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SUMMARY

This is a study of Gustav Mahler's interpretative style as a conductor of the symphonic repertoire which focuses particularly on his instrumental Retuschen. His performance practice as a conductor is related to his own concert career, the interpretations of his close predecessors, contemporaries and successors, studies of his concert repertoire, his conducting technique and rehearsal methods.

A catalogue is included of sixty sources from public and private collections in Europe and America comprising scores and orchestral parts of works by Bach, Beethoven, Bruckner, Mozart, Schubert, Schumann, Smetana and Wagner. Description, analysis and comparison of these sources is supplemented by contemporary accounts of Mahler's conducting. Both primary and secondary sources are employed to establish the relative importance of the scores and orchestral parts and to assign dates when they were used by Mahler.

The individual discussion of the works is accompanied by analyses of Mahler's treatment of each of the instruments of the orchestra, including the extensively used E-flat clarinet. Mahler's response to acoustics, his changes of dynamic nuances, tempi, attitude to repeats, and cuts are all considered in detail. His performance practice and instrumental Retuschen in Hamburg, Vienna and New York are also compared.
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The reader of this study will need access to scores of the following works. It is essential that these scores have bar numbers.

Beethoven
- Coriolan Overture
- Egmont Overture
- King Stephan Overture
- Leonore II Overture
- Leonore III Overture
- Zur Weihe des Hauses Overture
- Symphonies 2-9

Mahler
- Symphonies 1-9

Mozart
- Symphonies 40 & 41

Schubert
- Symphony 9 (D.944)

Schumann
- Manfred Overture
- Symphonies 1-4

Smetana
- The Bartered Bride Overture

Wagner
- Die Meistersinger Overture

DEFINITIONS

Certain terms have been used with a specific meaning:

Retusche (pl. Retuschen): This German word is used extensively in the Mahler literature. Although technically it means re-touching in the sense that an artist or photographer might add finishing or correcting touches to a picture, it has been used here to refer to Mahler's instrumental, dynamic and other textural alterations which he made in order to realise the works which he conducted.

Double, doubling: When referring to wind instruments, this is used here exclusively to refer to the reinforcement of an instrumental voice by a second, third or fourth, player of the same instrument.
the reinforcement of an instrumental voice by one or more other instruments of a different timbre. Unless stated, this reinforcement is at the unison. The use of the word "reinforce", does not imply that the part being reinforced is the more important one, since the reinforcing instrument may actually be the more important colour in the revised version.

Hairpins: A crescendo followed by a diminuendo, denoted by wedge shaped lines. Hairpins come in pairs, a single hairpin being denoted throughout this study by the term crescendo or diminuendo.

ABBREVIATIONS AND CONVENTIONS

In order to reduce the physical size of this document, several conventions have been observed throughout for the abbreviation of frequently occurring words:

Instrumental Designations

Ww = woodwind
Br = brass
St = strings

Pi = piccolo
Fl = flute
Ob = oboe
Cl = clarinet
Es-cl = E-flat clarinet
Fg = bassoon
Cfg = Contrabasson

Hr = horn
Cr = horn (See Ch.22.)
Tr = trumpet
Ps = trombone
Tb = tuba

Pk = timpani

Vnl = = violin I
The following examples will demonstrate the convention which has been adopted in describing subdivisions within these groupings:

F12 = second flute, F13 = third flute. In cases where the original score only requires two flutes, F13 is the flute which doubles the F11 part.

The notation Ww3/4 has been used to denote the doubling players as a whole.

Tr1/3 = first and third trumpets.

Hr1-4 = horns 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Vnl.9 = ninth desk of the first violin section.

Vc2 = 2nd desk of the cello section.

VcII = the second half of the cello section.

References to Sections, Works and Pages

The chapters, chapter sections and music examples have been numbered. Thus

Ch.12.3.4 = Chapter 12, section 3, subsection 4.

Ex.13.10 = Example 10 of Chapter 13.

The number of the chapter and section has been placed at the bottom left hand of each page. This is the number current at the beginning of the page.

In the main body of this document, notes are referenced by numbers, e.g. <1>. In the section at the end containing the text of these notes, the number of each note has been prefaced by the number of the chapter in which it is referenced, thus simplifying the search for the right note.
Capital P has been used to refer to individual sources catalogued in Chapter 15, e.g. P.32, P.34/5, etc.

Works, Movements and Bar Numbers

Considerable simplification has been necessary in referring to works, movements and bar numbers:

Roman numerals have been used to identify symphonies.

E.g. Beethoven IX = Beethoven Symphony No. 9.
Schumann I/4 = Schumann Symphony No. 1, 4th movement.

The convention was not extended to Mozart Symphonies Nos. 40 & 41, which are referred to as K.550 and K.551, respectively.

Bar numbers are referred to simply as numbers, or with the prefix b.:

113-7 = bars 113 to 117 inclusive.

b.206-25 = bars 206 to 225 inclusive.

As an extension of this convention:

Beethoven IX/2, P.39; 322-7 = Beethoven, Symphony No. 9, score catalogued here as No.39, 2nd movement, bars 322 to 327 inclusive.

In referring to sections of bars, it has often been found convenient to subdivide the bar in units of note values. For example, the fourth quaver unit of time measured from the beginning of a bar is denoted by the term "4th quaver". This avoids confusion, say in a bar of 4/4 which has a dotted crotchet followed by two semiquavers and four quavers, when the present example would refer to the second two notes of the bar. By abandoning any description which involves the term
number of actual beats given by a conductor is also avoided.

*From* and *until* have been used in an inclusive sense:

from b.13 (2nd crotchet) = beginning with the 2nd crotchet of b.13.
until b.34 (1st note) = up to and including the first note of b.34.

**Pitch**

The system of pitch notation employed in this study is the one used in the *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 1980:

The notes are named in octave groups extending from C to the B above:

- c'''' - b'''' higher
- c''' - b'''
- c'' - b''
- c' - b' This octave starts on middle C
- c - b
- C - B lower
- C' - B'
- C'' - B''

With regard to transposing instruments, e.g. Cl, Hr, Tr, the pitches quoted are written pitches, unless otherwise stated.
Chapter 1

An Introduction

1.1 Objectives and Primary Sources

Although thought of today primarily as a composer, Gustav Mahler made his living from conducting; and the present study has as its object the exploration of his interpretative style as a conductor. As there are no recordings or films of Mahler conducting, we shall never be able to piece together as complete a picture of him as we can of his contemporary Arturo Toscanini (1867-1957), or the great Germanic conductors of the succeeding generation, Bruno Walter (1876-1962), Otto Klemperer (1885-1973), or Wilhelm Furtwängler (1886-1954); but the extant evidence already tells us more than we know about three other great conductors from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century: Hans von Bülow (1830-1894), Hans Richter (1843-1916), or Arthur Nikisch (1855-1922).

To date most of the vast Mahler literature has naturally concentrated on his life and compositions; and since his interpretative activity has been explored relatively little it soon became apparent that a serious study would have to begin in a small area of this field, that of his conducting in the concert halls of Europe and America.

The most important sources for the discovery of Mahler's practice as an interpreter are the scores and orchestral materials which he used for
Europe and America, and they have formed the basis of most of the deductions made in this study. Although most biographies do not stress this, as a conductor Mahler was more active in the theatre than in the concert hall, and a study of his conducting in this sphere would therefore be extremely valuable: but his operatic performance material is not available in the same quantity, nor is it of the same quality, since that which exists has also been used by other conductors.

In the scores and the orchestral parts of the works which Mahler conducted are contained his famous Retuschen, his textural alterations to the works of other composers. These have been mentioned by many writers on Mahler but, except for articles on Mahler's Schumann Retuschen by Erwin Stein and Mosco Carner which have served as the source of most other writings, and more recent monographs by Peter Andrashke and Ernst Hilmar, little interest has been shown in establishing in what Mahler's actual Retuschen consisted.

Mahler's Retuschen are not always remarkable, although they might appear to be so from the short studies published heretofore. It may be that many of them were not originally devised by Mahler; but to determine the extent that this may be true demands the establishment of what he actually did and the removal of the subject from the realm of mythology. The main object of this study is to do just that: to establish what facts can be discovered about Mahler's conducting, relating not only to his Retuschen, though these are the most accessible aspect, to digest and arrange these facts critically, to gauge what still might be discovered, and to prepare the way for further comparative studies of this nature, including studies of other conductors. <1>

1.1.0 - Introduction
In respect of the performing materials which form the core of this study, the objects have been:

- to track down scores and parts used by Mahler,
- to describe and decipher these sources,
- to compare and date the sources, and
- to draw general conclusions.

The chief difficulty which has stood in the way of any study beyond straightforward description has been that of comparing sources in libraries in different cities, countries or continents. For instance, there exist two scores of Schubert IX with Mahler’s Retuschen, one in Southampton and the other in Munich; while one must travel to Vienna in order to examine the set of orchestral parts which was used by Mahler and which in all but crucial detail matches the Munich score. A second problem concerns the fact that Mahler entered his Retuschen into scores with many different implements, coloured inks, lead and coloured pencils. Most of these cannot be reproduced adequately, even with colour photography, and a photostatic reproduction is practically useless for serious study, except as a means of refreshing the memory.

Having found the sources and obtained the raw data, the task became one of organisation; of discovering a method of presentation and comparison which would neither trivialise the significance nor disguise the artistic value of the data by the application of an over rigorous and inappropriate pseudo-scientific approach. It would be easy to be side-tracked into cataloguing and describing in minute detail inks, watermarks, handwriting styles and plate numbers at the expense of an assessment of the musical implications of Mahler’s Retuschen; but the achievement of a musical assessment has been the central aim of this study. Certain interpretative details have not been possible to
indications have been given as to what might result from the approaches taken, as and when additional data emerge.

