. 3 ('Scottish').[10] Various benefit and extraordinary concerts provided the opportunity for introducing still other new works, including Mendelssohn's Symphony No. 2 (*Lobgesang*), Schumann's Symphony No. 4 (in its original orchestral dress from 1841), together with his *Overture, Scherzo and Finale* and, from France, Hector Berlioz's *Symphonie fantastique* and Félicien David's *Le Désert* (each conducted by its composer). Newly introduced works often were repeated in subsequent programmes; Schubert's 'Great' C major, for example, was heard twelve times during the Mendelssohn era.

In principle, the concerts of the Gewandhaus Orchestra encouraged the silent aesthetic contemplation of music, the 'selfless immersion into a music that manifested "another world"', and so performed an educative and edifying function (*Bildungsfunktion*): in such a context, as Dahlhaus notes, music was intended to be 'understood' and not merely to be 'enjoyed'.[11] Yet there was more to this than 'vintage German transcendentalism', inasmuch as the symphony was constituted 'not only aesthetically but also as a relation of nations'.[12] This distinction comes through clearly in August Kahlert's review of Mendelssohn's Symphony No. 3, introduced at the Gewandhaus on 3 March 1842 and published a year later:

> For a long time the symphonic field has indisputably belonged to the Germans . . . France and Italy, for all the trouble they take with it, do not

> understand this dream world of tones which the German has created, where no words are required which guide the listener's fantasy to a definite thought, but rather where the free forms of the tonal structures make themselves the law-givers.[13]

Seen in this way, then, the *Bildungsfunktion* of the symphony concert assumes not only an aesthetic, but also a national dimension that Dahlhaus, with his aversion to political interpretation, seems loath to acknowledge.

Complicating this picture, however, was the *Symphonie fantastique*. Introduced at the Gewandhaus on 4 February 1843 (and thus undoubtedly on Kahlert's mind as he penned his review of the 'Scottish' Symphony), this work had in fact already been the subject of considerable interest in 1835, following the publication of Schumann's lengthy and extravagant review of the work when it appeared in Franz Liszt's piano reduction.[14] Here (and not for the last time) Schumann offers his take on the recent historical development of the genre: 'After *Beethoven*'s Ninth Symphony, greatest of all instrumental works in external proportions, form and intention seemed to have been exhausted . . . Later symphonic composers sensed this, and some of them even took refuge in the comfortable forms of Haydn and Mozart'.[15] Schumann goes on to list a number of more recent composers, regretting that 'none . . . had ventured to make any significant modifications to the old forms – if we leave aside isolated attempts such as the most recent symphony of Spohr'.[16] He finds more to praise in Mendelssohn's development of the concert overture as an alternative to the symphony – Schumann appears to be unaware of the 'Italian' Symphony, performed by the London Philharmonic Society in March 1833 and immediately withdrawn by the composer – and then acknowledges that he had begun to doubt whether the symphony had any future at all.

With all this as background, Schumann turns to the form of Berlioz's first movement, so strange on the surface. 'Yet we ought always to look at a thing on its own terms', he cautions. 'The stranger and more ingenious a thing outwardly appears, the more carefully we ought to judge it.' Reminding his readers that the outlines of Beethoven's music, too, had once seemed unintelligible, he contrasts Berlioz's unorthodox form with that of 'the earlier norm'. He provides diagrams of both, finds nothing preferable about the latter in either variety or uniformity, and adds, 'We only wish we possessed a truly colossal imagination and could then pursue it wherever it goes.' Here – for all his doubts about programme music – Schumann seems to have discovered the step forward from Beethoven that he found lacking in so much contemporary symphonic fare.[17]

Having nothing to do with this idea, by contrast, was Gottfried Wilhelm Fink, editor of Leipzig's *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung*. Schumann's nomination of a potential French successor to Beethoven in the realm of the symphony was by itself an affront; even worse, the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* had recently published without comment a translation of an article from a recent French journal that made the claim that François-Joseph Gossec had 'founded the true character of the symphony' and that Haydn had merely been his 'successor'.[18] To this Fink responded indignantly:

> The old is vanished, and everything has begun anew. The essence, therefore also the concept, of the symphony has completely changed, has become grand; one should therefore distinguish it from the old with the name 'grand symphony' [*große Symphonie*]. That is its name, and the honour of having created it belongs exclusively to the Germans, and this honour will not be taken from us.[19]

Schumann probably would not have disagreed with this sentiment, the gist of which had already appeared in E. T. A. Hoffmann's famous review of Beethoven's Symphony No. 5 (July 1810), with its claims that the German composer 'unveils before us the realm of the mighty and the immeasurable'.[20] But the two critics part company over the question of whether any real progress in the genre might be possible beyond that achieved by Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven (those 'three heroes of our music', as Fink described them).[21] Again relying heavily on Hoffmann's aesthetics of 'pure' instrumental music, the conservative Fink takes qualities such as large dimensions, expanded forms, richness of medium and elevated ideas that Hoffmann had extolled in Beethoven's Fifth and subsumes them all under his notion of the grand symphony, presumably attempting to establish in this way standards for the genre that he knew the Romantics would find impossible to meet.[22]

A prize symphony

This critical colloquy between the editors of Leipzig's two music periodicals provides the best context in which to examine one of the most talked-about symphonies of the 1830s, Franz Lachner's Symphony No. 5 in C minor (*Sinfonia passionata*), widely known as the 'Prize Symphony' by virtue of its having won a competition for new symphonies sponsored by the 'concerts spirituels' in Vienna in 1835.[23] Following its performance at the Gewandhaus on 27 October 1836, both Schumann and Fink weighed in with memorable reviews that tell us a good deal about the contemporary state of symphonic politics.

Schumann came first and took the unusual step of pitching his remarks as a response to a story told tongue-in-cheek by his friend Wilhelm Florentin von Zuccamaglio, published under the pseudonym Gottschalk Wedel as a kind of preface to Schumann's review.[24] Here the protagonist dreams that he has written a symphony for the competition in the style of the *Symphonie fantastique*, certain that the judges would favour this 'new artistic fashion', only to awaken in a cold sweat to learn with relief that the prize had already gone instead to a proper German composer, Franz Lachner of Munich. 'Our gentle Gottschalk Wedel has worked himself into quite a rage over the Frenchman Berlioz!' begins Schumann's anonymous review.[25] He continues in jest for a few lines, but when he moves on to the music at hand, he turns serious – and unusually merciless. '[Lachner's] symphony is lacking in style', he writes, 'a mixture of German, Italian and French, comparable to Romansh.' The best comparison Schumann could find was Meyerbeer's operas, but these works – which, for Schumann, epitomised the worst of Philistine culture – certainly offered no suitable model for the elevated genre of the German symphony. The critic could forgive neither the 'sprawling breadth' (the work runs about an hour), nor the overly obvious (and overused) allusion in the first two movements to the famous rhythmic motive of Beethoven's Fifth and the associated lack of any real thematic substance. Even still, the first movement at least shows 'a kind of passion, if perhaps not the most poetical source'. Not so the Adagio, 'which ends on every page and never stops!' And with that comes the *coup de grâce*: 'Were there but uncouth blunders, formal weaknesses, excesses, then there would be something to talk about and improve, and some reason for encouragement. Here, though, one can only say things like "it is tedious", or "it will pass", or sigh, or think about something else.'

Fink took a very different stance. He begins by making a careful analysis of each movement, and though he shares some of Schumann's reservations, he nevertheless concludes, 'without fearing the slightest contradiction from connoisseurs I must therefore pronounce this symphony of Lachner's a thoroughly capable and skilful work . . . The flow of ideas is natural, straightforward [*unverschnörkelt*], never tied together in confusion.'[26] Fink notes with approval that Lachner's 'inner essence of musical poetry is more like that of Haydn and Mozart than of Beethoven', and then explains the difference:

> The newer style of poetry is freer, more unbound, more passionate, fuller of movement, more colourful, more developing, in the way of a novella, in unrelated and unmotivated plot situations; at the same time the diabolical force of claws piercing into what wounded or feverishly moved humanity

> has restlessly grasped, violently pushing forward toward either terrible pain or externally rushing lust. By contrast, the old style of poetry is more ordered, more honouring of [deep] thought, more internal, more reflected, more motivated, more true, giving oneself more to the deep world of emotion than to staged acts, and loving and creating at the same time joyful, human encouragement, refreshment, and uplift.[27]

Fink explicitly associates the older (one might say, classical) style with the 'Prize Symphony': '[Lachner's] passion', he writes, 'is not the so-called Romantic [passion]'. And while Fink ties the newer style to no musical work in particular, it is easy enough to associate it in a negative way with the programme of the *Symphonie fantastique* ('terrible pain', 'externally rushing lust') and the unusual music to which it gave rise. It thus seems clear enough whom the critic had in mind when he castigates those composers who falsely claim to be Beethoven's disciples and who become 'drunk on [Beethoven's] wine [only to] sing, not in exaltation but in inebriation'.[28] Who else apart from Berlioz might have inspired such imagery?

A 'new norm'

Two years later, in a review from July 1839 of recently published symphonies by Gottfried Preyer, Karl Gottlieb Reißiger and, again, Lachner (this time, the Sixth, in D major), Schumann trained his focus on a more sober group of Beethoven's disciples. He begins by placing Beethoven's symphonies at the very centre of German national identity:

> When a German speaks of symphonies he speaks of Beethoven: he considers the two words as one and indivisible; they are his pride and joy. Just as the Italian has Naples, the Frenchman has the Revolution, and the Englishman his merchant marine, so the German has his Beethoven symphonies. Because of Beethoven he forgets that he cannot boast of a great school of painters, and he wins in spirit the many battles forfeited to Napoleon. He may even dare to place Beethoven on the same plane as Shakespeare.[29]

As the critic continues, he implicitly takes note of the extent to which Beethoven's symphonies had come to dominate the public concert and so, in effect, the self-understanding of the German bourgeoisie. Yet, in what seems a clear reference to his earlier criticism of the 'Prize Symphony', he laments the failure of any living German composer to come to terms with this patrimony and to build on it meaningfully in his own music:

> We do find reminiscences – particularly, though, only of the earlier symphonies of Beethoven, as if each one needed a certain period before it could be understood – reminiscences too frequent and too strong; only

> rarely do we find continuation or command of this magnificent form, where measure after measure the ideas appear to change but are connected by an inner spiritual bond.

After briefly mentioning Berlioz (a 'phenomenon' known more in Germany by hearsay than by his music itself) and Schubert ('whose accomplishments in the area of the symphony [had] not yet become public'), Schumann turns to the works at hand. While he is fairly merciless with Preyer and Reißiger, he treats Lachner more kindly than before. Once again, however, Schumann chides the composer for his long-windedness, urging him not to milk each of 'his beautiful ideas' dry, but rather to mix them in with other 'new, ever more beautiful ones'. He concludes: 'everything as in Beethoven. And so we always come back to this godly [composer] and would add nothing further today than to hope that Lachner might move forward on the path towards the ideal of a modern symphony, which after Beethoven's passing it is granted to us to arrange in a new norm. Long live the German symphony, and may it blossom and thrive anew!' The contradiction lying at the heart of this admonition is evident. Mark Evan Bonds has suggested that for Schumann the new norm could only be measured against the standard set by Beethoven. Yet, as Siegfried Oechsle has noted, what the critic calls for here – beauty and diversity of thematic-motivic invention – is not exactly what one takes to be the defining properties of Beethoven's symphonies.[30] At all events, Schumann had already found something close to what he was looking for in Schubert's 'Great' C major Symphony (1825–8), which he had 'discovered' in a visit during the previous winter to the Vienna home of Schubert's brother Ferdinand.[31] This work 'matched Beethoven's symphonies in length, drive, weight, and freshness of form but ... with [Schubert's] special brand of expansiveness, leisureliness, lyricism, instrumental colour, and harmonic finesse'.[32] Whereas in 1835, in his review of the *Symphonie fantastique*, Schumann could only hope that 'after Beethoven's nine muses [Schubert] might have borne us a tenth', five years later, in an equally remarkable review of the 'Great' C major, Schumann could write Berlioz out of the history of the German symphony once and for all as merely 'an interesting foreigner and madman'.[33] Here, too, was everything that the 'Prize Symphony' had not been: in contrast to Lachner's 'never-ending' essay, with its feeble imitations of Beethoven's manner, stands Schubert's work, with its 'heavenly length, like a novel in four volumes by Jean Paul', and its 'complete independence' from Beethoven's symphonies.[34]

The 'Great' C major led directly to Schumann's own breakthrough as a symphonist.[35] Drafted in a scant four days in January 1841 and introduced

at the Gewandhaus to great acclaim two months later, Schumann's Symphony No. 1 ('Spring') shows a host of Schubertian influences, extending from its prominent use of a melodically similar introductory horn call to matters of tonal planning and musical rhetoric. Schumann was not alone in being swept up in the moment. Mendelssohn's 'Scottish' Symphony (many of whose themes can be described as 'songs without words') and Gade's Symphony No. 1 (largely based on the Danish composer's song 'Paa Sjølunds fagre sletter'), both of which date from the following year, likewise respond in their own way to the Schubertian model.[36]

By contrast, Dahlhaus discusses the 'Scottish' and 'Spring' symphonies – he leaves Gade's enormously popular 'Nordic' work unmentioned – entirely in terms of Beethoven, and by that measure each inevitably falls short.[37] A brief digression will help to explain why. Dahlhaus argues for a close connection between the idea of aesthetic autonomy (Hoffmann's 'pure' instrumental music) and the nineteenth century's striving to *Bildung*, that quintessentially German ideal of education leading to character formation, which 'fulfils no tangible function in everyday life', but rather, by presuming an inner detachment from the 'realm of necessity', offers a 'counter-instance' to the alienating 'functionalization of humankind'.[38] Herder's concept of *Bildung zur Menschheit*, in turn, helps to explain why Dahlhaus claims the symphony as the illustrative model of aesthetic autonomy. *Menschheit* (humanity) carries a double meaning; it refers not only to the totality of humankind, which commentators from the early nineteenth century on maintained was the symphony's rightful intended audience, but also to the humanity of the individual. With their will towards monumentality (characterised by easily grasped thematic ideas that are intimately bound to the orchestral medium and are easy to follow in their subsequent development) and dramatic teleological form – the exoteric and esoteric sides of the 'symphonic style' – Beethoven's symphonies seemed to encompass both sides of the humanity idea.[39] The composer's chamber music likewise dealt in *thematische Arbeit*, but it was only his symphonies, because of their monumentality and association with the institution of the public concert (as opposed to private musical culture), that became the musical representative of bourgeois humanitarian ideas in the sense outlined above.

But here is where, for Dahlhaus, the Romantic composers come up short. To be sure, he praises Mendelssohn's ability in the 'Scottish' Symphony to shape a successful symphonic movement through the use of lyrical themes, but these cannot give rise to an appropriately monumental edifice. By the same token, Dahlhaus draws a pointed contrast between the 'sublime uniformity' of Beethoven's Fifth and Seventh

symphonies, whose ostinato themes are the vehicle for real melodic development, and the rather different uniformity that characterises Schumann's Symphony No. 1, which, because its main theme couples a motoric ostinato rhythm to a largely unchanged sequence of pitches, 'falls short of its vindicating sublimity'.[40] As Scott Burnham has noted, Schumann is faulted in this case 'for trying to be Beethovenian without fully understanding the nature of Beethoven's music'.[41]

Things look very different, however, when we let go of Dahlhaus's idea that these works constitute the dying breath of an implied 'first age of the symphony' dominated by Beethoven and the idea of the sublime, and follow Oechsle in positing Schubert's 'Great' C major Symphony and the idea of humanity (in the sense of the individual and not of the masses) as having sparked the beginning of a new era of the Romantic symphony.[42] By 1839, Oechsle argues, during a period marked by social processes of liberalisation and equalisation in which the independence of the individual was more strongly accented than before, the genre was 'ripe . . . for the reception of the revolutionary attempt to produce grand symphonic form on the basis of an "individual" that was initially absolutely unthematic and in and of itself not suited to represent the symphonic "masses"'.[43]

Dahlhaus argues that the essence of a successful symphonic movement resides in the critical 'double function of a symphonic main theme, which Beethoven elevated to the status of a rule': it was to be broken down into its constituent parts in the development only to return intact at the beginning of the recapitulation as the 'triumphant goal and result' of what had come before it.[44] But none of the works under consideration follows this 'rule'. Each begins with important cantabile material that is introduced 'outside the form' (that is, in a slow introduction) – the horn call, in the case of Schubert and Schumann; the song or song-like themes, in the case of Mendelssohn and Gade.[45] And in all four works, this material eventually recurs in the main body and even determines its form. This results in a distinctly non-Beethovenian 'epic-lyrical monumentality', whereby the symphonic structure is created, not through the dramatic working out of a main thematic idea, but rather, as Oechsle puts it, 'as a process of integration of an originally extraterritorial, individual, "capricious" subject-matter that seems strictly limited in its [symphonic] working potential'.[46]

Seen in this way, the 'Great' C major Symphony stands as the central work in a *Problemgeschichte* that is very different from Dahlhaus's conception. With the discovery of Schubert's Symphony and its 'new norm', a dike was opened through which a stream of new symphonies now might flow freely. (This is a very different metaphor, of course, from that having

to do with Beethoven's shadow.) Indeed, for all its reputation as a work in which the composer 'overcomes difficulty' in the manner of the heroic Beethoven, Schumann's Symphony No. 2 in C (1846) is unthinkable in the absence of Schubert's symphony in the same key, and the same thing can be said for Gade's Second and Third symphonies (1843 and 1847).[47]

The 'dead era'

Yet Dahlhaus argues that the symphony fell into a 'crisis' around mid-century, in that some twenty years would pass following the appearance of Schumann's Symphony No. 3 (1850) before there would come another orchestral 'work of distinction that represented absolute rather than program music'.[48] With the deaths, not only of Mendelssohn and Schumann, but also, in Wagner's provocative formulation in *Opera and Drama* (1851), of the genre itself, historical development in the orchestral realm now seemed to shift to the symphonic poem, established by Liszt and marked by features such as *Mehrsätzigkeit in der Einsätzigkeit* and thematic transformation.[49] This allows Dahlhaus to dispense with the ensuing 'dead era' in the history of the older genre simply by invoking the names of the popular Gade (eight symphonies altogether), Anton Rubinstein (six) and Joachim Raff (no fewer than eleven), while leaving their music and the broader context in which it was heard entirely unexamined.[50] To do otherwise, he explains, would be to give undue weight to 'mere statistics' at the expense of 'music-historical facts' based on 'aesthetic judgments'.[51]

There is something to be gained, however, by not passing too quickly over this period. 'Serious' programming of the type that had characterised the concerts of the Gewandhaus Orchestra during the Mendelssohn era gradually took hold elsewhere.[52] Moreover, subscription concerts on the Leipzig model were established, not only in major urban centres such as Vienna, Berlin and Dresden, but in smaller towns as well. While the balance between living and dead composers in concert programmes continued to shift in favour of the latter – the music of Schubert, Schumann and Mendelssohn, after all, had now joined that of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven in the corpus of available repertoire from the past – works by contemporary composers still held a respectable share in concert programmes, in the order of 20 to 30 per cent, depending on the locale and decade.[53]

Fearing that concerts might become too hidebound, critics used their pens to urge the inclusion of new works.[54] As a result, there was no dearth of orchestral *Novitäten* in the third quarter of the nineteenth century,

which witnessed the composition, premiere or publication of approximately 500 new orchestral compositions.[55] This list includes a range of programmatic types, including such once-popular works as Johann Joseph Abert's 'Columbus' Symphony (1864), Joseph Rheinberger's four-movement 'symphonic tone painting' *Wallenstein* (1866) and Heinrich Hofmann's *Fritjof* Symphony (1874), but the lion's share consists of more-or-less traditional multi-movement symphonies. And though fully half of these works were what Grotjahn calls 'nine-day wonders' (*Eintagsfliegen*), no small number achieved status as 'short-term hits' (*kurzfristige Spitzenreitern*) and some were heard often enough over a long enough period of time to warrant her characterisation of them as 'living classics' (*lebende Classikern*).

Among the works in this last-named category are several that attest to a continuing 'Mendelssohn cult'. Heading this group is Gade's Symphony No. 4 (1850), with ninety-one performances by 1875; the composer's earlier First and Third symphonies retained their popularity as well, with fifty-five and thirty performances respectively. At eighty-nine performances during the same period, Anton Rubinstein's 'Ocean' Symphony (1851, rev. 1863, 1880), a 'characteristic' work that shows clear affinities with Mendelssohn's *Hebrides* and *Meeresstille und glückliche Fahrt* overtures, was as familiar a presence in concert programmes as Gade's Fourth.[56] Other popular works in the Mendelssohn style include Ferdinand Hiller's Symphony in E Minor (1849), inscribed with a motto from Emanuel Geibel (*Es muß doch Frühling werden*) and Julius Rietz's Symphony No. 3 in E flat (1855).

Works that date from the 1860s, of course, had a more difficult furrow to plough: they had to compete, not only with the symphonies of the Viennese Classical composers and the first generation of Romantics, but also, almost as soon as they appeared, with those that came during Dahlhaus's 'second age of the symphony'. Yet even among this group, too, are several that could be heard with some frequency over the next several decades, including the Symphony No. 1 in D minor by Robert Volkmann (1863), a handful of works by Joachim Raff, as well as Max Bruch's Symphony No. 1 (1868) and Albert Dietrich's Symphony in D minor (1870), exemplifying the Mendelssohn and Schumann traditions respectively.[57]

Conspicuous by his absence here was Brahms, but this composer carried unique burdens dating back to Schumann's encomium 'Neue Bahnen' (1853), with its foretelling of a grand symphony to come from the then-unknown composer. Matters were only made worse in 1860, when, with no such work to show, Brahms instigated a public 'Manifesto' against the historical claims made on behalf of Liszt and the

symphonic poem in the pages of the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, which, under the editorship of Franz Brendel, beginning in 1845, had coupled a progressive, anti-Romantic stance with a denial of the continued historical viability of traditional genres such as the symphony.[58] Relatively few critics took such an extreme position, however, and there is no reason to believe that most critics – despite the occasional reproach that the main theme of this symphony or that was not 'truly symphonic' (*echt symphonisch*) – were determined to find fault with composers for failing to meet a set of standards derived from middle-period Beethoven or as codified by the likes of Fink.[59]

Indeed, the aesthetic demands of the symphony after 1850 seem on balance to have been reduced well beyond even the 'new [non-Beethovenian] norm' for which Schumann had once called. Writing about Woldemar Bargiel's Symphony in C (1860), for example, one critic noted, with no particular regret, that 'It is no "grand" work in the eminent sense that we have before us, since the "grand" in this sense, which is sometimes called the "monumental", may in our times be hard to find in the realm of art.'[60] What often comes across instead is a concept of the genre as *mittlere Musik* (music of an intermediary *niveau*), which allowed one to assume the proper attitude of a *Bildungshörer* without having to forgo simpler pleasures: one did not have to choose between art and entertainment.[61] In such an environment, composers could respond to growing market demands for new music while knowing that they were not charged to seek a place in the canon. (That Brahms carried higher ambitions – and composed accordingly – helps to explain the lukewarm reception that often greeted his challenging symphonies.)[62] Even *mittlere* works should demonstrate technical solidity, but they should steer clear of becoming overburdened with too much 'art'. Terms frequently appearing in reviews that may now seem patronising – 'pretty', 'fresh', 'interesting' – were in fact in step with listeners' expectations, while those that may now seem more favourable – 'grand', 'deep', 'monumental', 'significant' – were seldom used and then mostly as a way of negatively characterising works for their excesses in either length or instrumental forces.[63]