1.2 Secondary Sources

The study of Mahler's scores and orchestral parts has been supplemented and supported by evidence derived from newspaper and journal reviews and from biographical studies. Of paramount importance has been the three volume biography in French by Henry-Louis de La Grange: this is the most complete biography to date and a magnificent achievement. <2>

Few of the sources consulted have been entirely accurate in every detail and it would be a miracle if La Grange's superhuman task had achieved perfection. Some of the newspaper reviews which La Grange quotes have been discovered to be misleading in their French translation. Every effort has been made to locate the originals, but when this has proved impossible, La Grange's translation has been referred to.

The two wonderful books on Mahler by Kurt Blaukopf present a more concise but complete account of Mahler's life and work. <3> The discussion on Mahler's Retuschen in his biography is excellent. <4> An article by Ernest Lert, while interesting has not been used here. <5>

The publication of Knud Martner's Gustav Mahler im Konzertsaal in 1985 made superfluous a listing of Mahler's concerts prepared by the present author and it has only occasioned a couple of queries. These discrepancies are mentioned below.

Of those writers who knew Mahler, Natalie Bauer-Lechner should be mentioned first because she provides many quotations directly relevant
in rounding out a picture of Mahler in Hamburg and it is a pity that Alma Mahler fails to provide similar information about Mahler's Viennese and New York activities. Guido Adler, the musicologist, was a life-long friend of Mahler and his deep knowledge of music and objective approach have encouraged the author to quote him extensively.

Despite the small number of them involved, the pronouncements of Walter and Klemperer are here regarded as major testimony concerning the quality of Mahler's work, both on account of the enormous musical talents of these two conductors, and because of their connection with Mahler.

Newspaper criticisms should be read with caution since one can often find totally opposing reviews of the same concert. However, an attempt has been made to select the more reliable of these criticisms, which have been employed mainly to verify the use and date of specific Retuschen. Programme booklets have been hard to locate, though they have been of value in establishing the playing strength of the New York Philharmonic Orchestra in the two seasons when Mahler was its conductor. A series of taped interviews prepared by William Malloch and broadcast in Los Angeles in 1964 has provided some interesting insights from players who worked with Mahler. These often had to be paraphrased in order to make written sense of the disjointed originals. <6>

1.3 Previous Literature

Despite the evidence, which has been available since the late 1920s,
conflicting reports. Even as late as 1984, La Grange published at the end of the third volume of his Mahler biography a nine page discussion of The "Versions" of Symphonic Works from the Classical and Romantic Repertoire which was based on inaccurate and incomplete information as to existing sources and which leaned heavily on previous essays. However, La Grange identifies all the main studies in his brief résumé which clearly has the main intention of stimulating further study.

In 1920 a pioneering article by Julius Bittner made a call for the continued use of Mahler’s Beethoven IX Retuschen and this was followed in 1927 by an article written by Erwin Stein shortly after Alma Mahler had deposited a selection of Mahler’s conducting scores and orchestral parts in the Universal Edition Archive. Stein identified the Schumann Retuschen as the most important, probably on the basis of the great need for clarity in Schumann’s originals. Stein’s article is discussed in Ch.6.4, together with other writings about Mahler’s Schumann Retuschen, chief among which is the independent approach taken by Mosco Carner. The emphasis on Schumann among Mahler’s Retuschen, first made by Stein, has coloured most discussions until now, and the present study seeks to redress the balance.

Mahler’s Beethoven Retuschen have received attention from Egon Wellesz and Igor Markevitch, though the only substantial article is that by Ernst Hilmar discussed in Ch.5.2. Peter Andraschke’s Die Retuschen Gustav Mahlers an der 7. Symphonie von Franz Schubert, which is discussed in Ch.29.3, again reads like an apology for not having time to do more than dip into the subject. The set of orchestral parts in Vienna had not been located by Andraschke and his listing of the contents of the U.E. Archive differs from mine.
sein, on Mahler's cuts in Bruckner V, which in giving much general information is also another obvious attempt to interest somebody in taking a deeper look at the whole subject. There are again discrepancies between the materials listed and those which I have been able to find.

In 1979 an Exhibition *Gustav Mahler, Works and Interpretation: Autographs - Scores - Documents* was mounted in Dusseldorf. An excellent catalogue was produced, containing good reproductions of seven pages from Mahler's conducting scores of Beethoven Coriolan Overture, Beethoven VII, Schumann Manfred Overture and Bruckner V. <10>

1.4 The Limitations of this Study

As explained above, in order to construct a framework and methodology on which further studies might be based, it has been necessary to restrict the scope of the enquiry. Apart from overtures, none of Mahler's operatic repertoire is discussed, though Mahler's Retuschen in Tschaikovsky's *Queen of Spades* and Smetana's *Bartered Bride*, to give but two examples, were no less significant than those discussed here. <11>

Although three continuo parts of Bach Cantatas have been found, no mention of the works has turned up in listings of Mahler concerts and unless full scores and other parts are found little can be added to Donald Mitchell's brief remarks. <12> Mahler's published *Bach Suite* comes into the same category; <13> and as his performances of the two Bruckner Symphonies for which material is available were based on the truncated and rescored versions of Franz Schalk and Ferdinand Löwe,
A discussion on Mahler's string quartet arrangements for full string orchestra has been relegated to Appendix 10, simply because the author has not been able to see Mahler's score and parts of Beethoven's Op.95 and because the Schubert quartet has been published recently and is readily available.

Certain features of orchestral playing are impossible to discuss in detail today, such as the use of portamento by string players and the specific details of rubato.

1.5 The Organisation of this Study

Mahler's work was never systematically organised. Each one of his symphonies is a work *sui generis*, and his conducting repertoire has sizeable gaps. He was a man who lived for the minute and this is reflected in his conducting scores. There was no fixed point at which he arrived at a final solution to the interpretative problems posed by the works which he conducted, and right to the end of his life we see him experimenting with different Retuschen. Accordingly, it was found inappropriate to force a definite style on the discussion of each major work from Mahler's conducting repertoire or of each aspect of his performing practice. The treatment has been varied throughout in order to bring out clearly the different aspects, alternating between narrative and other styles and attempting to give breadth and depth of treatment only where it was called for. For instance, on the basis of what has been written elsewhere, the reader may be surprised to find Schumann's symphonies treated at less length than the same composer's Manfred Overture, and for other works to receive even more attention.
Sometimes this is explained by a scarcity of sources, but it will become readily apparent to the reader where it is this which has curtailed the discussion, and where the relative significance of the work or topic in Mahler's case has dictated a greater or lesser depth and breadth of study. I have tried to steer clear of dry, minute description of detail on the one hand, and an excessive number of musical examples on the other, and have made every attempt to relate Mahler's Retuschen to the composer's originals.

The three volume format enables the reader simultaneously to refer to general and specific features and the notes or musical examples, Volumes Two and Three being referred to frequently from Volume One.

Vol 1 Introductory and background information. Description, and analysis of the source material. Conclusions.
Vol 2 Catalogue of Mahler's extant performing materials. Description and discussion of individual sources.
Vol 3 Musical examples, appendices, bibliography and notes.

In Volume One, Chapter 2 discusses the historical background against which Mahler's conducting career and his orchestral Retuschen are to be understood. Chapter 3 deals with Mahler's concert conducting activities, repertoire, rehearsals and conducting technique, and Chapter 4 gives details of the provenance of scores which are the subject of most of this study and the methods which have been used to analyse them. The most important groups of scores which have been found comprise compositions by Beethoven and Schumann and general features of Mahler's Retuschen in these composers are discussed in Chapters 5 and 6. Chapters 7, 8, 9, 10 & 11 deal with each instrument or instrumental group in turn to explore the common features of the different works for which we have Mahler's Retuschen. Chapter 12 brings together all those features of his Retuschen which relate to dynamic
while Chapter 13 discusses Mahler's practice in respect of cuts, repeats and tempi. Chapter 14 draws general conclusions and suggests ways in which further knowledge of Mahler's interpretative style might be acquired.

The first chapter of Volume Two comprises a complete listing of all the conducting scores and orchestral parts with Mahler's Retuschen known to the author at the end of November 1988. Individual works from this list of primary sources are treated in separate chapters comprising the rest of Volume Two. Those works for which not enough information was available to justify an individual chapter have been discussed in appendices to be found in Volume Three. Naturally, many of the works themselves contain unique features which determined Mahler's particular approach, and these have occasioned the slightly different treatment of each one. After a brief description of the place of the work in Mahler's repertoire, each of Chapters 16-36 discusses the main features which can be determined from the sources and concludes with a description of and commentary on selected passages not already discussed.

Volume Three comprises the musical examples referred to in the preceding text, ten appendices which bring together other facts which would have encumbered the text had they been rehearsed earlier, the notes referred to throughout the study and a bibliographic listing.

A detailed Table of Contents has been placed at the end of each volume to enable the reader to identify sections of specific interest.
2.1 Orchestral Development in the Nineteenth Century

The history of conducting is intimately connected with the development of the orchestra itself. The first major treatise on instrumentation, Berlioz' *Grand traité d'instrumentation et d'orchestration modernes*, was written by a conductor and later revised by Richard Strauss, another conductor. That these two were also composers is no accident: their gifts as composers demanded an intimate knowledge of instrumentation and entitled them to conduct orchestras. In the Strauss edition of Berlioz' work the differentiation of the printing allows us to distinguish clearly between the contributions of the two authors, presenting us in one volume with a comparison of the resources available to Beethoven and Mahler.

In the course of the century the orchestral complement increased in size and consequent power. In his largest works Beethoven was writing for double woodwind plus piccolo and double bassoon, and two natural horn pairs. The specification of a different crook for each pair enabled one or other pair to participate most of the time, but also placed some restrictions on their ability to play together. The
necessary to employ more than two. In Beethoven's music the trombones were still reserved for moments of spiritual exaltation, and it was left for Schubert to show how they might be used to play passages of which the horns were incapable. Apart from his development of timpani parts to the point where more could hardly be expected from two hand-tuned drums, Beethoven's percussion writing had not evolved much further than Janissary Music.

At the opposite end of the century, the early score of Mahler's First Symphony, which dates from 1889-93, is written for triple woodwind, four horns, four trumpets, three trombones, tuba, harp and percussion. The brass instruments are fully chromatic and demand a much greater technical accomplishment than those known to Beethoven. When Mahler revised the finale of this work for publication in 1899, he increased his demands to quadruple woodwind, and added a second timpanist. The number of horns was increased to seven throughout the work, with a demand for an unspecified number of strengthening horns in the finale. Mahler does not specify the actual size of the string sections, but this had also increased over the century and Wagner's and Strauss' prescription of 16,16,12,12,8 was a reality in many orchestras.

Concert halls had also developed during the century. In the earlier years concerts were still being given in large homes and palaces, but these were later supplanted by even larger public concert halls, like the Musikvereinsgebäude in Vienna, which was opened 1870 and whose large hall holds 1680, the Neues Gewandhaus in Leipzig, opened in 1884 with a capacity of 1560, and the Concertgebouw in Amsterdam which holds 2,200 and dates from 1888, the same year as the transformation of a skating rink into the Berlin Philharmonie. Of these four, the Leipzig and Berlin halls were destroyed during the Second World War, but the
large stages, but they have the most flattering acoustics for orchestral concerts. Their main acoustic characteristic is the fullness and warmth which the sound of an orchestra acquires at the expense of brilliance in the upper voices.

The third element which was also brought to near perfection by the end of the century was the concert orchestra itself. Each one of the four concert halls mentioned above had a great orchestra associated with it. Had Beethoven been able to hear his works played by the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, the course of musical history would undoubtedly have been different. Comprised of the best players available, these orchestras were, and are, even larger than the requirements of any single work in the repertoire, so that the practice of doubling woodwind parts was not unusual by the time Mahler started conducting.

2.2 At the Cross Roads with Wagner

As one of the instigators of these developments, the contributions of the composer and conductor Richard Wagner are crucial. Strauss wrote in his preface to Berlioz' Traité: Richard Wagner's scores are the alpha and omega of my additions to this work; and, though Wagner wrote no book on instrumentation, through Strauss' additions we gain a codified study of his important contributions to the craft.

Among Wagner's manifold writings, however, is his treatise of 1869, Ueber das Dirigiren, which was absorbed by all conductors with any admiration for him. In this treatise, Wagner discusses the interpretation of works by Mozart and Beethoven, illustrating his
overtures to Weber's Der Freischütz and his own opera, Die Meistersinger.

Wagner concerns himself with the two features of interpretation with which a conductor is especially charged: tempo and its modification, and the balance of voices, stressing that the correct interpretation of a work in both these aspects is based on a correct understanding of the melos. <4>

In his essay On the Performance of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, written in 1873, Wagner discusses in some detail the imperfections of orchestral instruments and the technique of players in the time of Beethoven, and demonstrates the compromises which Beethoven was obliged to accept as a result. In effect, Wagner identifies these compromises as fundamental barriers to the correct understanding of the melos in Beethoven's works; and he accordingly proposes ways to remedy the problem. <5>

In Wagner's view, Beethoven was not the only composer working under this disadvantage, for in 1847 he conducted Gluck's Iphigénie en Aulide in Dresden in a revised version, in 1854 also furnishing the overture with a concert ending. Wagner's version of the overture has been published and is still commonly performed. <6> It contains extensive Retuschen which comprise the addition of two clarinets to reinforce the oboes in unison or octaves, and a third bassoon to reinforce the bass line in tutti passages. Wagner also added an extra horn pair and a third trumpet, completely rewriting the brass parts in places, employing only the notes available to the natural brass instruments, but taking the horns up to A to follow the melody and using the stopped E-flat eschewed by Gluck.

2.2.0 - Historical Background
2.3 The Concept of Werktreue

Such changes as Wagner made in Iphigenia and proposed in Beethoven's symphonies imply a licence to modify the actual notes and instrumentation prescribed by the creator of the work. Wagner tacitly assumes all this, but it is left to a later composer, Ferruccio Busoni, to give a cogent justification for the process in a letter written in 1902 to the Belgian critic, Marcel Rémy. Rémy had evidently criticised Busoni's "alterations" in the Prélude, Choral et Fugue of César Franck, and Busoni replied:

You start from false premises in thinking that it is my intention to "modernize" the works. On the contrary, by cleaning them of the dust of tradition, I try to restore their youth, to present them as they sounded to people at the moment when they first sprang from the head and pen of the composer.

The Pathétique, in its time a highly revolutionary sonata, must sound "revolutionary" - one cannot invest enough passion in a work like the Appassionata which was the climax of passionate expression in its day. In my Beethoven playing I have tried, with freedom, to come close to the nerve centre of humanity, which characterises the compositions of the master in contrast to those of his predecessors.

...One can play gently a phrase which is instrumented fortissimo, but one cannot play strongly one which is orchestrated pianissimo. One can moderate the power of the trumpet, but one cannot make the flute more heroic. We have an example of this in Franck's Choral, where he demands three different loudnesses without modifying the layout of the chords. I believe I have responded to the intention of the master, when I altered the "instrumentation." <7>

In 1907, Busoni explained further when he wrote in his Neue Aesthetik der Tonkunst:

What the composer's inspiration necessarily loses through notation, his interpreter should restore by his own.

...Every notation is, in itself the transcription of an abstract idea. The instant the pen seizes it, the idea
We notice that Wagner's original intention of remedying defects in instrumentation have been supplemented by an obligation placed upon the interpreter to divine the intentions of the composer and to modify the text so as to be truthful to these original intentions. When used in this, its widest sense, the German word Werktreue implies a consideration of each individual work, rather than a generic approach towards the oeuvre of any one composer, style or period. Klemperer, who admitted that his attitude to Retuschen was always changing, but who made few textural changes in Beethoven, said:

All this talk that one shouldn't change a single note in a score is nonsense. Werktreue, that is faithfulness to the work, is a very different matter from merely using the pure text, isn't it?

2.4 Musical Zeitgeist

Most of the conductors who stood in the tradition of Wagner made Retuschen; but except for Weingartner's, none of these has been published in substantial detail, and until they are it will be difficult to assign with certainty the invention of any one Retusche to a specific conductor and establish who influenced whom. What we know at present tends to be related to the more spectacular Retuschen and may not be typical. Where they are known with certainty, the Retuschen of Bülow, Nikisch and Weingartner are mentioned here in the context of Mahler's own Retuschen; but as instances of arbitrary modifications of the conception of the composer by conductors the following should be considered:

- Grove claims that in b.394-5 of the first movement of Beethoven
and Markevitch attributes this same change to Bülow. The Musical Courier claims that: "On one occasion Nikisch played the (Leonore Overture) No. 2 in Berlin, but as a coda used the finale of No. 3. None of the local critics noticed the substitution and it remained for the Berlin representative of The Musical Courier to point it out to them."

Bülow and Nikisch in these Retuschen go much further than Mahler ever did; yet were working entirely within the spirit of the age (Zeitgeist). This was a time when the severity of the classical style was unacceptable, when the classical organ of Bach had given way to the instrument of Reger with its enclosed divisions, Rollschweller, and imitations of orchestral instruments. It was moreover an age when composers' manuscripts were regarded as objets d'art in their own right, were even divided and extracts given as presents, and were rarely consulted as a means of establishing the composer's notation, let alone his intentions. The modern science of musicological research was in its infancy, and the twentieth century concept of Urtext had only recently been mooted by Brahms.

2.5 Mahler and his Reception

In the light of these creative efforts, Mahler's Retuschen in the works of Beethoven, Schubert and Schumann may seem tame; and indeed they are in the main sober, well-considered attempts to come to terms with problems set either by the composers, or by the different circumstances under which Mahler worked.
conversations with Natalie Bauer-Lechner and in two public statements which he made during his period as conductor of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra. One was written in response to criticism of his Retuschen in Beethoven IX in February 1900:

...Richard Wagner... has in his essay "On the Performance of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony" directed one to that way of executing this symphony which corresponds as much as possible with the intentions of its creator, and to which all more modern conductors have conformed. Out of his own acquired and confirmed conviction and experience of the work, the conductor of today's concert has also done this, without fundamentally going beyond the boundaries suggested by Wagner.

Naturally, there can be absolutely no talk of a re-instrumentation, alteration, or even of an "improvement" of Beethoven's work. ...far from arbitrariness and preconceived design, but also misled by no "tradition", it has everywhere been the sole object of the conductor to sympathise with Beethoven's will down to the apparently most trifling detail, and in the execution also not to sacrifice or to allow to be submerged in a confused bustle of sound the least of the Master's wishes.

The second statement was made in a newspaper interview in conjunction with Mahler's performance of Beethoven's Op.95 quartet with full strings:

...What I am proposing is but an ideal performance of the quartet. Chamber music is fundamentally written for a (small) room... When chamber music is transferred to the concert hall this intimacy is already lost... In the large room the four voices disperse, they do not speak to the listeners with the power which the composer wanted to give them... The volume of sound which we give a work, depends upon the room in which we perform it... I am not acting against the composer's intentions, but according to his wishes. Beethoven, in his last quartets, certainly did not think of the restricted little instruments... He realised a mighty idea in four voices. The idea must be properly realised, be given its true significance... All our chamber music suffers in the concert hall from the inappropriateness of the hall. If one wants to be successful in this then one must certainly take account of the hall.