By the same token, originality was not essential. When one critic wrote of Hiller's *Es muß doch Frühling werden* Symphony that it was made up of motives taken from Mendelssohn, Schumann and others, this was not necessarily seen as a fault, since the work sprang from a 'refined artistic spirit' and showed 'nothing of that morbidity that attaches to almost our entire modern literature and from which the productions of even our most highly honoured younger powers cannot completely be freed'.[64] 'At all events', as Grotjahn notes, 'a workmanlike, cleanly executed "beautiful" symphony is preferred to works that expect their listeners to deal with

complex contents and unusual musical effects.'[65] Many of these themes are neatly summed up in Eduard Hanslick's report on the first Viennese performance of the period's most often played work of all:

> Gade's Fourth Symphony in B flat made the most agreeable impression . . . Neither grand [*groß*] nor thrilling [*hinreißend*], but rather quite 'charming' – that's how one must call a work from which a pure spirit, a warm temperament speaks to us in moderate, exquisite locution. The limitation that the composer imposed on the themes and the extent of the movements stands the work in good stead . . . We prefer to praise works of the genuine, modest aura of the B-flat Symphony too much rather than too little in a time when hardly anyone writes an orchestral piece without the firm intent of unconditionally outdoing Beethoven.[66]

Another prize symphony

If Gade's eight symphonies extend from the age of Mendelssohn and Schumann clear through the 1860s, the eleven symphonies of Joachim Raff appeared, one every year or two, from the mid-1860s through the first decade of the genre's 'second age'. This composer claimed to follow a 'middle way' between the New German (Berlioz–Liszt) and conservative (Mendelssohn–Schumann) factions in the musical politics of the day. As Louis Köhler put it, 'he is a New German (*vulgo* "Musician of the Future") in classical guise'.[67] Thus while nine of Raff's symphonies carry a descriptive title, only the Fifth (*Lenore*), based on the famous *Sturm-und-Drang* ballad by Gottfried August Bürger, follows Liszt in having a programmatic basis in literature (*Eine Faust-Symphonie*, *Dante* Symphony, the symphonic poems). For the most part, as in the Symphony No. 3 (*Im Walde*), with its colourful delineation of the German forest, the composer aimed to realise traditional symphonic forms with the help of a scrupulous use of tone painting, an attempt 'to write programme music that shall at the same time be absolute music' that Hugo Riemann later contemptuously dismissed as 'an aesthetic lie'.[68]

Although the Symphony No. 1 (*An das Vaterland*) fell by the wayside long before either the *Im Walde* or *Lenore* symphonies, this earlier work warrants some further attention here. Evidently composed between 1859 and 1861, it was selected as the first-place winner in a competition for new symphonies announced by Vienna's Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in April 1861. Reviewing the first performance, which took place in Vienna on 26 February 1863, Hanslick acknowledges that *An das Vaterland* contains 'ingenious and absorbing features, poetic moments and original technical experiments', but its 'affectedness, bizarrerie and floridness'

made it impossible for the critic to want to hear any of its parts again.[69] He continues:

> A fiery, brilliant, very self-conscious yet sparsely productive nature works here with great exertion to get beyond Beethoven. If never-ending volubility is a character trait of the Germans, then in this respect Raff has aptly portrayed his fellow-countrymen. But the German people, who like to recognize themselves in the ideal mirror of Beethoven's symphonies, will find it difficult to feel flattered in Raff's first movement.[70]

Hanslick's comment about Raff's portrayal of the Germans was prompted by the work's programme, which the critic reproduces in full.[71] The first three movements are poetic in nature, depicting, in turn, the 'German character', 'the German forest' and the 'homely hearth'. The fourth and fifth movements, by contrast, are explicitly political: the fourth concerns the 'failed attempt to found the unity of the fatherland', symbolised by quotation of Gustav Reichardt's well-known setting of Ernst Moritz Arndt's patriotic poem 'Was ist des Deutschen Vaterland?' ('What is the German's Fatherland?'); the Finale begins with a 'lamentation' on this defeat followed, at last, by a 'renewed upswing' in the ensuing *Allegro trionfale*, symbolised by a peroration on the borrowed patriotic hymn.

In view of Hanslick's reputation as an opponent of programme music, what he makes of all this is naturally of some interest. In a review written only one month earlier, the critic had noted with approval that Rubinstein's 'Ocean' Symphony 'carries no poetic guide apart from the inscription "Ocean". The composer is liberal enough to allow our fantasy full freedom.'[72] It was precisely a lack of such freedom for the listener that irritated in the case at hand. 'It requires a fair amount of self-control', Hanslick begins, 'not to be prejudiced against [Raff's] music from the start on account of this poetic-political user's manual [*Gebrauchsanweisung*].' He continues:

> Nowadays one is no longer so Philistine as to resent the composer for every poetic stimulus or hint; but one is already, thank God, over and above a musical hair-splitting [*Musikdeutelei*] of such exactness. For whom the motto ('An das Vaterland') or the simple inscription 'Germany' is not sufficient, to him it will also be of no avail if Herr Raff has distributed the complete *Allgemeine Zeitung* from the year 1848 'for a better understanding'. In the entire symphony, a direct connection to the political program is presented only by the melody of the 'German's Fatherland', whose appearance, rising, suppression, and extinguishing moreover contain a palpable symbolism.[73]

Raff was not thinking solely about the failed revolution of 1848 and the dashed hopes of German national unity, however, but was also looking ahead. In the foreword to the first edition of the score, he reports that he

had set to work on the Symphony under the first impression of the Armistice of Villafranca (1859), which ended active hostilities between the combined Franco-Italian forces of the Second Empire and the Kingdom of Piedmont–Sardinia and those of Francis Josef's Austrian Empire. As a result, Austria lost most of her Italian holdings and impetus was given to the movement towards Italian unification. These developments were not without ramifications elsewhere, and in the same year leading German liberal nationalists met in Frankfurt to form the *Deutsche Nationalverein* with the goal of unifying the German states in the *klein-deutsch* solution under Prussian leadership. Meanwhile, traditional Austrian hopes for hegemony in Germany under a *großdeutsch* solution were beginning to fade, and this may explain why Hanslick made no mention of the peroration of 'Was ist des Deutschen Vaterland' coming at the end (the symbolism in that omission is palpable). However that may be, Wolfram Steinbeck seems on the right track when he posits *An das Vaterland* as one of the first truly national symphonies: 'That it is a German work, what is more, that is locked into a concrete (and at that time moving) historical situation is remarkable. The universal claim of the symphony is destroyed through the particularly national subject matter.'[74] But while Europeans had long identified and accepted the symphony as being a German art – the enormous prestige of Beethoven had seen to that – Raff's Symphony No. 1 was more than simply a national work; it was a self-consciously nationalist one.

The national symphony outside the German cultural sphere

The rise of important national schools, both to the east in Russia and to the west in France, is a defining feature of music history in the later decades of the century. (The situation in Bohemia stands somewhat apart on account of its close historical–cultural relations with Austria and *Mitteleuropa* more generally.) In Russia, the first symphonies by Mily Balakirev, Aleksandr Porfirevich Borodin and Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov date from the 1860s. There was a certain paradox in the timing of this development, coming as it did in the wake of the 'death of the symphony' and the transferral of the symphonic style into a new genre, the symphonic poem, that was seemingly more amenable to nationalist musical discourse. As Andreas Wehrmeyer has noted:

> While, on the one hand, the 'Balakirev Circle' felt itself bound to the New German School, to its progressive harmonic thinking, its inclination to

> profile the national and the exotic, it wanted, on the other hand, to reconstruct its turning to the symphonic poem, to the programmatic, to the opening up of formal principles – in fact there was a belief in the sublimity and along with that in the future of the traditional symphony, which it was valid for Russia to develop according to national inflections.[75]

Among the members of the 'Mighty Handful' (*moguchaya kuchka*), Beethoven exercised a strong hold and provided a powerful model for cultural accreditation.

What for these composers was not valid, however, were the earlier accomplishments in the genre by their fellow Russian Anton Rubinstein, whose affinities with Mendelssohn in his early symphonies, among other works, made him unacceptably 'German'. (That Rubinstein was born a Jew probably should not be overlooked either in explaining the antipathy towards him.) Reviewing a St Petersburg performance of the 'Ocean' Symphony in 1869, for example, Borodin claimed: 'Here, as in most other works by Rubinstein, is shown this same repetition of banalities of a routine à la Mendelssohn. One finds in the ideas the same paltriness and shortness of breath, the same lack of colour in the instrumentation, the same conventional symmetry in the formal construction.'[76]

Tchaikovsky, by contrast, was an admirer of the 'Ocean' Symphony and, more fundamentally, shared Rubinstein's openness to Western principles of form. His Fourth, Fifth and Sixth symphonies, of course, are staples of the standard repertory. The Fourth (1878) provides Dahlhaus with an example of how, in the 'second age of the symphony', a composer who employed un-Beethovenian materials could nevertheless create a large-scale symphonic form by adopting techniques from the symphonic poem. (This work and Dahlhaus's assessment of it are considered again in Chapter 9.) The 'fate motive' played by the horn and trumpet at the outset appears at first to function as an introduction. By using the same theme to initiate the recapitulation, Dahlhaus argues, the composer contravenes Beethovenian norms by transferring it from an introductory to a formally constitutive role, thereby creating a 'monumentality that remains a decorative façade unsupported by the internal form of the movement'.[77] Yet Schumann's Symphony No. 1 (a work that Tchaikovsky was known to have admired) likewise opens, as we have seen, with a somewhat similar horn call that is originally presented 'outside the movement' and eventually becomes integrated into the form as a whole. Seen in this way, Tchaikovsky's work provides another example of the 'epic–lyrical monumentality' that characterised an important group of symphonic works from the 1840s and so suggests a continuous historical development that is at odds with Dahlhaus's dialectical model.[78]

A handful of major French composers likewise took up the genre during these years (two examples each by Charles Gounod, Georges Bizet and Camille Saint-Saëns, with numerous echoes of Beethoven, Mendelssohn and Schumann), but operatic hegemony in France made this something of a thankless task, as did the overwhelming preference for older, mostly German repertoire in the programmes of the Société des Concerts du Conservatoire, Société de Sainte-Cécile and Jules Pasdeloup's Concerts Populaires de Musique Classique. Moreover, although the composition of a 'school symphony' (*symphonie d'école*) formed a student's capstone requirement at the Conservatoire, the genre itself was held in no special high regard.[79]

It took military humiliation at German hands in the Franco-Prussian War (1870–1) to begin to turn matters around. The Société Nationale de Musique was founded on 25 February 1871 by Saint-Saëns and a number of other composers with the patriotic 'intention to let French instrumental music speak for itself in a language of its own'.[80] Yet under its motto *ars gallica*, the Society in fact 'fostered the most thoroughgoing Germanification (or "New-Germanification") French music ever endured', as Richard Taruskin has wryly put it, whose 'chief concern was to prove that the Germans, with their absolute music, had no lock on "lofty musical aims"'. The task, then, was nothing less than to produce a body of non-programmatic orchestral and chamber music designed 'to rival the German and even surpass it in its demonstrative profundity of content'.[81]

In the event, however, it was the music of Berlioz and Wagner, respectively, that was more likely to be included in the orchestral programmes of the newly founded Concerts Colonne (1873) and Concerts Lamoureux (1881). Not until the later 1880s did the 'New-Germanified' French symphony really come into its own. Saint-Saëns's 'Organ' Symphony (1886), Vincent d'Indy's *Symphonie sur un chant montagnard français* (1886), César Franck's Symphony in D minor (1886–8) and Ernest Chausson's Symphony in B flat (1889–90) – these works share a number of features, none more prominent (nor more important in the effort to establish 'lofty aims' along New German lines) than cyclic form, characterised by the dramatic return of material from one movement to another, thematic transformation and a variety of other formal experiments.

Symphonic politics in Vienna

These same years saw Vienna reclaim the status it had ceded to Leipzig in the 1830s as the most important centre of symphonic activity in the

German cultural sphere. In 1860 the Wiener Philharmoniker formally established a regular subscription series and elected Otto Dessoff as their conductor. Dessoff was followed, in 1875, by Hans Richter, who conducted the group over the last quarter of the century, during what one commentator has called its 'golden era'.[82] Most programmes contained at least one newer work, and nearly every season offered at least one premiere, most notably Johannes Brahms's Second and Third symphonies (1877 and 1883, respectively) and Anton Bruckner's Symphony No. 8 (1892). The opening of a new home for the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in 1870 further shaped the city's musical life; in its magnificent Großer Musikvereinssaal were given not only the Philharmonic's concerts, but also those of the Society's own series of choral and orchestral programmes, which included the first Viennese performances of Brahms's Symphony No. 1 (1876) and Bruckner's Second and Third symphonies (1876 and 1877, respectively).

The familiar Brahms–Bruckner polemics of the day not only reflected a fundamental aesthetic disagreement – over the relative merits of 'rational elaboration' (Brahms) versus 'inspired invention' (Bruckner) – but also fell out along a growing political fault line within Vienna's bourgeoisie.[83] Brahms's tradition-orientated style suited the taste of Vienna's older *Bildungsbürgertum*; indeed, as Margaret Notley has suggested, it seemed actually to project the typically middle-class values of logical thinking, self-restraint and accomplishment earned through hard work. Significantly, the cultural outlook of these 'commercial, industrial, academic, professional meritocrats', as Ernst Gellner put it, still reflected much of the liberal nationalist ideology of 1848.[84] For this social stratum, which included a disproportionate number of Jews, Germanness was not a birthright, but something that could theoretically be acquired by any ambitious *Bürger* through a conscious embracing of liberal cultural values such as education and property ownership. If this side of the cultural divide could make little sense of Bruckner's sprawling symphonies, which seemed to be more a matter of emotional outpouring than of intellectual control, it was precisely that aspect of the music (along with Bruckner's avowed worship of Wagner) which appealed to those musicians and music critics who reflected the more ethnically delineated German nationalist sentiment that began to form among younger segments of the bourgeoisie in the 1880s. Along with this form of German nationalism came a new *völkisch* cultural critique, whereby essentialist 'German' and 'non-German' traits were opposed in a set of binary oppositions that always privileged the former against an (implied liberal and Jewish) 'other': idealism as opposed to materialism; inwardness as opposed to superficiality; morality as opposed to intellect; rural as opposed to urban; and so

on.[85] From this time forward, German identity became a matter of contention in the reception of new symphonies (that most German of genres).

Brahms's long-awaited emergence as a symphonist – and with a work that invited comparison with Beethoven's Ninth and was even dubbed 'The Tenth Symphony' – drew from Wagner a predictably vitriolic response, expressed in a series of essays published in the *Bayreuther Blätter*.[86] Of particular interest are Wagner's biting comments in the essay 'On the Application of Music to Drama' regarding the 'symphony compositions' of Brahms and other composers of the 'Romantic-Classical school'. No composer other than Beethoven is mentioned by name but the inferences are clear. All but Brahms were Jews and none was shown in a favourable light. After dismissive allusions to Anton Rubinstein's 'programmatic oceanic birds' ('Ocean' Symphony), Joseph Joachim's 'Hungarian' Concerto and Felix Mendelssohn's 'Scottish' Symphony, Wagner comes at last to the 'sterling symphonist disguised in a *Numero Zehn*' and with that to a less opaque style, so as not to be misunderstood:

> We cannot believe that instrumental music has been assured of a thriving future by the creations of its latest masters . . . [Instead of] unthinkingly assigning these works to the Beethovenian legacy . . . we should come to realize the completely un-Beethovenian things about them. And that ought not to be too difficult, considering how unlike Beethoven they are in spirit.

And this was especially true, Wagner held, in the case of the absolute symphony, which took on a 'clammy cast of melody' that had been inappropriately transplanted from the chamber into the concert hall: 'What had been fixed up as quintets and the like was now served up as symphonies. Paltry "melody-chaff", comparable to a mixture of hay and old tea . . . '

These essays gave intellectual 'cover' to a future strand of anti-Semitic musical discourse (while setting a precedent for lumping Brahms in with the Jews).[87] At the same time, they gave new life to old notions of the *große Symphonie* and sowed doubts about the generic propriety of the Romantic symphony, above all in terms of its themes, which were seen to fall short of the 'truly symphonic'.[88] Although, as suggested earlier, it is easy to overstate the importance of this kind of essentialist thinking in the reception of new works introduced in the years following Wagner's mid-century pronouncement of the death of the symphony, it seemed to take an especially strong hold in the 1880s and 1890s among Vienna's Wagnerian critics.[89] Brahms had more powerful champions in the liberal press, especially Hanslick, but even in this quarter certain doubts about his symphonic style occasionally came to the surface.[90]

Still, it is important to stress that the symphony was not inevitably a high-stakes affair. Consider the case of Robert Fuchs, a genuinely popular composer with Viennese audiences who, with two symphonies, several orchestral serenades and a piano concerto under his belt by the end of the 1880s, was heard as often in the Philharmonic's subscription concerts as any other living composer apart from Brahms himself. Fuchs's breakthrough as a symphonist came in November 1884 with the premiere of the Symphony No. 1, Op. 37. To be sure, for the critic Theodor Helm (a recent convert to Bruckner's cause and clearly reflecting the Wagnerian line described above), this was little more than a 'very pretty, charming work'; its main theme, he acknowledged, was 'truly symphonically conceived', but overall the composition left him with 'the feeling that Fuchs's creative power [was] insufficient for the wide scope of a grand symphony'.[91] Yet Hanslick (echoing the sentiments expressed a quarter of a century earlier in his review of Gade's Fourth) offers a considerably different take:

> New forms, unimagined revelations are not to be expected – 'Nature would burst', says Schumann, if she wanted to produce nothing but Beethovens. Fuchs deserves praise for demanding none of this straining from [his symphony] and ventures none of that vigorous storming of the heavens from which most young composers come home with bloody heads. He proceeds with sureness and grace within the boundaries of his amiable talent and writes in a naturally flowing way, with an uncorrupted sense of the beauty of the form and of the sound.[92]

What evidently mattered to this important critic – and, no doubt, to the majority of the orchestra's well-heeled subscribers – was that the composer had set his sights on expressing the beautiful, not the sublime. As for Brahms, he described the Symphony as Fuchs's 'best larger work, and far better, more buoyant, and polished than I ever expected . . . He carries on in such a cosy, intimate way.'[93]

Cosiness and intimacy is not what one associates with Bruckner's symphonies, of course. Owing to Hanslick's opposition, these were largely kept off the Philharmonic's subscription programmes throughout the 1880s, and it fell to the Vienna Academic Wagner Society to keep Bruckner the symphonist in the public eye.[94] It was, after all, easy enough to associate Bruckner with the deceased 'Master' (despite the latter's limited interest in the former). In part, this had to do with certain musical similarities involving outward features such as size and scope, instrumentation and harmonic language. But, as Thomas Leibnitz has argued, Bruckner's devotees seem to have recognised a certain spiritual kinship between the music of the two, in that both 'demanded total devotion from

the listener', although not of the critical, rational sort required fully to apprehend the work of Brahms.[95] On the contrary, Bruckner's symphonies, in the Wagnerian manner, 'aroused a state of overwhelming feeling that brought listening into the vicinity of a mystical and cultic experience' – a far cry indeed from the bourgeois sensibilities of the Philharmonic's patrons.[96]

Not until 21 March 1886, with the Symphony No. 7, did the Philharmonic's subscribers have the opportunity to hear a Bruckner symphony in its entirety. (No doubt the orchestra was responding here at least in part to the recent breakthrough performances of this work in Leipzig and Munich.) The Vienna Academic Wagner Society afterwards presented Bruckner with a laurel wreath inscribed 'To the German symphonist, Master Anton Bruckner, in faith and veneration'.[97] In an earlier time, of course, the expression 'German symphonist' would have amounted to a tautology, but in the politicised environment of the moment, it carried pointed meaning among the Viennese Wagnerians, as suggested above. Yet the liberal critics Hanslick (who likened the work to a 'symphonic boa-constrictor'), Gustav Dömpke (who asserted that 'Bruckner composes like a drunkard') and Max Kalbeck (who described the work as 'no more than an impromptu comedy') found less flattering ways to characterise the composer and his music, and Bruckner disappeared once more from the subscription concerts.[98] Dahlhaus termed this period 'one of the sorriest chapters in the history of music criticism', although he might have noted that Bruckner could at least count on the strong support of Helm, critic for the German-nationalist *Deutsche Zeitung*.[99] Moreover, by 1890, when the composer's symphonies finally began to appear regularly in the Philharmonic's programmes, Helm had been joined by a new, younger breed of national–liberal (and anti-Semitic) critics who published in the newly established *Deutsches Volksblatt* (1889) and *Ostdeutsche Rundschau* (1890), for whom Bruckner represented nothing less than the Aryan ideal of a symphonic composer.[100]

Was ist deutsch?

Far removed from this Aryan ideal, but enjoying a place at the very centre of late Hapsburg musical culture, was Carl Goldmark, best known for *The Queen of Sheba*, which opened at the Vienna Court Opera on 10 March 1875. Goldmark's debut as a symphonist came one year later, on 5 March 1876, when the Philharmonic players introduced *Ländliche Hochzeit* (*Rustic Wedding*), a colourful symphony in five suite-like movements that likewise was highly popular in its day.[101] Our concern here, however,

is with the composer's less well-known Symphony No. 2, heard in the Philharmonic concerts on 26 February 1888, during a period when Viennese anti-Semitism, in a new racialist manifestation, was beginning to gather some political force, and in particular with the work's reception by the critic Ludwig Speidel, who, along with Hanslick, was the most influential of Vienna's liberal critics.

'With Goldmark', notes Speidel, 'the East is doubly present: by birth and heritage; he is Hebrew and Hungarian, Jew and gypsy'. He continues:

> Apart from his *Queen of Sheba*, where Judaism is local colour, in his earlier instrumental works there welled up from time to time quite melancholic, anxious, strangely crimped melodies, which stemmed from the synagogue or his own strained disposition. In . . . his symphony, this inclination toward the Orient is set aside; not even so much as a trace of dialect is left over.[102]

For Speidel, the supposed lingering influence in the opera of Goldmark's traditional Jewish upbringing was unseemly, too redolent of the ghetto, and the critic is only too happy to note how, in the new symphony, no trace of this aspect of the composer's heritage can be detected.[103]

There could be no denying, by contrast, that the second movement, marked by two outbursts in the *verbunkos* style, looks towards the other side of Goldmark's Eastern heritage. Yet this was a matter of no special dismay; after all, as Speidel notes, Haydn, Beethoven and Schubert had long ago incorporated gypsy music 'as an interesting province into the empire of German music'. (The implication, of course, is that a musical style that might somehow reflect *Ostjudentum*, with its assumed religious obscurantism, was fundamentally incompatible with that empire.) And with that, the critic turns happily from the subject of Goldmark's Eastern heritage to his firm embrace of liberal German culture:

> [The symphony] is German in its invention and certainly German in its aesthetic rendering. The first movement is in both respects the most outstanding, with a peacefully and nobly performed main idea, in which the capacity for development and advancement is distinctly marked. Only with the development, however, is it shown what a devil of a theme this had been in the first place. The composer reduces it with passionate energy into its constituents, and as if from a witch's cauldron it rises again to its initial beauty.