As is well known, Mahler was frequently attacked for arbitrary changes to classical works, but the key to the antagonism shown by many members...
details of his actual Retuschen. In the main it stems from his own arrogant manner of dealing with others and a corresponding lack of generosity on the part of the critics. Ludwig Karpath reports of Mahler's Retusche in b.317-9 of the finale of Beethoven V in November 1899 that:

The news of this unheard of sacrilege was brought into the open soon after the rehearsals by a few members of the Philharmonic orchestra who were jealous of Mahler, which literally meant that the world-shattering communication was reported directly to the editors of newspapers hostile to Mahler. The battle already began, therefore, before the performance: the unsuspecting public awaited with the most eager interest the dreadfully disfigured theme, and was highly disappointed not to be able to find it. Had not members of the orchestra drawn their attention to it, nobody among the public would have had the faintest suspicion of the minute instrumental strengthening, and maybe one out of ten critics would have noticed it. But the incident sufficed to accuse Mahler of the desecration of Beethoven, much ink was spilt on account of one bar, or rather, in order to make a scandal about Mahler. <18>

A similar situation obtained in New York where one of Mahler's fiercest opponents when it came to Retuschen was Krehbiehl, the critic of the New York Daily Tribune. <19> Krehbiehl was also the writer of programme notes for the New York Philharmonic Orchestra and was upset when Mahler refused to give him information about the programmatic content of his own First Symphony when he conducted it in December 1909. In his by no means untypical review of the concert, Krehbiehl devoted three quarters of his space to this fact, forbearing to discuss the performance at all:

It belongs to the record of incidents, however, to say that for the first time in a generation at least the society's official programme contained neither description nor analysis of the composition. Instead the neatly printed pamphlet which is put into the hands of the auditors this season contained the following notice... <20>

Krehbiehl went on to explain why no programme notes appeared, even though he admitted that Mahler made the score available to him. The
Beethoven's *Coriolan* Overture, was reviewed by Krehbiehl in the following terms:

The performance of the Schubert fragment brought out much of its loveliness, especially in the andante, though there was considerable violent accentuation of dynamic contrasts, and it was not necessary to be a purist to make one deplore the loss of refinement which came from the frequent doubling of the voices of the wind instruments. The performance of the familiar overture was dramatically lurid. All through the evening the timpanist bombarded the ears of the hearers. <21>

The other major daily paper, the *New York Times*, while discussing Mahler's symphony in some detail also deplored the Retuschen in the *Unfinished Symphony*:

...was it wise for Mr. Mahler to double the wood-wind players in certain passages of the symphony? There is gain of sonority, but there is also change of quality, loss of some of the transparency that is so fascinating in Schubert's instrumentation. <22>

The attitude of the New York critics was a complex one and a discussion of the opinions of the newspaper music critics forms a substantial part of the Ph.D. thesis by Marvin L. von Deck. <23> Von Deck gives a good impression of the prejudices of the daily critics, though regrettably he did not study the more considered opinions of writers in *Musical America* or *The Musical Courier*. *The Musical Courier* in particular was a journal with a wide-ranging brief. In 1910, for instance, reports on musical events in America were invariably preceded by pages on happenings in Berlin, Paris, Leipzig and London. <24>

*The Musical Courier* took a particularly sane view of Mahler's Retuschen.

...In matters of tempi here and there and in questions of certain accents, crescendos and sforzandos, some peevish pedants might have been inclined to argue with Mahler, but as it is the business of such persons to argue with any and every conductor, their protests need carry no weight. Mahler, through closer study, greater musical gifts, and
dissenters who air their pseudo knowledge and croak their criticisms. If Beethoven be beyond the ken of a student and imaginative musician like Mahler, then surely the Olympic composer is a sealed book to the commentator who cannot even read orchestral music written in the tenor clef and would not know what to do with a baton if it were put in his hands... 

The *New York Press* was also unwilling to criticize Mahler for his bold Retuschen in Beethoven VII:

Beethoven’s score was made as clear to the hearing as if the ear were pierced with every note of the music like the printed page. The conductor obtained wonderful dynamic balance. No instrumental voice was permitted to sink out of sight. In his anxiety to achieve extreme lucidity and to set forth vividly thematic structure, Mahler had gone so far, indeed, as to make slight changes in the score—excisions here and there, not to mention the now quite usual reduplication of woodwind instruments. In the hands of a man less skilled than Mahler, who indeed is a past master of orchestration, such a privilege might be dangerous. But last night’s results fully justified means, and one wondered whether Beethoven would not gladly have welcomed the advice of so expert a man as Mahler... 

It is pointless to speculate with the writer of this review whether the composer would have approved of Mahler’s Retuschen since Mahler demonstrates that such was his own point of view; and it is with this in mind that Mahler’s interpretations of the symphonic repertoire must be examined.
This chapter gathers together information and opinions about Mahler’s concert conducting career, together with what evidence can reliably be adduced about his rehearsals and baton technique. The main sources are Martner’s list of Mahler’s concerts, and the memoirs of Natalie Bauer-Lechner and Guido Adler.

3.1 Opinions of Mahler’s Conducting

We are faced with an embarrassment of choice when deciding whose testimony to take as to Mahler’s ability as a conductor. Brahms is said to have thought so highly of his conducting of Don Giovanni in Budapest that he actively recommended him for the post of Chief Conductor of the Vienna Opera; but direct documentation of this does not exist. Of those definitely documented views, the following quotations of three composers, two conductors and one anonymous, but important individual give a good representation of the opinions of distinguished musicians on Mahler’s conducting, and their remarks require no amplification.

Tchaikovsky was in Hamburg in 1892 to conduct the German premiere of Eugene Onyegin, a task which he ceded to Mahler, and wrote to his nephew:
Ethel Smyth writes of her impressions of Mahler, whom she saw in 1888 in Leipzig and in Vienna in 1907, that:

He was far and away the finest conductor I ever knew, with the most all-embracing musical instinct. <4>

Stravinsky heard Mahler conduct in St. Petersburg in 1902 and 1907 and stated much later that:

The conductor who impressed me most was Gustav Mahler. I attribute this, in part, to the fact that he was also a composer. The most interesting (though, of course, not necessarily the prettiest or the most rousing) conductors are composers, for the reason that they are the only ones who can have a really new insight into music itself. <5>

Bûlow's opinion of Mahler was expressed in a letter of 24 April 1891 to his daughter, Daniela:

Hamburg has now acquired a simply first-rate opera conductor in Herr Gustav Mahler (serious, energetic - Jew from Budapest), who in my opinion equals the very best conductors (Mottl, Richter, etc.). Recently I heard Siegfried under his direction...sincere admiration has filled me for him, when without an orchestral rehearsal he compelled the musical rabble to whistle according to his dance. <6>

The day after his debut at the Vienna Opera, Mahler received an anonymous letter from "an old musician". This letter which, by virtue of the detail in which it discusses Mahler's interpretation of Lohengrin, establishes the excellent credentials of the writer, alludes to the praise which Wagner received in Dresden from the cellist Dotzauer and concludes:

Since Wagner and Bûlow, I have never experienced conducting of such significance as yours yesterday. <7>

Klemperer's most significant words on Mahler's stature as a conductor were:

3.1.0 - Mahler in the Concert Hall -34-
performances, and especially his Beethoven, were sometimes very disputable. But Mahler, never. ...When he conducted you felt it couldn't be better and it couldn't be otherwise. That isn't the case with other conductors: with one you have this reservation, with another that, but you don't feel completely comfortable. <8>

3.2 Mahler's Concert Conducting Career

To most of his contemporaries Mahler was known first and foremost as an operatic conductor. He was active in this sphere from 1880 to 1910, reaching the heights of the profession; but always wanted to be free of the routine of the theatre and to conduct concerts. Most conductors in Germany and Austria were obliged to earn their living mainly in the opera house, and Mahler's model for the concert conductor was exceptional in all senses: Hans von Bülow, who had not held a regular operatic appointment since he left Hannover in 1880. Mahler wrote to Bülow after one of the latter's concerts with the Meiningen Orchestra when it visited Kassel in January 1884:

...At the concert yesterday, when I beheld the fulfilment of my utmost intimations and hopes of beauty, it became clear to me that I had found my spiritual home and my master, and that my wanderings would come to an end now or never!

And now I am here to beg you to take me along in any capacity you like - let me become your pupil, even if I had to pay my tuition fees with my blood... <9>

Bülow never replied to Mahler's letter but instead passed it to Wilhelm Treiber, the Kassel Court Kapellmeister, who arranged for this youthful indiscretion to be placed in Mahler's personal file at the Opera.

A few years later, when they were both working in Hamburg, Bülow recognised Mahler as a colleague. Walter reports that the older musician presented Mahler with a wreath inscribed To the Pygmalion of

3.1.0 - Mahler in the Concert Hall
When Bülow stepped to the desk to conduct one of his Hamburg concerts, he saw Mahler in the front row of the hall. Instead of acknowledging the applause with which he had been received he hurried down the steps of the platform and towards Mahler, offering him his baton and inviting him with a courteous gesture to take his place on the platform. When Mahler, embarrassed, declined, Bülow mounted the steps again and conducted the concert. <10>

Apart from the occasional performances he gave in Prague and Budapest, Mahler's first real opportunities as a conductor of the symphonic repertoire presented themselves in Hamburg when he deputised for Bülow in December 1892, and took over the Hermann Wolff sponsored "Bülow concerts" with the Hamburg Philharmonic after his death in February 1894. <11> At the same time, the Musical Directorship of the Hamburg Philharmonic was about to become vacant due to the imminent retirement of Julius von Bernuth, and Mahler pressed his friend Pfohl to intercede on his behalf with those who would be responsible for the appointment of Bernuth's successor, saying:

"You must understand, dear friend, that an activity such as that which the opera demands of its conductors has an intolerable, even fatal effect in the long run. Out of instincts of self-preservation and self-respect I must conduct concerts, refresh myself in the concert hall, recreate, complement the one-sidedness of opera conducting through the activity of symphonic conducting. As truly as I stand before you, I must conduct symphonies, in short I must also some time be able to conduct a symphony by Beethoven and Mozart. I want to save myself in this way, and in the circumstances I can do so only through your support and your help." <12>

Pfohl duly spoke on Mahler's behalf to a certain Senator Schemmann, earnestly mentioning all Mahler's good points and praising his work in the Hamburg Opera, only to receive the response:

"My dear young friend, what you say is completely true, as far as it concerns an operatic conductor; but how could you believe that Mahler, who up to now has only worked as an operatic conductor, could be capable of conducting concerts? Opera and concerts are two such very different things, that can never be associated. Mahler is indeed a good opera conductor, but believe me he can quite
Mahler conducted the eight "Bulow concerts" with the Hamburg Philharmonic during the 1894-5 season but, according to Förster:

Although the subscription concerts which Mahler led made a deep impression on informed hearers, his concert conducting activities did not find the wished-for support. The critics were in the main unanimously of the opinion that Mahler was a distinguished interpreter only in the theatre. Without the stage and the artificial light he felt out of his element. So again the unexpected came to pass: after a single season Mahler was succeeded at the conducting desk of the Hamburg Philharmonic by Felix Weingartner. <14>

On 15 March 1897 Mahler conducted in Moscow a programme which included Beethoven V, and nine days later conducted the same work in a trial engagement with the Kaim Orchestra in Munich. The critic of the Allgemeine Zeitung wrote of this concert that:

On the basis of this first appearance, we are far from giving an opinion on the conducting talent of the guest. According to that which we saw and heard we have a mind to class him rather with the new-fangled virtuosi (den Pultvirtuosen nach neuerem Schnitt) than with the higher category of well-promising conductors (Heil versprechenden Dirigenten) . . . Mahler appears to be . . . the right conductor for modern works, and we are perhaps standing before a time when an impresario must engage two conductors, one classical and one modern. <15>

The "modern" work referred to was Berlioz' Symphonie fantastique, of which Mahler conducted the second two movements. Weingartner was selected as the conductor of the Kaim Orchestra, and Natalie Bauer-Lechner reports that:

Mahler said irritably: "I could have done what they wanted - played Beethoven in their soulless and senseless way, and spared myself a lot of effort in the process. But in music at least I will maintain my standards even if my life is a struggle in other respects." <16>

Mahler's idealism paid off, for his next concert orchestra was the Vienna Philharmonic. Then, as now, this orchestra was a private venture run by the musicians of the Vienna Opera and for twenty-five years
of the Court Opera, Richter left Vienna for Manchester and Mahler was the obvious choice to succeed him at the Philharmonic. Mahler began work with the Philharmonic in November 1898 and was its conductor for over two full seasons; but from the start the relationship was more controversial than the orchestra wanted. Note was taken of the fact that the *Eroica* was one of the works which Mahler conducted on his first programme, a work which was also on Richter's farewell programme. Among Mahler's other controversial acts with the Philharmonic Orchestra were his performance of Beethoven's Op. 95 quartet with full strings and his Retuschen, especially in Beethoven IX; and when these are added to Mahler's intense demands on the players it is easy to understand why the orchestra eventually decided that working in the opera house was sufficient contact with him. For political reasons, however, and because there was never any problem with the box office when Mahler conducted the Philharmonic, nothing was done about the disquiet until February 1901 when, due to ill health, Mahler asked to be relieved of his Philharmonic duties, and the orchestra then willingly engaged Hellmesberger, a much less demanding task master. <17>

When Mahler left the Vienna Opera in 1907 it was to assume an appointment as conductor at the New York Metropolitan Opera. In due course he was offered the position of Musical Director, but when he made it known that he was not interested in the responsibilities of that position Toscanini and Gatti-Casazza, who had worked together at La Scala, were engaged. The inevitable happened: there was not room at the Metropolitan for both conductors, who moreover had important repertoire in common and, after losing control of *Tristan* to Toscanini and other frustrations, Mahler again turned to concert conducting. In
Damrosch's New York Symphony Orchestra; but it was actually the success of his *Fidelio* production at the Metropolitan with his interpolation of *Leonore III* that caused talk of Mahler as permanent director of the Philharmonic Orchestra in December 1908. <18> For sixty-seven seasons the New York Philharmonic Orchestra had been a musicians cooperative, giving only eight concerts per season; but it was now to be reorganised. The players would be contracted for 23 weeks of the year, under the control of the conductor and a Board of Directors. The guarantors included J.P. Morgan and Joseph Pulitzer, and Mahler was engaged to conduct two specially arranged concerts at the end of the season in March and April 1909 in order to attract the sponsorship which would enable the orchestra to engage players on a regular basis and improve in quality. <19>

The second of these concerts, on 6th April, comprised the Egmont Overture and Beethoven IX, and proved to New York's musical world that, at the helm of a reorganised Philharmonic Orchestra, Mahler would be able to create an ensemble not only worthy of the city, but also one comparable in quality to the Boston Symphony Orchestra. <20>

In the 1908-9 season, the standard of performance had been low. A review of a concert conducted by Wassily Safonoff, Mahler's predecessor stated that: *The usual out-of-tunefulness in the wood and brass choirs frequently marred the orchestra's performance.* <21> Mahler's first task was to re-build the orchestra, and at the beginning of the 1909-10 season, in addition to the retiring concertmaster, he replaced all but two of the woodwind players, all but three of the brass players and many of the string players. <22> As in Vienna, he inscribed Beethoven III on his first programme. The critics recognised the change in the orchestra:

3.2.0 - Mahler in the Concert Hall
played so nearly in tune and with such brilliancy and precision as was the case last evening. <23>

...the (Weihe des Hauses Overture) was performed with splendid smoothness and sonority of tone, excellent balance of orchestral choirs, and minute attention to baton and gesture of the conductor. The first five minutes of the concert sufficed to show that the old stiffness and immobility had gone from the Philharmonic orchestra and were replaced by genuine enthusiasm and pliable submission to the wishes of the directorial chief.

...The new virtues that shone out most strongly ... were the precision of attack in the strings and their vibrant, flexible quality under the able guidance of Theodore Spiering, the new concertmaster; Xavier Reiter's wonderful horn playing ... and the unusual lucidity and fullness of the reeds... <24>

As its Musical Director Mahler conducted the re-organised New York Philharmonic Orchestra during the 1909-10 season and for as much of the 1910-11 season as his health permitted. Despite the fact that the serious existence of the orchestra as an ensemble of quality dates from Mahler's appointment, his years with it were stormy. There was a constant struggle to improve the quality of the playing, and with regard to programming Mahler had to submit to the wishes of a committee of financial sponsors. However, in January 1910, Mahler wrote to his life-long friend Guido Adler that:

I absolutely require a practical exercise of my musical abilities as a counterpoise to the enormous inner happenings in creating; and this very conducting of a concert orchestra was my life-long wish. I am happy to be able to enjoy this once in my life. <25>

So, during his 20 or so years' activity as a concert conductor, Mahler was at the head of only three concert orchestras for one, two and a half, and one and a half seasons respectively, making five seasons in all. For the rest of the time when not discharging his duties in the opera house he was guest conducting and, particularly between 1901 and 1907, in demand mostly as a conductor of his own works.
3.3 Mahler's Concert Repertoire

Bearing in mind that Mahler was only active with his own orchestra for a total of five seasons, it is not surprising that there are many anomalies to be discovered in perusing a list of his concert programmes. In his book *Gustav Mahler im Konzertsaal*, Knud Martner identifies a total of 280 concerts for Mahler’s whole conducting career. Of these concerts, approximately 80, or 28%, took place in America in the last two years of his life. In breaking down Mahler’s repertoire by composer we can derive from Martner the following summary of works which Mahler performed with orchestra:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Number of Works</th>
<th>Total Number of Performances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strauss, R</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchaikovsky</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendelssohn</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16 &lt;27&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But these and other statistics drawn from Mahler’s concert programmes are deceptive, and it is necessary to discover the conditions which determined his repertoire.

In his early years, Mahler’s activity as an opera conductor gave him few opportunities for concert giving. When opportunity did present itself, Mahler was often employed to conduct at festivals, where the choral repertoire was stressed. Thus we find him conducting Haydn’s *Seasons* and Mendelssohn’s *Paulus* in 1885 in Cassel. In Prague, in 1886, he had the opportunity of conducting two concert performances of the
Prague, Mahler was able to give Mozart's 40th Symphony in a charity concert which also included Boccherini's Minuet and the Scherzo from Bruckner III.

With Mahler's move to Budapest a new emphasis enters the picture with the first performance of his own First Symphony; but this concert with the Philharmonic Orchestra is, however, the only one in a list of six at which Mahler conducted in the two seasons 1889-91 which was not a benefit performance or a Gala night at the Opera. Mahler's concert conducting engagements at that time were largely made possible by the needs of the pension funds of the Opera House and the Actors' Union, The Employees of the Burned-down German Theatre in Budapest, and The Polyclinical Society, which enabled him to add to his repertoire Beethoven V and three overtures, Leonore III, Meistersinger, and Weber's Oberon.

The situation improved dramatically when Mahler was in Hamburg: on Good Friday of 1892 he had the opportunity of conducting Mozart's Requiem and Bruckner's Te Deum and at the end of the same year he deputised for Bülow and his concert career began to take form. <29> In Hamburg he conducted more performances of the Mozart and Bruckner choral works and also gave Haydn's Creation annually at the Day of Prayer & Repentance Concert (Buß- und Bettags-Konzert) in Altona. Good Friday also continued to be a regular date for a Mahler concert.

In Hamburg Mahler began to conduct the repertoire which is the main subject of this study, the Beethoven Symphonies and Overtures, Schubert IX and Schumann I. He first performed these works, and the others for which we have scores and parts, with orchestras with which he was familiar, later taking the same pieces on guest engagements. Mahler
standard repertoire, though of recently composed works which he performed it should be remembered that Tchaikovsky's *Romeo & Juliet* was composed in 1870 and Bruckner's *Te Deum* in 1884. Sarasate came to Hamburg and played his *Muineira* Variations and Lalo's *Symphonie espagnole* with Mahler. Other contemporary composers receiving Mahler performances in Hamburg were Brahms (Symphony III), Grieg (Piano Concerto), Strauss (*Guntram* 1st Act Prelude), and Mahler's friend, J.B. Förster, whose First Symphony Mahler presented to the world.