The end of this passage almost reads like an account of a Beethovenian sonata form, and it clearly recalls Dahlhaus's notion of a Beethovenian 'rule' regarding the 'double function' of a symphonic main theme as something to be broken down in the development and then triumphantly recombined at the outset of the recapitulation. Thus, striking as Speidel's comments about oriental inclinations and musical imperialism may be, what seems really at

stake for him is to establish Goldmark's *German* credentials. The Jew has been assimilated; the gypsy, colonised; the German, celebrated. And we have no reason to think that Goldmark – who utterly embraced a German cultural identity – would have objected.[104]

Antonín Dvořák, by contrast, would never have counted himself among the Germans, but that did not stop Hanslick, the Czech composer's greatest Viennese champion, from writing about his music as though he did.[105] Hanslick's determination to treat Dvořák as an acculturated German betrays, of course, his continuing commitment to traditional liberal nationalist ideology. The younger Helm, by contrast, who came of age in the 1860s, after the Czech national movement had begun to threaten traditional German prerogatives in Bohemia, tended to see difference based in ethnicity where Hanslick did not.[106] And among those still-younger critics of the *Deutsches Volksblatt* and *Ostdeutsche Rundschau* who evince the radical ideology of pan-Germanism in their work, we see the tendency to denigrate both the Jews and the Czechs, treated more or less interchangeably as aliens within the German nation and enjoying undue favourable treatment under the Hapsburg state.

The critical response to Dvořák's Symphony No. 8, heard in the Philharmonic series on 3 January 1891, illustrates every aspect of this complex picture. Whereas Hanslick writes favourably about the work, Helm looks disparagingly at Dvořák's 'addiction to Slavic national composition'.[107] This last remark pales, however, in comparison to the over-the-top rhetoric employed by Camillo Horn (a German Bohemian) in his review for the *Ostdeutsche Rundschau*.[108] Much of this scathing account consists of a gloss on Hanslick's review, in which the *deutschnational* critic interweaves passages adapted from that account with his own caustic commentary. Horn then takes wider aim at the liberal critic as a 'foreign' representative of the despised supranational monarchy:

> As in everything else so also unfortunately in the essence of art do we see the striving of the state and of the Germans, or, to put it better, of those who want to be numbered among them, to rear the Slavs and Jews to the detriment of their own people. Thus . . . Dvořák received a state stipend long before Bruckner; but what is Dvořák next to a Bruckner?

Here Horn treats Hanslick (whose mother was a baptised Jew) not as a fellow German but as one 'who wanted to be numbered among them'. And this 'imposter' had not only sat on the state commission that awarded the Slavic composer several stipends in the 1870s, but was also largely responsible for impeding Bruckner's fortunes in the Imperial capital. To a pan-Germanist like Horn, then, the critic of the *Neue freie Presse* was an almost irresistible target – as both a Jew (however Hanslick might have thought of

himself) and a powerful representative of the hated liberal nationalist elite, and as both an opponent of an unjustly neglected *echt* German composer and a champion of an unworthy Slavic one. Just how unworthy becomes clear, finally, in the essay's concluding lines, wherein, by likening Dvořák to Meyerbeer, Horn in effect condemns him as a Jew:

> Dvořák, who . . . might appropriately be called the Bohemian Meyerbeer, is only original where he is Slavic; but where he is Slavic he is for the most part vulgar . . . [If only] our artists were national, then that and much else would be better. Will this ever happen? We can only hope!

Although coarse rhetoric of this kind is scarcely representative of Viennese society as a whole, much less of the elite that retained its hold over the institutions of culture, it cannot escape notice that the 1890s, which saw Karl Lueger's Christian Social Party rise to municipal power on an openly anti-Semitic appeal, marked the securing at last of a firm place in the Philharmonic's repertoire for Bruckner, capped by the triumphant premiere of the Symphony No. 8 on 18 December 1892. Subscribers trickled out of the hall after each of the movements (Hanslick himself before the Finale), but this evidence of discomfort on the part of the city's 'meritocrats' only encouraged the large crowd of some 300 Bruckner partisans, including many students with pan-German sympathies who gathered in the standing room and gallery of the Großer Musikvereinssaal. Writing this time in the *Deutsches Volksblatt*, Horn praised the 'German feeling and thinking, which endowed the second movement that the composer himself had christened "the German Michael", with eloquent expression', while the composer's triumph stimulated an anonymous writer for the *Ostdeutsche Rundschau* to enthuse in a manner worthy of Wagner himself: 'What makes Bruckner so valuable a musician is his unconscious recognition of the true mission of music, namely the direct illustration of the primordial shaping, destroying, conflicting world-feeling-elements.'[109] An account less apt to describe the music of Brahms, not to speak of Fuchs, Goldmark or Dvořák, is difficult to imagine.

Epilogue

In September 1898, Hans Richter abruptly resigned the position he had held for more than twenty years as director of the concerts of the Vienna Philharmonic and was replaced by Gustav Mahler, then entering his second season as director of the Imperial Court Opera.[110] The presence

in Lueger's Vienna of a thriving anti-Semitic press meant that Mahler's status as a Jew (despite the baptism he had recently undergone in order to work at the court) would not go unmentioned in discussions of his work in these two key appointments. The *Deutsche Zeitung* pulled no punches: 'In our view, in a German city only a *German* appears qualified to interpret German music, [and this is] a condition that Mahler is just not able to fulfill'.[111] Nevertheless, in an era in which Jews dominated Vienna's public life more than ever, the power and influence that Mahler exercised as head of both the Court Opera and the Philharmonic concerts was beyond question, and despite all the controversy he engendered (much of it having little to do with anti-Semitism), Mahler was undoubtedly 'one of the city's few authentic celebrities, with many more admirers than detractors'.[112]

In one sense, Mahler's association with the Wiener Philharmoniker reminds us of our starting point. As had been the case sixty years earlier with Mendelssohn and the Gewandhaus Orchestra, once again we find a composer of the first rank in a position of leadership of a pre-eminent orchestral series. Like those of Mendelssohn, Mahler's programmes were dominated by the music of Beethoven but also included selected symphonies by Haydn and Mozart as well as works by Schubert, Schumann and Mendelssohn himself. To this established canon was added music by the recently deceased Brahms (including the Second and Third symphonies) and Bruckner (abridged versions of the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth symphonies). On the other hand, the once-popular Fuchs now lost his place entirely in the orchestra's repertoire, while Goldmark and Dvořák, the other two living favourites of the Richter era, were represented only by shorter, non-symphonic works (mostly concert overtures and other programmatic compositions). To be sure, Mahler widened the orchestra's repertoire by conducting its first performances of a number of other compositions from the preceding half-century, including Liszt's *Festklänge*, Hermann Goetz's Symphony in F, César Franck's *Variations symphoniques*, as well as pieces by Bizet, Tchaikovsky and Smetana. But apart from Richard Strauss's *Aus Italien*, the only 'modernist' works that were heard during Mahler's time at the orchestra's helm were two symphonies of his own, the Second, in the annual Nicolai benefit concert, in April 1899, and the First, in a subscription concert in November 1900.

In April 1901 Mahler resigned his position as director of the Philharmonic concerts after only three turbulent seasons.[113] Although his symphonies remained a notable presence on Viennese concert bills for several years thereafter – each of the first seven was heard at least once in the Imperial city between 1902 and 1909; the Ninth received its première there posthumously in 1912 – it cannot be said that any of these works went down especially well with the largely conservative

Viennese audiences, nor with many of the city's music critics.[114] By the turn of the century, Vienna was gripped by the same 'suspicion of new music', as William Weber has put it, that now characterised public concert life more generally. Unfamiliar works of any kind – still more those of the 'modernist' stripe – were anathema to audiences, and most critics were quick to denounce new music 'in and of itself'.[115] To be sure, Mahler could always count on support from a vocal minority of mostly younger listeners. Moreover, certain liberal critics such as Richard Heuberger, Max Kalbeck and Julius Korngold, Hanslick's successor at the *Neue freie Presse*, consistently accorded the composer a measure of guarded respect, despite their aesthetic misgivings.[116] After all, if the aesthetic core of the earlier Bruckner–Brahms debate had had to do with the relative merits of 'inspired invention' as opposed to 'logical elaboration', then it is easy enough to see how Mahler's characteristic (and virtuosic) technique of breaking down his tunes into their constituent motives and then recombining them in ever new melodic and contrapuntal patterns would now have its appeal for the same critics who had always supported Brahms at Bruckner's expense.[117] Yet at a time when even Brahms's works were only now becoming an 'easier sell' in Vienna, we can scarcely wonder at the puzzlement caused by Mahler's symphonies, with their unheard-of dimensions, idiosyncratic formal designs and many stylistic discontinuities (which the composer made all the more puzzling by resolutely refusing to 'explain' them by means of a programme).

Hanslick was in attendance at the Philharmonic's performance of the Symphony No. 1 in 1900. Like Kalbeck and the other younger liberal critics mentioned above, he seems to have *wanted* to give the composer's work its due, yet he scarcely knew how to go about it. (For once, he regretted the absence of a programme that might show the way.) In conveying this state of affairs, the aging critic began with a brief anecdote and ended with a frank acknowledgment of his own limitations:

> 'One of us must be crazy and it is not I!' This is how two stubborn scholars ended a long argument. It probably is I, I thought with genuine modesty, after recovering from the horrific Finale of Mahler's D major Symphony. As a sincere admirer of the conductor Mahler, to whom the Opera and the Philharmonic Orchestra are so deeply indebted, I do not want to be hasty in my judgement of his strange symphony. On the other hand I owe sincerity to my readers and thus must sadly admit that the new symphony is the kind of music which for me is not music .... At a future performance of the symphony, I hope to be able to expand this brief review, which here is more confession than judgement. At present I lack a full appreciation of what at times this most intelligent composer also lacks: 'the grace of God'.[118]

Several years later Mahler would find himself in a somewhat similar situation after hearing the first performance of Arnold Schoenberg's taut, one-movement Chamber Symphony, Op. 9, given at the Musikverein on 8 February 1907. In a public display of his own guarded respect for the younger composer, Mahler came to Schoenberg's defence as the expected hue and cry broke out in the hall, just as he had done three days earlier when a similar scene erupted during the premiere of Schoenberg's First String Quartet.[119] But, like Hanslick, he could only go so far in his own appreciation. 'I don't understand his music', Mahler confessed afterwards to his wife, Alma, 'but he's young and perhaps he's right. I am old and I dare say my ear is not sensitive enough.'[120]

The very notion of a 'chamber symphony', something that Brahms but certainly not Wagner might have imagined (although Schoenberg's work was indebted to both), is clearly at odds with concepts such as the symphonic style and monumentality. At the same time, it is emblematic of what Dahlhaus characterises as 'a shift in accent in the system of musical genres' that took place in the early twentieth century in the transition from musical modernism to the New Music: in a 'tricky dialectics' (*vertrackte Dialektik*), chamber music – that erstwhile 'reserve of conservatives who clung to the old because they were baffled by the new' – now displaced the Lisztian symphonic poem and Wagnerian music drama as the principal means of 'progressive' musical expression.[121] But when Dahlhaus goes on to argue that the symphony as represented by Bruckner and Mahler had formed a 'quasi-neutral' genre in the party polemics at the turn of the century we have reason once again to take pause.[122] In Vienna, at any rate, the highly charged question of who counted as German was never far from the surface in any critical account of that most 'German' of genres.

Notes

1 Carl Dahlhaus, *Die Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Laaber, 1980), 65. I take my characterisation of Dahlhaus's historiographic method from James Hepokoski, 'The Dahlhaus Project and Its Extra-Musicological Sources', *19th-Century Music*, 14/3 (1991), 238–9, n. 3. Hepokoski was prompted in part by the recent publication of *Die Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts* in an English translation: *Nineteenth-Century Music*, trans. J. Bradford Robinson (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1989). Unless otherwise indicated, however, I provide my own translations. I am grateful to Professor Hepokoski, as well as to Walter Frisch and Sanna Pederson, for their comments on earlier versions of this essay.

2 Dahlhaus, *Die Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts*, 125.

3 See, for example, Sanna Pederson, 'On the Task of the Music Historian: The Myth of the Symphony after Beethoven', *Repercussions*, 2 (1993), 5–30.

4 Enormously helpful, too, are the three instalments in A. Peter Brown's *Symphonic Repertoire* series devoted to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (excluding Beethoven and Schubert), which together run to nearly 3,000 pages. See A. Peter Brown, *The Symphonic Repertoire*, vol. III, Part A: *The European Symphony ca. 1800–ca. 1930: Germany and the Nordic Countries* (Bloomington, 2007); A. Peter Brown and

Brian Hart, *The Symphonic Repertoire*, vol. III, Part B: *The European Symphony ca. 1800–ca. 1930: Great Britain, Russia, and France* (Bloomington, 2008); and A. Peter Brown, *The Symphonic Repertoire*, vol. IV: *The Second Golden Age of the Viennese Symphony: Brahms, Bruckner, Dvořák and Selected Contemporaries* (Bloomington, 2003).

5 For a thoughtful overview that is focussed more than I am here on matters of musical style, see James Hepokoski, 'Beethoven Reception: The Symphonic Tradition', in *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth-Century Music*, ed. Jim Samson (Cambridge, 2001), 424–59. As implied by its title, this article is largely accepting of Dahlhaus's model, but this is developed in quite a nuanced reading.

6 Brown, *The European Symphony from ca. 1800 to ca. 1930: Germany and the Nordic Countries*, 28.

7 For a thorough and most useful study of changing concert-programming practices in this regard, see William Weber, *The Great Transformation of Musical Taste: Concert Programming from Haydn to Brahms* (Cambridge, 2008), esp. 169–207. See also Rebecca Grotjahn, *Die Sinfonie im deutschen Kulturgebiet 1850 bis 1875: Ein Beitrag zur Gattungs- und Institutionengeschichte* (Sinzig, 1998), 102–7 and Antje Pieper, *Music and the Making of Middle-Class Culture: A Comparative History of Nineteenth-Century Leipzig and Birmingham* (Basingstoke, 2008), 105–10.

8 Robert Schumann, 'Musikleben in Leipzig während des Winters 1839–40', *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 12 (1840), 139, trans. in Brown, *The European Symphony from ca. 1800 to ca. 1930: Germany and the Nordic Countries*, 4–5.

9 The standard reference is Alfred Dörffel, *Geschichte der Gewandhausconcerte zu Leipzig*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1884).

10 For a complete listing of new repertoire from 1801 to 1881, see Brown, *The European Symphony from ca. 1800 to ca. 1930: Germany and the Nordic Countries*, 9–23 (Tables I/4–I/9).

11 Dahlhaus, *Die Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts*, 41.

12 The first quotation is taken from Pieper, *Music and the Making of Middle-Class Culture*, 63; the second, from Sanna Pederson, 'A. B. Marx, Berlin Concert Life, and German National Identity', *19th-Century Music*, 18/2 (1993), 89. For discussion of the symphony as a 'German' genre, see Mark Evan Bonds, *Music as Thought: Listening to the Symphony in the Age of Beethoven* (Princeton and Oxford, 2006), 88–91.

13 A[ugust] K[ahlert], *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung*, 45 (1843), col. 341.

14 Robert Schumann, Review of Berlioz, *Symphonie fantastique*, *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 3 (1835), 1–2, 33–5, 37–8, 41–4 and 49–51, trans. Ian Bent as 'R. Schumann: "[Review of Berlioz: *Fantastic* Symphony]" (1835)', in *Music Analysis in the Nineteenth Century*, 2 vols., ed. Ian Bent (Cambridge, 1994), vol. II, 161–94 (hereafter: Schumann–Bent). On Schumann's conflicted attitude towards Berlioz, see Leon Plantinga, *Schumann as Critic* (New Haven and London, 1967), 235–50.

15 The quotations from Schumann's review in this and the following paragraph are taken from Schumann–Bent, 171–5.

16 Here Schumann is referring to Louis Spohr's once wildly popular programmatic Symphony No. 4 (*Die Weihe der Töne*), composed in 1832 and given no fewer than seventeen performances at the Gewandhaus between 1834 and 1869, more than half of which took place during the Mendelssohn era. For Schumann's devastating review of the Gewandhaus performance of 5 February 1835, see *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 11 (1835), 65–6, trans. in Brown, *The European Symphony from ca. 1800 to ca. 1930: Germany and the Nordic Countries*, 95.

17 Both Dahlhaus (*Nineteenth-Century Music*, 154–6) and Jon Finson (*Robert Schumann and the Study of Orchestral Composition: The Genesis of the First Symphony Op. 38* [Oxford, 1989], 20–2) suggest that Schumann is attempting to reassure his readers that Berlioz's design can be derived from standard practice and therefore need not be so forbidding. Yet, as Fred Everett Maus has argued, Schumann's concluding remark seems to privilege originality, not dependence on tradition. See Fred Everett Maus, 'Intersubjectivity and Analysis: Schumann's Essay on the *Fantastic* Symphony', in *Music Theory in the Age of Romanticism*, ed. Ian Bent (Cambridge, 1996), 125–37.

18 M[arie] Miel, 'Über Sinfonie, über die Sinfonien Beethovens, und über ihre Aufführung in Paris', *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 1 (1834), 101.

19 G. W. Fink, 'Ueber die Symphonie, als Beitrag zur Geschichte und Aesthetik derselben', *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung*, 37 (1835), cols. 505–11, 521–4, 557–63 (at col. 511).

20 E. T. A. Hoffmann, unsigned review of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung*, 12 (1809/10), cols. 630–42, 652–69; trans. Martin Clarke, with David Charlton and Ian Bent, in Bent, ed.,

Music Analysis in the Nineteenth Century, vol. II, 146.

21 Fink, 'Ueber die Symphonie', col. 523. For discussion of the long-running tension between the two critics, which involved both mutual disgust at the other's editorial policies and plain personal animosity and was often played out in print, see Plantinga, *Schumann as Critic*, 23–39 (esp. 30–9).

22 Fink, 'Ueber die Symphonie', col. 523. A few years later, Fink described the attributes of the grand symphony at greater length in his article 'Symphonie oder Sinfonie', in *Encyklopädie der gesammten musikalischen Wissenschaften: oder Universal-Lexicon der Tonkunst*, ed. Gustav Schilling, 6 vols. (Stuttgart, 1838; repr., Hildesheim and New York, 1974), vol. VI, 541–51. For discussion, see Siegfried Oechsle, *Symphonik nach Beethoven: Studien zu Schubert, Schumann, Mendelssohn und Gade* (Kassel, 1992), 24–31, and Walter Frisch, '"Echt symphonisch": On the Historical Context of Brahms's Symphonies', in *Brahms Studies*, vol. II, ed. David Brodbeck (Lincoln and London, 1998), 114–16.

23 Ulrich Konrad, 'Der Wiener Kompositionswettbewerb 1835 und Franz Lachners *Sinfonia passionata*: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Sinfonie nach Beethoven', in *Augsburger Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft 1986*, ed. Franz Krautwurst (Tutzing, 1986), 209–39. See also Wolfram Steinbeck, 'Franz Lachner und die Symphonie', *Franz Lachner und seine Brüder: Hofkapellmeister zwischen Schubert und Wagner* (Tutzing, 2006), 133–43.

24 *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 5 (1836), 147–8.

25 This and the next several quotations are from *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 5 (1836), 151–2. My translations in this paragraph are adapted from Plantinga, *Schumann as Critic*, 191–2.

26 G. W. Fink, 'Preissinfonie', *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung*, 39 (1837), cols. 201–9, 217–22 (the analysis in cols. 201–9; the quotation at col. 217).

27 Ibid., cols. 218–19. I am grateful to Annegret Fauser for her assistance in translating this colourful passage.

28 Ibid., col. 220.

29 Robert Schumann, 'Neue Symphonien für Orchester', *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 11 (1839), 1–3 and 17–18 (at 1); translation here and below adapted from Finson, *Robert Schumann and the Study of Orchestral Composition*, 19; and Frisch, '"Echt symphonisch": On the Historical Context of Brahms' Symphonies', 117.

30 Mark Evan Bonds, *After Beethoven: Imperatives of Originality in the Symphony* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1996), 111–17; Oechsle, *Symphonik nach Beethoven*, 374–5.

31 Schumann arranged to have the score sent to Mendelssohn, who conducted the work in its premiere at the Gewandhaus on 21 March 1839, but he remained in Vienna at the time of that performance and so had not yet heard the symphony at the time of this review.

32 L. Michael Griffel, 'Schubert's Orchestral Music: "Strivings after the Highest in Art"', in Christopher H. Gibbs, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Schubert* (Cambridge, 1997), 203.

33 Schumann–Bent, 171; Robert Schumann, 'Die 7te Symphonie von Franz Schubert', *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 12 (10 March 1840), 81–3 (here at 82).

34 Schumann, 'Die 7te Symphonie von Franz Schubert', 82–3.

35 See, for example, Schumann's letter of 11 December 1839 to his friend Ernst A. Becker, quoted in Bonds, *After Beethoven*, 110–11.

36 On the 'Great' C major in this context, see Siegfried Oechsle, 'Schubert, Schumann und die Symphonie nach Beethoven', in *Probleme der symphonischen Tradition im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Siegfried Kross and Marie Luise Maintz (Tutzing, 1990), 284–92, Marie Luise Maintz, '"... *In neuverschlungener Weise*" – Schuberts Einfluß auf die Symphonien Schumann', in ibid., 117–18, and Finson, *Schumann and the Study of Orchestral Composition*, 36–8, 44–5 and 56. On the symphonies by Mendelssohn and Gade, see Oechsle, *Symphonik nach Beethoven*, 376–84. Hereafter, unless otherwise indicated, all descriptive or analytical references to individual symphonies will be to their first movements.

37 In 1842 Gade's symphony was turned down for performance by the Copenhagen Music Society for being too 'Germanic', but it delighted the Leipzig audience on account of its exotic 'national tone' when Mendelssohn introduced it there instead on 2 March 1843. See Anna Harwell Celenza, *The Early Works of Niels W. Gade: In Search of the Poetic* (Ashgate, 2001), 169–76.

38 Carl Dahlhaus, 'Symphonie und symphonischer Stil um 1850', in *Jahrbuch des Staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung Preußischer Kulturbesitz* 1983/84, ed. Dagmar Droysen-Reber and Günther Wagner (Kassel, 1987), 43–4.