In his Vienna Philharmonic subscription series, Mahler consolidated his "standard" repertoire and continued to add contemporary works:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Dec 1898</td>
<td>Dvorak</td>
<td><em>Heidenlied</em> (first performance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Dec 1898</td>
<td>Bizet</td>
<td><em>Roma</em>, Suite No.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Jan 1899</td>
<td>Tchaikovsky</td>
<td><em>Overture 1812</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Feb 1899</td>
<td>Bruckner</td>
<td>Symphony VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Mar 1899</td>
<td>Perosi</td>
<td><em>The Resurrection of Lazarus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Nov 1899</td>
<td>Strauss</td>
<td><em>Aus Italien</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Dec 1899</td>
<td>Dvorak</td>
<td><em>Die Waldtaube</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Jan 1900</td>
<td>Bruckner</td>
<td>Symphony IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Mar 1900</td>
<td>Goldmark</td>
<td><em>Overture Im Frühling</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dec 1900</td>
<td>Franck</td>
<td>Symphonic Variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Jan 1901</td>
<td>Tchaikovsky</td>
<td><em>Manfred Symphony</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Feb 1901</td>
<td>Dvorak</td>
<td><em>Serenade for Wind Instruments</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He also performed three works from the 18th and early 19th century, maybe at the instigation of Guido Adler:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Composers</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 Nov 1899</td>
<td>Rameau</td>
<td>Rigaudon from <em>Dardanus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Dec 1899</td>
<td>Spohr</td>
<td>Overture to <em>Jessonda</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dec 1900</td>
<td>Bach</td>
<td>Piano Concerto in d minor (arr Busoni)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and conducted the variations from Haydn's *Emperor* Quartet and Beethoven's String Quartet in F minor, Op.95, in arrangements which he made for string orchestra with double basses, a practice which he had already introduced in Hamburg when he conducted Schubert's *Death and the Maiden* Quartet. <30>

Mahler resigned his position with the Vienna Philharmonic in February.
Philharmonic in 1909 was a time when his concert conducting was almost exclusively confined to the presentation of his own works. Whether this was due to him not being invited to conduct other works is not known; but there is no doubt of the importance to Mahler of ensuring that his own works were launched into the world and the difficulty in obtaining leave from the Opera may have persuaded him to concentrate on this. During these eight years, Mahler gave 74 concerts all over Europe, and three with the New York Symphony Orchestra.

Alma Mahler claims that Mahler's work with the New York Philharmonic Orchestra

...was child's play compared with his official duties in Vienna. There were rehearsals only every other morning. ...He performed a great deal of music merely to hear it himself without bothering whether it went down with the public or not. <31>

But, for someone who had only been in charge of a concert orchestra for three and a half seasons, who had a weak heart, and who composed as much as he did, it is amazing that he managed to keep pace with the repertoire, let alone spend time marking up scores with his Retuschen.

As musical director of the Vienna Philharmonic, Mahler had been responsible for a season comprising eight subscription concerts and a few extra ones. This meant that in the season Mahler had a concert about once a fortnight; and with his operatic responsibilities this was manageable. In New York in the 1909-10 season he was obliged to conduct his eight subscription concerts twice and he gave besides a Beethoven cycle of six concerts <32> and an "Historical Cycle" of six concerts, plus 13 concerts outside New York, making a total of 46 concerts in five months. During the 1910-11 season which he conducted in part, Mahler managed 49 concerts, including his last one of 21
whatever his misgivings about the quality of his orchestra, Mahler was happy: he was realising his dreams.

Mahler's "Historical Cycle" of 1909-10 was advertised as "arranged in chronological sequence, comprising the most famous composers from the period of Bach to the present day". <33> The concerts took place about once a month with the following programmes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Composer(s)</th>
<th>Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Nov 1909</td>
<td>Bach/Mahler</td>
<td>Suite for Orchestra &lt;34&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handel</td>
<td>Aria from Flavio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bach</td>
<td>Violin Concerto in E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rameau</td>
<td>Rigaudon from Dardanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grétry</td>
<td>Aria from Céphale et Procris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haydn</td>
<td>Symphony No.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dec 1909</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Symphony No.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haydn</td>
<td>Aria from The Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Aria from The Marriage of Figaro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Dec 1909</td>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>Symphony VIII (Unfinished)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mendelssohn</td>
<td>Violin Concerto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Symphony IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Jan 1910</td>
<td>Brahms</td>
<td>Symphony III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahler</td>
<td>Kindertotenlieder &lt;35&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dvorak</td>
<td>Overture, In der Natur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weingartner</td>
<td>Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smetana</td>
<td>Overture, The Bartered Bride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mar 1910</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Overture, the Flying Dutchman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Prelude to Lohengrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Prelude to Parsifal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Winterstürme from Die Walküre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Prize Song from Die Meistersinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Siegfried's Funeral March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liszt</td>
<td>Les Préludes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liszt</td>
<td>Mazeppa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Mar 1910</td>
<td>Pfitzner</td>
<td>Overture, Das Christ-elflein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bruckner</td>
<td>Symphony IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strauss</td>
<td>Guntram Preludes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strauss</td>
<td>Till Eulenspiegel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is easy today to criticise the repertoire selected, and a modern music historian would generally be disappointed by the missed opportunities evident in the choice; but it should be remembered that
composers before Beethoven were not well-known, even among musicians. This series was designed as an introduction to the repertoire, but clearly failed to attract an audience. The New York Daily Tribune specifically mentions this in the review of the last concert of the series:

There was proof in the size of the audience (probably the smallest that ever attended a Philharmonic concert in fifty years) that the programme had little attractive power.

Apart from this cycle, new works which Mahler added to his repertoire in 1909-10 included:

- Busoni: Turandot Suite (first performance)
- Debussy: Three Nocturnes
- Debussy: Prélude à l'après-midi d'un faune
- Dukas: The Sorcerer's Apprentice
- Rachmaninov: Piano Concerto III
- Strauss: Till Eulenspiegel
- Strauss: Tod und Verklärung
- Tchaikovsky: Symphony VI

Till Eulenspiegel received eleven performances by Mahler during this season, including one in Rome in April, but was not revived by him the following year, and he never again programmed the Debussy or Dukas pieces. The Rachmaninov concerto, with the composer playing the solo part, was the second ever performance of the work, it having been performed earlier by the New York Symphony Orchestra.

In a front page article, Musical America reported on changes which would be made for the 1910-11 Philharmonic season:

Another year there will be no historical nor Beethoven cycles, which will eliminate eleven (sic) performances during the season. ... The artistic results of the season were satisfactory to the directors, and the financial deficit was not more than expected. Nevertheless, the losses were heavy, reaching a total estimated at about $75,000. <37>

During this second season Mahler had problems in his relationship with
America felt sufficiently confident about its facts to report gossip and to speculate on a replacement for Mahler as musical director of the Philharmonic should Mr Mahler decide to remain in Europe next season.

<38> Alma Mahler reports on a meeting which Mahler had at the home of Mrs Sheldon, the chairman of the Board of Directors, in February 1911:

He found several male members of the Committee there and was severely taken to task. The ladies had many instances to allege of conduct which in their eyes was mistaken. He rebutted these charges, but now at a word from Mrs Sheldon a curtain was drawn aside and a lawyer, who (as came out later) had been taking notes all the time, entered the room. A document was then drawn up in legal form, strictly defining Mahler's powers. He was so taken aback and so furious that he came back to me trembling in every limb; and it was only by degrees that he was able to take any pleasure in his work. <39>

Another sign of growing problems between Mahler and the board of directors is the increasing number of all-Wagner concerts, eight alone in January 1911. Alma Mahler writes that

He conducted the overture to the Flying Dutchman and the Paris version of the Tannhäuser overture six times in succession, merely because he had fallen in love with them. <40>

Be this as it may, although the Wagner concerts helped materially with the box office receipts, a continued diet of these would have hastened Mahler's dissatisfaction with his role as conductor of the New York Philharmonic.

Musical America's report of one of these concerts, which devotes about half its space to a consideration of the soprano, is eloquent of this problem when it presents a complete contrast to its report of the last "Historical Concert" of the previous season, quoted above:

It fell to the Philharmonic last Sunday afternoon to give the sixth Wagner concert of the past two weeks, and the audience that filled Carnegie Hall was of record-breaking dimensions. By ten minutes before the starting time it was necessary fairly to fight one's way through the struggling
An earlier proof of changes affecting Mahler’s own choice of repertoire is seen in the number of Tchaikovsky performances that Mahler conducted in the 1910-11 season. The previous musical director of the Philharmonic, Wassily Safonoff, was identified with Tchaikovsky performances of great power and Mahler had obviously been prevailed upon to conduct the Pathétique Symphony in January 1910, despite his dislike of the work:

He called it a shallow, superficial, distressingly homophonic work - no better than salon music. "...These rising and falling arpeggios, these meaningless sequences of chords, can’t disguise the fundamental lack of invention and the emptiness. If you make a coloured dot spin around an axis, it appears to be magnified into a shimmering circle. But the moment it comes to rest, it’s the same old dot, which wouldn’t tempt even the cat to play." <42>

Benjamin Kohon spoke of Mahler’s dislike of the work:

He didn’t like Russian music, particularly Tchaikovsky. When we played the Pathétique, in the last movement there are some descending scales, and at the end of the scale there's a sudden pause; and he said "See, is that symphonic?" Then he gave us a speech, he said: "You see, Tchaikovsky was a very talented composer, he had beautiful melodies, but they’re really Italian melodies. It's nice music but that’s not symphonic style." Tchaikovsky was not in his opinion a symphonic composer. <43>

La Grange reports that Tchaikovsky VI had been added to the programme of 20 January 1910 at the behest of certain members of the board of directors. <44> Mahler had also had a disastrous experience with the work in Rome in May of the same year, and this had been reported in the American press. <45> This experience and the uncomplimentary reviews which Mahler received in New York whenever he conducted Tchaikovsky symphonies point clearly to the fact that his programming of the Pathétique Symphony in his final season was instigated by the board. <46>

Mahler’s attitude towards Tchaikovsky is far from clear. He took great
in March 1910, even revising large sections of it; <47> but, except for Symphony VI and Romeo and Juliet, he did not add Tchaikovsky's major orchestral works to his permanent repertoire, though he performed Symphonies II, V, and Manfred, the First Suite and the 1812 Overture. A similar trend is evident with the contemporary French music which Mahler conducted: it was obviously done as a duty to the composers and to the public, but he never returned to the works in his later season. Perhaps as an Austrian he felt insecure about meeting the very different demands of the French style; though it is hard to advance any similar argument in the case of Tchaikovsky.