39 Ibid., 45–6. For a convenient summary, see Carl Dahlhaus, 'Wagners Stellung in der Musikgeschichte', in *Richard-Wagner-Handbuch*, ed. Ulrich Müller and Peter Wapnewski (Stuttgart, 1986), 73, trans. by Alfred Clayton as 'Wagner's Place in the

History of Music', in *Wagner Handbook*, ed. Ulrich Müller and Peter Wapnewski, trans. and ed. John Deathridge (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1992), 102. A more detailed account is provided in Carl Dahlhaus, *Ludwig van Beethoven: Approaches to his Music* (Oxford, 1991), 67–90.

40 Dahlhaus, *Nineteenth-Century Music*, 156–60.

41 Scott Burnham, 'Novel Symphonies and Dramatic Overtures', in Beate Perrey, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Schumann* (Cambridge, 2007), 154. Ironically, Schumann's own instinct, in his reviews of the *Symphonie fantastique* and 'Great' C major Symphony, was to praise each work precisely in terms of what he claimed they were *not*, namely, imitations of Beethoven; see Bonds, *After Beethoven*, 116.

42 Siegfried Oechsle, 'Die problemgeschichtliche Vitalität der Symphonie im 19. Jahrhundert', in *Aspekte historischer und systematischer Musikforschung: Zur Symphonie im 19. Jahrhundert, zu Fragen der Musiktheorie, der Wahrnehmung von Musik und Anderes*, ed. Christoph-Hellmut Mahling and Kristina Pfarr (Mainz, 2002), 19–27.

43 Oechsle, *Symphonik nach Beethoven*, 376.

44 Dahlhaus, *Die Musik im 19. Jahrhundert*, 221.

45 Oechsle, *Symphonik nach Beethoven*, 377.

46 Ibid., 376, 383.

47 Burnham ('Novel Symphonies and Dramatic Overtures', 154–7) shares an insightful observation about the uniformity of the opening Allegro of Schumann's Second by way of contrasting the music with Beethoven's Seventh. On the Schubertian resonances in Schumann's Second, see Brown, *The European Symphony from ca. 1800 to ca. 1930: Germany and the Nordic Countries*, 262–77, and John Daverio, *Robert Schumann: Herald of a 'New Poetic Age'* (New York and Oxford, 1997), 315–22. On Gade, see Brown, *The European Symphony from ca. 1800 to ca. 1930: Germany and the Nordic Countries*, 431–52.

48 Dahlhaus, *Die Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts*, 220. Schumann's Fourth Symphony (1851) dates from 1841 but was withdrawn following its first performance and issued to the public only after undergoing a thorough reorchestration ten years later.

49 What Wagner had in mind, of course, was the claim that the Beethovenian symphonic style had been subsumed within the music drama, and Dahlhaus follows this line of thinking in suggesting a similar transformation, not only of the concert overture (Liszt's symphonic poems), but also of the solo concerto (Henry Litolff's *concert symphonique*) and mass (Liszt's *Graner Messe*). See Dahlhaus, 'Symphonie und symphonischer Stil um 1850', 39–41, and Dahlhaus, 'Liszts Idee des Symphonischen', in his *Klassische und romantische Musikästhetik* (Laaber, 1988), 392–3.

50 See Dahlhaus, *Die Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts*, 65 and 197; Dahlhaus, 'Symphonie und symphonischer Stil um 1850', 38, and Dahlhaus, 'Liszts Idee des Symphonischen', 392 (Rubinstein only).

51 Dahlhaus, *Die Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts*, 197. For a thoughtful critique of this position, see Wolfram Steinbeck, *Romantische und nationale Symphonik*, part I of *Die Symphonie im 19. and 20. Jahrhundert*, by Wolfram Steinbeck and Christoph von Blumröder (Laaber, 2002), 156–60. See also Siegfried Kross, 'Das "Zweite Zeitalter der Symphonie" – Ideologie und Realität', in *Probleme der symphonischen Tradition im 19. Jahrhundert*, 16, and compare Frisch, '"Echt symphonisch": On the Historical Context of Brahms's Symphonies', 122–4.

52 See Rebecca Grotjahn, 'Zur Bedeutung der Sinfonie im Musikleben 1850 bis 1875', in Mahling and Pfarr, eds., *Aspekte historischer und systematischer Musikforschung* (Mainz, 2002), 49–57, on which I base much of the following discussion.

53 Grotjahn, *Die Sinfonie im deutschen Kulturgebiet*, 154–202.

54 In his review of the Vienna Philharmonic's concert of 8 March 1863, for example, Eduard Hanslick wrote, 'By featuring two new works [Brahms's Second Serenade (1859) and the Symphony in C minor (1863) by Moriz Käsmayer] . . . the Philharmonic players fought with praiseworthy decisiveness against the often made complaint – including in these pages – of an exclusivity in its programs that borders on rigidity.' See Ed[uard] H[anslick],'Musik', *Die Presse* (13 March 1863).

55 For an alphabetical listing by composer, see Grotjahn, *Die Sinfonie im deutschen Kulturgebiet*, 323–64. Somewhat less complete (but still useful) counts are provided in Walter Frisch, *Brahms: The Four Symphonies* (New Haven and London, 2003), 7–10, and F. E. Kirby, 'The Germanic Symphony of the Nineteeth Century: Genre, Form, Instrumentation, Expression', *Journal of Musicological Research*, 14 (1995), 193–221.

56 See Steinbeck, *Romantische und nationale Symphonik*, 170–2, and Andreas Wehrmeyer, 'Zur historischen Stellung der Symphonien Anton Rubinsteins', in Mahling and Pfarr, eds.,

Aspekte historischer und systematischer Musikforschung, 209–11.
57 See Matthias Wiegandt, *Vergessene Symphonik? Studien zu Joachim Raff, Carl Reinecke und zum Problem der Epigonalität in der Musik* (Sinzig, 1997), 105–314, Falke, *Die Symphonie zwischen Schumann und Brahms*, 19–52 and 157–283, Steinbeck, *Romantische und nationale Symphonik*, 167–70, 173–5, and Frisch, '"Echt symphonisch": On the Historical Context of Brahms's Symphonies', 124–30.
58 On the Manifesto, see David Brodbeck, 'Brahms, the Third Symphony, and the New German School', in Walter Frisch and Kevin Karnes, eds., *Brahms and His World*, rev. edn (Princeton, 2009), 103–7. It is worth noting that, among Liszt's twelve symphonic poems, only *Les Préludes* (1848) and *Tasso* (1849) attained status as 'living classics' during the period under question.
59 This helps to explain the paradox that Frisch observes in the case of Friedrich Chrysander's review of Max Bruch's First Symphony (*Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung*, 4 [1869], 67) of a favourable account that contains sharp criticism of the suitability of the main theme for symphonic treatment. Emanuel Klitzsch's review of the same work (*Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 66 [1870], 282) calls the main theme 'truly symphonic' but finds fault in what Bruch does with it. See Frisch, '"Echt symphonisch"', 124–30.
60 *Leipziger Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung*, 1 (1866), col. 103.
61 Grotjahn, *Die Sinfonie im deutschen Kulturgebiet*, 278.
62 In this way, as J. Peter Burkholder has argued, Brahms established the very model of the modern composer by explicitly writing works for the 'concert hall as museum'; see J. Peter Burkholder, 'Brahms and Twentieth-Century Music', *19th-Century Music*, 8 (1984/5), 75–83.
63 Grotjahn, *Die Sinfonie im deutschen Kulturgebiet*, 264–6.
64 *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung, Neue Folge*, 3 (1865), col. 521.
65 Grotjahn, 'Zur Bedeutung der Sinfonie im Musikleben 1850 bis 1875', 56.
66 Ed[uard] H[anslick], 'Concerte', *Die Presse* (22 November 1860); repr. in Eduard Hanslick, *Aus dem Concertsaal* (Vienna, 1870), 208.
67 Louis Köhler, *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 62 (1866), 26.
68 Hugo Riemann, *Geschichte der Musik seit Beethoven* (Berlin and Stuttgart, 1901), 432–3; quoted in Steinbeck, *Romantische und nationale Symphonik*, 167. On Raff's 'middle way', see Wolfram Steinbeck, 'Nationale Symphonik und die Neudeutschen: Zu Joachim Raffs Symphonie "An das Vaterland"', in Helmut Loos, ed., *Musikgeschichte zwischen Ost- und Westeuropa* (Sankt Augustin, 1997), 70–3.
69 Ed[uard] H[anslick], 'Musik', *Die Presse* (24 February 1863); repr. in Eduard Hanslick, 'Die Preissymphonien', *Aus dem Concertsaal*, 279–83 (at 282). The work's great length also posed its difficulties: 'Raff's symphony is the longest we know. With his praise of the "heavenly lengths" of Schubert's C major Symphony, Schumann has caused much misfortune, since not all his followers have had the good sense of Schumann himself not to imitate this "heavenly length" when the heavenly long thread of Schubert's melody is not there as well' (ibid., 282–3).
70 Ibid., 282.
71 Ibid. I am grateful to Alan Krueck (personal communication) for informing me of Helene Raff's claim that her father added this programme on the day for the concert; see Helene Raff, *Joachim Raff: Ein Lebensbild* (Regensburg, 1925), 160. Raff provided a rather more detailed programme in the published score.
72 Ed[uard] H[anslick], 'Concerte', *Die Presse* (16 January 1863); repr. in Hanslick, *Aus dem Concertsaal*, 291.
73 Hanslick, 'Die Preissymphonien', 282.
74 Steinbeck, *Romantische und nationale Symphonik*, 170; see also Steinbeck, 'Nationale Symphonik und die Neudeutschen', 73–4.
75 Wehrmeyer, 'Zur historischen Stellung der Symphonien Anton Rubinsteins', 209.
76 Quoted in ibid., 212. When, after a long hiatus, Rubinstein took up the genre again with his Fourth Symphony ('Dramatic', 1874), his model, by contrast, was Beethoven, and in his final two symphonies he approached a Russian nationalist style at last, with nearly all the themes in the Fifth Symphony ('Russian', 1880), for example, exuding the character of folksongs. Ibid., 215–17.
77 Dahlhaus, *Nineteenth-Century Music*, 266–8 (here at 268).
78 Wolfram Steinbeck has claimed that a similar fruitful comparison can be made between the horn melody that opens the slow introduction to Tchaikovsky's Second and the openings of Schubert's 'Great' C major and Mendelssohn's 'Scottish' symphonies. See Wolfram Steinbeck, 'Russische Rezeption deutscher Symphonik: Zu Čajkovskijs *Zweiter Symphonie*', in *Rezeption als Innovation: Untersuchungen zu einem Grundmodell der europäischen Kompositionsgeschichte*, ed. Bernd Sponheuer, Siegfried Oechsle and Helmut Weill (Kassel and Basel, 2001), 357–66. See also the discussion of the striking

similarities between the terse openings of Volkmann's First Symphony and Borodin's Symphony No. 2 in B Minor, in Falke, *Die Symphonie zwischen Schumann und Brahms*, 157–271, Grotjahn, *Die Sinfonie im deutschen Kulturgebiet*, 282–6, Steinbeck, *Romantische und nationale Symphonik*, 173–4, and Klaus Wolfgang Niemöller, 'Zur Symphonik von Robert Volkmann', in Loos, ed., *Musikgeschichte zwischen Ost- und Westeuropa* (Sankt Augustin, 1997), 57–68.

79 Brian Hart, 'The French Symphony After Berlioz: From the Second Empire to the First World War', in Brown, *The European Symphony from ca. 1800 to ca. 1930: Great Britain, Russia and France*, 529–725; also helpful is Ralph P. Locke, 'The French Symphony: David, Gounod, and Bizet to Saint-Saëns, Franck, and Their Followers', in *The Nineteenth-Century Symphony*, ed. D. Kern Holoman (New York, 1997), 163–94.