Apart from the increase in Wagner and Tchaikovsky, from the beginning of his second, and last, orchestral season in New York Mahler's programmes become less obviously didactic, and the large number of pieces performed by him for the first time in the 1910-11 season undoubtedly reflects the need felt by the board to attract an audience by means of a wider selection of works than he had previously offered.

New entries to Mahler's repertoire included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahms</td>
<td>Symphony I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherubini</td>
<td>Overture to Anacreon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debussy</td>
<td>Rondes de Printemps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgar</td>
<td>Enigma Variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liszt</td>
<td>Tasso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDowell</td>
<td>Piano Concerto II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimsky-Korsakov</td>
<td>Sheherazade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Symphony II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Symphony III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strauss</td>
<td>Also sprach Zarathustra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchaikovsky</td>
<td>Symphony II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchaikovsky</td>
<td>Symphony V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were four programmes on national themes:

"French" Programme - 3 January 1911:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Piece</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enesco</td>
<td>Suite No.1, Op.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalo</td>
<td>Aubade from Le Roi d'Ys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massenet</td>
<td>Arias</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.0 - Mahler in the Concert Hall
This was Mahler's last concert.

With this information as the background, it can readily be seen as a futile exercise to speculate on why Mahler did or did not regularly conduct certain works: except for his one season with the Hamburg Philharmonic when he was learning the repertoire, or during his tenure with the Vienna Philharmonic when he conducted a total of 22 subscription concerts, his repertoire in the concert hall was proscribed by the demands of his audience or his New York board of directors. In an editorial written during Mahler's illness in March 1911, Musical America alluded to the difficulties which Mahler had had in selecting his own programmes during the 1910-11 season:

It is said that he has had difficulty in making out his programs this season, that in almost every instance his programs have been changed for some reason or other by members of the board of directors. <49>

The works which Mahler conducted by choice were not identical with
prepared to devote time in preparation, even if the work involved
required him to spend hours in writing Retuschen into score and parts.
On the list of Mahler's preferred repertoire must be numbered Bach,
<50> Beethoven, Berlioz, Bruckner, Dvorak, Haydn, <51> Liszt,
Mendelssohn, Mozart, Schubert, Schumann and Wagner, but in view of the
special circumstances of his orchestral conducting career, I do not
consider it wise to draw any more general conclusions.

3.4 Mahler's Baton Technique

A study of Mahler's baton technique is not one which is able to pretend
to any scientific accuracy. It is a subject which is difficult to
discuss, particularly since Mahler died before the advent of film or
television. This section will therefore content itself with reporting
what is reliably known.

In modern times the technical aspect of conducting has been studied and
taught more systematically than it was in the time of Mahler. It finds
no place in the treatises by Wagner or Weingartner, and Berlioz'
instructions are at a very basic level, <52> though, to judge from the
example of Boult, Nikisch must have taught baton technique very
thoroughly in his classes in Leipzig, and his example was probably
unique at that time.

In defence of the study of baton technique, it is often claimed that
less rehearsal time is available today, making greater demands upon the
conductor's dexterity; yet Mahler's first performance of Lohengrin in
an orchestra which knew the work well: but, even so, in the opera house
precision of gesture is a pre-requisite for the co-ordination of stage
and orchestra and Mahler must have had that. However, this does not
imply the technique of a Boulez with the ability to beat simultaneously
different patterns with the two arms: the music of Mahler's repertoire
did not demand it, and by the time of the first performance of *Le Sacre
du Printemps* Mahler had been dead two years.

Mahler expressed himself on baton technique only in the case of the
ending of his own *Lied von der Erde*, as Walter reports:

> Then he pointed out the rhythmical difficulties and asked
jestingly: "Have you any idea how this is to be conducted? I
haven't." <53>

Some of the players who worked with Mahler in New York have alluded to
the fact that beating academic patterns was not one of Mahler's
priorities:

> Theodore Spiering, NYPO concertmaster, and himself a
conductor wrote that: As a conductor he had developed over
the years an informality of technique that was sometimes
almost fatal for the orchestra. In correcting one player's
inaccuracy, or while trying to get across some nuance or
particular phrasing, he tended to forget that the whole
orchestra was dependent on his beat. <54>

> Alois Reiser, cellist in the NYSO in 1908: "His beat was
poor, not a regular pattern, just a rhythm, pure
expression. But we understood after a couple of
rehearsals." <55>

> Benjamin Kohon, 2nd bassoon in the NYPO: "I remember he had
a run in with the oboe player, who was an older man than I
was and had lots of experience in orchestras. And he once
said to Mahler: "Mr Mahler, we don't understand your beat,
it's hard for us to know what to do." So he says: "Good
musicians don't need a conductor: a conductor is only a
necessary evil... Don't worry what I do: just play your
music."

> "I played a few performances with him at the Metropolitan -
*The Bartered Bride* - and Mahler had a habit of dropping his
arm, either from fatigue or thinking of something else.
He'd drop it right down under the stand and Mr Rothmeyer
(principal second violin and personnel manager) used to
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Herbert Borodkin, viola in the NYSO and NYPO: "He would be so immersed many times in his music that he'd forget his beat, and because he had so many rehearsals he didn't have to beat everything so thoroughly on point." <57>

It might be inferred from these descriptions that Mahler was incompetent, yet it is hardly likely to be the case that a musician who can successfully conduct the repertoire which Mahler conducted is unable to indicate the beat with sufficient precision; and not only that, but the slow movement of the Beethoven Ninth, to name but one work as an example, demands a sovereign control of gesture for its successful performance. If Mahler conducted in an unorthodox fashion it can only have been for a good reason, as in the case of Furtwängler. In this it is significant that, although the New York critics frequently refer to imprecision in the playing of the Philharmonic Orchestra, there is never any suggestion that this was due to Mahler's beat.

Natalie Bauer-Lechner brings us closer to understanding Mahler's aims:

Conducting, according to Mahler, should be a continual elimination of the bar (des Taktes), so that it retreats behind the melodic and rhythmic content, like the fabric of a Gobelin under the pattern of the embroidery. On the contrary, the average plodding conductor treats every barline as a barrier, and scans the subdivisions of each measure indiscriminately, like a bad actor stressing the metrical feet of his lines.

In Mahler's conducting, it is often impossible to distinguish what beat he is using. His baton stokes serve only to emphasise the significant melodic and rhythmic content at any one moment. Consequently, he often glides completely over the first beat of a bar, and stresses instead the second or third beat, or wherever the principal emphasis should be placed. Of course this way of giving the beat makes quite different demands on the players from the regularly beaten 'donkey-bridges' (Takt-Eselsbrücken) of the average conductor. "They have to help produce the music themselves, instead of merely following someone else thoughtlessly and relying on him," said Mahler "and anyone whose attention wanders is lost." <58>

Musical America made a similar point:
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Passages Sunday afternoon during which the baton did not move at all. He is rather a master interpreter who depends on his work at rehearsal and his indications of important accents and shadings to bring about the desired results. <59>

Guido Adler's testimony on Mahler's conducting style is based on seeing him in the opera house:

...he indulged himself freely in his bodily motions, frequently to the point of grotesqueness, with nervous twitching and foot-stamping. <60> Yet in riper years his movements became increasingly concentrated. The arms seem to want to satisfy themselves with the necessary indication of time and tempo, eyes and expression bore into the attentively upturned faces, wrist and fingertips accomplish more now than arms and feet earlier. Mahler's conducting became more and more spiritualized, and his will communicated itself as if in electrical discharges, which remained invisible to the eyes of the listeners. <61>

The Viennese Music Critic, Max Graf also describes Mahler's early excesses and subsequent calming down:

His conducting was striking enough in his first years of activity in Vienna. He would let his baton shoot forward suddenly, like the tongue of a poisonous serpent. With his right hand, he seemed to pull the music out of the orchestra as out of the bottom of a chest of drawers. He would let his stinging glance loose upon a musician who was seated far away from him, and the man would quail. Giving a cue, he would look in one direction, at the same time pointing his baton in another. He would stare at the stage and make imploring gestures at the singers. He would leap from his conductor's chair as if he had been stung. Mahler was always in full movement like a blazing flame. Later he became calmer. Evidently he controlled himself, which only augmented his inner tension. <62>

Bauer-Lechner explains the reasons for Mahler's change in his conducting gestures when writing in 1898, after Mahler's first Philharmonic concert in Vienna:

As the concerts continued, it was generally admitted that Mahler no longer conducted 'like a galvanized frog' as one of the gentlemen of the press had been pleased to describe him. In fact, his movements were quiet and restrained. Naturally enough! - since, for the Philharmonic concerts, he has plenty of rehearsals in which he studies every detail thoroughly with the orchestra, and so needs only a minimum of indications and gestures at the concert itself.
Walter reports on Mahler's demeanour when conducting that:

The visible picture of Mahler's conducting became very considerably simplified in the course of years. Boehler's excellent silhouette caricatures show the violent and drastic nature of his motions during his first years in Vienna... As time went on, his attitude and gestures became quieter. His technique of conducting had become so spiritualized that he was easily able to achieve a combination of unfettered playing and unfailing precision by his seemingly simple beat, his body remaining otherwise almost motionless. His powerful influence upon singers and musicians accomplished by a look and the most sparing of gestures what he had formerly endeavoured to convey by violent motion. In his last years, his conducting presented a picture of almost uncanny quiet, although the intensity of expression did not suffer by it. I recall a performance of the Sinfonia Domestica by Strauss under Mahler's direction at which the contrast between the uproar of the orchestra and the immovable attitude of him who had unleashed it made the most eerie impression. <64>

Herman Martonne, 2nd violinist in the NYPO, describes Mahler's conducting in New York:

He didn't make any show. He always had his hands right next to his body and that's all. And if he wanted something to come out, he'd just kind of make a little movement. That's all, nothing for show. <65>

So, what was Mahler's baton technique like? We can gain little other than general knowledge from these witnesses, except that it is clear that he was not an elegant conductor like Nikisch or Weingartner, nor was he a four-square Kapellmeister. The only definite clue to what we might imagine is given by Herman Klein, music critic of the Sunday Times when Mahler conducted in London in 1892. He describes Mahler in rehearsal at the Drury Lane Theatre:

He reminded me in many ways of Richter; he used the same strong, decisive beat; there was the same absence of fussiness or superfluous action, the same clear, unmistakable definition of time and rhythm. His men, whom he rehearsed first in sections, soon understood him without difficulty. <66>
Mahler in rehearsal was as exigeant a taskmaster as ever stood before an orchestra. Although he seems not to have smashed batons, broken watches, or hurled personal insults at his players in the manner of Toscanini, he demanded total concentration and the highest standards of musical discipline.