80 Dahlhaus, *Nineteenth-Century Music*, 284.

81 Richard Taruskin, 'Nationalism', in Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online, www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/50846 (accessed 31 December 2008). For an excellent discussion, see Michael Strasser, 'The Société Nationale and Its Adversaries: The Musical Politics of *L'Invasion germanique* in the 1870s', *19th-Century Music*, 24/3 (2001), 225–51.

82 Clemens Hellsberg, *Demokratie der Könige: Die Geschichte der Wiener Philharmoniker* (Zurich, Vienna and Mainz, 1992), 205–93.

83 For the best introduction, see Margaret Notley, *Lateness and Brahms: Music and Culture in the Twilight of Viennese Liberalism* (Oxford and New York, 2007), 3–35 ('Brahms as Liberal, Bruckner as Other'). Following Notley (ibid., 16), I borrow these characterisations from Constantin Floros, 'Einfallsapologetik gegen Verherrlichung des Ausarbeitung', in his *Brahms und Bruckner: Studien zur musikalischen Exegetik* (Wiesbaden, 1980), 30–4.

84 Ernest Gellner, *Language and Solitude: Wittgenstein, Malinowski and the Habsburg Dilemma* (Cambridge, 1998), 11.

85 For a convenient tabular presentation of this dichotomy, see Margaret Notley, 'Bruckner and Viennese Wagnerism', in *Bruckner Studies*, ed. Timothy L. Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw (Cambridge, 1997), 54–71 (at 62). Notley credits Ernest Hanisch, 'The Political Influence and Appropriation of Wagner', trans. Paul Knight, in Ulrich Müller and Peter Wapnewski, eds., *Wagner Handbook* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992), 191.

86 'Über das Dichten und Komponieren' (July 1879), 'Über das Opern-Dichten und Komponieren im Besonderen' (September 1879), and 'Über die Anwendung der Musik auf das Drama' (November 1879), in Richard Wagner, *Gesammelte Schriften und Dichtungen*, 3rd edn, 10 vols. (Leipzig, 1887–8), vol. X (1888), 137–51, 152–75 and 176–93. For discussion, see David Brodbeck, *Brahms: Symphony No. 1* (Cambridge, 1997), 87–90, from which I take the translations from 'On the Application of Music to Drama' that are quoted below. Brahms's First, a watershed work if there ever was one, is nowhere to be seen in Dahlhaus's history, perhaps because its deep engagement with symphonies by Schubert and Schumann, as well as those by Beethoven, works against the circumpolar model, or because it cannot easily be reconciled with the dialectical approach implied by the notion of a 'second age of the symphony'.

87 On the trope of Brahms as Jew in anti-liberal Viennese music criticism around 1890, see Notley, *Lateness and Brahms*, 32–4.

88 For Dahlhaus's discussion of the nature of appropriately symphonic themes, see *Beethoven*, 76–80.

89 As Notley has shown, later critics (she cites Paul Marsop and Paul Bekker) worked out more thoroughgoing critiques of the Romantic symphony along the same lines (*Lateness and Brahms*, 144–68).

90 Notley, *Lateness and Brahms*, 162–6.

91 Theodor Helm, 'Musikbrief aus Wien', *Musikalisches Wochenblatt*, 16 (1885), 97–8.

92 Ed[uard] H[anslick], 'Concerte', *Neue freie Presse* (4 December 1884).

93 Letter to Fritz Simrock of 8 November 1884, in *Johannes Brahms Briefwechsel*, nineteen volumes to date, consisting of sixteen original volumes (rev. edns, Berlin, 1921–2; repr. edn, Tutzing, 1974) and a *Neue Folge* consisting of three volumes to date (Tutzing, 1991–), vol. XI, 79–80.

94 On Bruckner's support among Viennese Wagnerians, see Andrea Harrandt, 'Students and Friends as "Prophets" and "Promoters": The Reception of Bruckner's Works in the *Wiener Akademische Wagner-Verein*', in *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*, ed. Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw and Timothy Jackson (Aldershot, 2001), 317–27, Harrandt, 'Bruckner in Vienna', in John Williamson, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner* (Cambridge, 2004), 26–37, and Notley, 'Bruckner and Viennese Wagnerism'.

95 Thomas Leibnitz, 'Anton Bruckner and "German Music": Josef Schalk and the Establishment of Bruckner as a National Composer', in *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*,

328–40, at 336. On Brahms in this context, see Notley, *Lateness and Brahms*, 21–5.
96 Leibnitz, 'Anton Bruckner and "German Music"', 336.
97 *Deutsche Zeitung* (23 March 1886) (quoted in Harrandt, 'Bruckner in Vienna', 33).
98 For translations of a number of reviews, see Crawford Howie, *Anton Bruckner: A Documentary Biography*, 2 vols. (Lewiston, 2002), vol. II, 504–16.
99 Dahlhaus, *Nineteenth-Century Music*, 271.
100 Notley, *Lateness and Brahms*, 27–35.
101 Steinbeck (*Romantische und national Symphonik*, 172–3) claims that the composer did not designate the work as a symphony, but in fact the first edition (1876) carries the title *Ländliche Hochzeit. Symphonie in 5 Sätzen für grosses Orchester*, Op. 26. Goldmark later recalled that Brahms was especially well-disposed towards this work and was indignant that anyone would think that it should not be called a symphony simply because its first movement was written in theme-and-variations form rather than sonata form; see Karl Goldmark, *Notes from the Life of a Viennese Composer*, trans. Alice Goldmark Brandeis (New York, 1927), 161–2.
102 sp. [Ludwig Speidel], 'Konzerte', *Fremden-Blatt* (2 March 1888), from which the quotations in the next two paragraphs are also taken. Speidel had first made mention of Goldmark's 'doubly oriental' heritage – and in an entirely negative way – in his review of *The Queen of Sheba* ('Hofoperntheater', *Fremden-Blatt* [12 March 1875]); although the *Deutsche Zeitung* eventually embraced anti-Semitism that did not take place until the later 1890s.
103 Although Speidel has occasionally been identified by modern scholars as a Jew – see, for example, Robert S. Wistrich, *The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz Joseph* (Oxford, 1989), 436 and Notley, *Lateness and Brahms*, 34 – he was not and was never identified as such by Vienna's anti-Semites. Like Hanslick, however, he was a traditional German liberal nationalist, who, as Steven Beller has suggested, was especially devoted to the project of complete Jewish assimilation see Steven Beller, *Vienna and The Jews, 1867–1938: A Cultural History* (Cambridge, 1989), 133–4.
104 On Goldmark's identification with the German cultural project, see Goldmark, *Notes from the Life of a Viennese Composer*, 150–1; on the satisfaction he took in Speidel's review of the symphony, see ibid., 157–8.
105 David Brodbeck, 'Dvořák's Reception in Liberal Vienna: Language Ordinances, National Property, and the Rhetoric of *Deutschtum*', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 60 (2007), 71–131.
106 Notice, for example, the subtle difference in emphasis between Hanslick's and Helm's evaluation of Dvořák's Seventh Symphony, heard in the Philharmonic Concerts on 16 January 1887. While Hanslick indicates that 'Dvořák shows himself to be a man who, trained in the study of our German masters, stands on his own feet (Ed[uard] H[anslick], 'Concerte', *Neue freie Presse* [25 January 1887]), Helm took note of the 'Slavic-national complexion that Dvořák liked so much to introduce into the classical sonata and symphonic form' (Theodor Helm, 'Concerte', *Deutsche Zeitung* [21 January 1887]). For more on Hanslick and Helm in this context, see Brodbeck, 'Dvořák's Reception in Liberal Vienna', 100–4 and 110–18.
107 Ed[uard[H[anslick], 'Concerte', *Neue freie Presse* (6 January 1891); repr. in Eduard Hanslick, *Aus dem Tagebuche eines Musikers* (Berlin, 1892), 335–41. Theodor Helm, 'Musikbrief aus Wien', *Musikalisches Wochenblatt*, 22 (22 January 1891), 47.
108 C[amillo] H[orn], 'Wie man "Kritiken" macht', *Ostdeutsche Rundschau*, 18 January 1891.
109 Camillo Horn, *Deutsches Volkblatt* (20 December 1892), quoted in Notley, 'Bruckner and Viennese Wagnerism', 70. Anonymous, *Ostdeutsche Rundschau* (25 December 1892); quoted in Benjamin M. Korstvedt, *Bruckner: Symphony No. 8* (Cambridge, 2000), 6 (where authorship is attributed to Joseph Stolzing). In pan-German circles, the Archangel Michael served as the personification of the German–Austrian people.
110 On the intrigue surrounding this development, see Henry-Louis de la Grange, *Gustav Mahler*, vol. II: *Vienna: The Years of Challenge* (1897–1904) (Oxford and New York, 1995), 116–21, and Hellsberg, *Demokratie der Könige*, 290–1.
111 *Deutsche Zeitung* (27 September 1898), 7; trans. in K. M. Knittel, '"Polemik im Concertsaal": Mahler, Beethoven, and the Viennese Critics', *19th-Century Music*, 29 (2006), 289–317 (at 289). See also E. Th., 'Das jüdische Regime an der Wiener Oper', *Deutsche Zeitung* (4 November 1898).
112 Leon Botstein, 'Gustav Mahler's Vienna', in Donald Mitchell and Andrew Nicholson, eds., *The Mahler Companion* (Oxford, 1999), 8. For a thoughtful overview of this period in the city's musical history, see Margaret Notley, 'Musical Culture in Vienna at the Turn of the Twentieth Century', in Bryan R. Simms, ed., *Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern: A Companion*

to the Second Viennese School (Westport, 1999), 37–71.

113 On Mahler's frequently strained relationship with the orchestra's membership, see Hellsberg, *Demokratie der Könige*, 295–319.

114 For discussion and a sampling of Viennese reviews, see de la Grange, *Vienna: The Years of Challenge*, 148–55, 307–13, 471–6, *Gustav Mahler*, vol. III: *Vienna: Triumph and Disillusion (1904–1907)* (Oxford and New York, 1999), 66–76, 272–9 and 533–43, and *Gustav Mahler*, vol. IV: *A New Life Cut Short* (*1907–1911*) (New York and Oxford, 2008), 511–24. Also useful is 'Mahler's German-Language Critics', ed. and trans. Karen Painter and Bettina Varwig, in Karen Painter, ed., *Mahler and His World* (Princeton, 2002), 267–378.

115 Weber, *The Great Transformation of Musical Taste*, 306.

116 Notley, 'Musical Culture in Vienna at the Turn of the Twentieth Century', 42–50; Sandra McColl, 'Max Kalbeck and Gustav Mahler', *19th-Century Music*, 20/2 (1996), 167–84.

117 Consider the handling of the *Gesellen* theme that forms the basis of the opening movement of the First Symphony or, more generally, the thematic technique seen in the first movement of the Fourth Symphony. On the sceptical attitude along these lines that Mahler himself eventually adopted concerning Bruckner's accomplishment as a symphonist, see de la Grange, *Vienna: The Years of Challenge*, 332–3.

118 e.h. [Eduard Hanslick], 'Zweites Philharmonisches Concert', *Neue freie Presse* (20 November 1900), trans. in Painter and Varwig, 'Mahler's German-language Critics', 289–90.

119 de la Grange, *Vienna: Triumph and Disillusion*, 607–16.

120 Alma Mahler, *Gustav Mahler: Memories and Letters*, 3rd edn, ed. Donald Mitchell, trans. Basil Creighton (Seattle, 1975), 112.

121 Dahlhaus, *Die Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts*, 284 and 211.

122 Ibid., 284.