Bauer-Lechner reports Mahler's own comparison of his attitude to rehearsals when he was in Hamburg and earlier in Kassel when he talks about orchestral players:

"Do you really think these people are interested in learning and making progress? For them, art is only the cow which they milk so as to live their everyday lives undisturbed, as comfortably and pleasantly as possible. And yet, there are some amongst them who are more willing and better than the rest; one ought to have more patience with them than I am able to manage. For if one of them doesn't immediately understand what is on the page, I could kill him on the spot; I come down on him, and upset him so much that he really hates me. In this way I often demand more of them than they are capable of actually giving; no wonder they don't forgive me for it!

"...I'm quite gentle today compared with what I used to be. In the first years of my career as a conductor, when I didn't yet quite know how to go about things and made people rehearse eight hours and more a day, matters once deteriorated in Kassel to such an extent that a real revolution threatened to break out in my orchestra. A friend warned me that all the orchestral players were intending to come to the rehearsal armed with sticks and cudgels in order to beat me soundly. My friend advised me to plead indisposition and stay at home. Naturally, I went straight to the rehearsal, and began it immediately, as sternly and severely as possible! I never took my eye off a single one of the gentlemen, and never left them a moment's respite in which to collect their wits. As soon as the rehearsal was over, glaring around me furiously, I banged the grand piano lid shut - and without saying a word, or anyone having dared to approach me, let alone touch me, I left the hall.

"Looking back, I've often felt sorry for the poor fellows who were my first victims, and whose last breath and last
Out of her own experience, Natalie Bauer-Lechner reports of Mahler's concert with the Berlin Philharmonic in March 1896 that:

For sheer intensity, there is nothing to match his rehearsals. Naturally, not the slightest error escapes him. If even the most inconspicuous note is a shade off-pitch or late, he becomes wildly impatient, even furious. Relentlessly he has the passage repeated until it is perfect: first by the offender alone, then by individual sections - strings, wind, percussion - and finally by the whole orchestra. <68>

These are all descriptions of orchestras which Mahler conducted before he moved to Vienna where initially he found the Vienna Court Opera Orchestra better than any he had encountered, reporting to Natalie in May 1897:

"I got further with them in one rehearsal than after years with the others. It's true that the acoustics of the Vienna Opera House idealize the tone in a quite unbelievable way, whereas elsewhere bad acoustic properties make it less spiritual, coarser. But the chief credit must still go to Austrian musicianship: the vitality, the warmth, and the great natural gifts which each man brings to his work." <69>

But by August he was already demanding more than the players wanted to give:

"I want much more out of them, and at close range I find masses of offending features and imperfections. These perpetual portamenti <70> of the cellos are horrible; they cannot hold a single note evenly! And, instead of taking piano as the mean, their natural dynamic (Sprechton) is always forte, except when they want to achieve a special "effect" by playing pianissimo - no matter how violently I signal them to desist. If a string player has a solo, he thinks it is there only so that he can play as loudly and prominently as possible. Their rhythm is sloppy, too. But I shall drive all that out of them in time!" <71>

In November 1899, when Mahler was working with the Vienna Philharmonic, Natalie gives a different picture of Mahler in rehearsal, one less concerned with technical problems than with communicating his view of the music to the players:
grasped my meaning. "Just look at this ... passage!" I told them. "Where is the 'monumental calm' (monumentale Ruhe) and where is the 'impetus' (Schwung) that you have always been used to putting into Beethoven and often at the wrong place? Here is grace and humour; there is tenderness and restrained sentiment. But now comes a moment of passion, an unparalleled crescendo, and the most tremendous climax; now is the moment to change your tactics, and to sweep everything before you by the intensity, the ardour and the grandeur of your playing!" <72>

In New York, where Mahler was obliged to build his orchestra almost from scratch and could not rely on the traditions of the Vienna Court Opera Orchestra or the Philharmonic, Herbert Borodkin relates the following event:

We had to play the Ninth Symphony of Beethoven, and there's a long passage for the bass players, and he didn't like the way they played it. So he stopped them and he said, "Basses play this allein." (He only spoke German and we all had to learn German.) So he started with the first desk, and they played it all right. He came to the second desk and there was a very old man there, I even remember his name was Kissenberth, <73> and he said: "Now you play this alone." And the man said, "I'm very sorry Mr Mahler, but I'm too nervous now to play it". So he went back on his podium and conducted. After about half an hour he stopped the orchestra and said: "Are you still nervous?" The man said, "Yes, I am still nervous." And about another half hour (later) he stopped the orchestra and he said: "Are you still nervous?" And the man said, "Yes, I am still nervous." The first thing the next morning, before anyone else could play or anything, he said: "I'd like you to play that passage for me now." The man said, "I didn't sleep all night, and I am still very nervous. I am a good player, but I just can't play alone today." Well, he stopped him three or four times during that rehearsal and the man couldn't play. So he said: "You know, you have no business to play in a symphony orchestra. You should be playing in the back room of a saloon." <74>

Herman Martonne (NYPO violinist) gives the other side of the picture:

If you did your duty and did it well, and did it with your heart, he had nothing against you. He terrorised when he saw something which shouldn't be; but when something counted, was important and meant something, why then he'd insist on it, whether it was the spirit or whether the sound, or whether the ensemble or anything, he'd just get what he wanted, what he felt it should be, and he imparted that to his musicians. He not only demanded loud and soft, but the spirit of it. That atmosphere, that's what made the man outstanding. <75>
Busoni wrote to his wife about Mahler rehearsing for the first performance of his *Turandot* Suite in March, 1910 that:

> It was a pity that you did not hear *Turandot* under Mahler. In the end I remained there for the evening; it seemed to me to be unjust towards Mahler to go away. With what love and unerring instinct this man rehearsed! Artistically, and humanly, it was both gratifying and warming. <76>

A sympathetic description of Mahler’s rehearsal methods in Europe is given by Adler:

> In conducting his own works and those of others, the character of the conductor and the work of art conducted both manifested themselves. He buried himself in the work to be performed, and it drew him in, so that he completely surrendered to it. Subject and object became one. While he re-created the work of art, he led those working with him and guided by him, his companions, with an irresistible power of suggestion, and drew them over to his conception. He allowed his co-workers just as much freedom as was possible at any time without damaging an integrated performance. He extracted the utmost capacity for work from the players and placed them all in the service of the composition. At the same time he subjugated them to his will and with a general’s look assigned the divisions of his troops in accordance with his master plan, which was based on the music itself and was ordered in accordance with the situation and the forces at hand. In rehearsals one could observe how, step by step, the ground was taken and mastered, how, in the careful polishing of the smallest details, his view was directed to the unity of the whole. Sometimes he gives a comparative explanation, sometimes with throat and lips, suggesting a wind instrument or fiddle, sings a motive or passage, with arm and hand indicates the lines, the type of movement, stabs the air, in a crescendo grows into a giant, in a decrescendo shrinks into a dwarf, with his looks, his threatening brows, the pleading corners of his mouth, his furrowed forehead, entices the greatest intimacy and the greatest tension from *pppp* all the way to *ffff*. He enlivens with humorous words, censures in a sarcastic manner - but always to spur the players and singers on to 'new deeds'. He tells an anecdote that is intended to revivify the imagination. The softest middle-voice in a movement in many parts he hears and corrects if it sounds untrue; in the midst of a roaring attack he rejects the sound of an instrument that has not begun properly; in a large chorus notes a singer who intones an octave too low, in the *tutti* a violinist who plays the right note but does so on an unsuitable string. From orchestras expressly assembled, or more accurately, thrown together, for individual performances of his symphonies and other works, he created homogeneous instrumental bodies in a few rehearsals... In separate wind or string rehearsals he sought to maintain the balance...
same time permit each player to feel himself a soloist.

As he is totally absorbed - to the last fibre - in the work of art, so he expects the same from his co-workers. He will not relent until everything is achieved that seems achievable to him. He demands the continuation, repetition and augmentation of the rehearsals. Here he hits the most substantial resistance - to the musicians, earning a livelihood is of equal importance, excessive exertion disagreeable. To most men - and especially to certain musicians - it seems an unpardonable transgression to become uncomfortable. As a result, in Vienna conflicts developed - manifesting themselves not in noisy opposition, but in a growing quiet resentment, which accumulated and subsequently relieved itself through ostracism... In the realm of art he hated nothing more than the mechanical - not to be confused with the mechanical tools of the musician or the 'golden mechanics' of art in creation and re-creation. <77>

Despite its general despotic nature, Mahler did tailor his approach to match the ensemble. Alfred Hertz reported to Klemperer that, in New York at his first Tristan rehearsal

Mahler didn't say a word. Only at the end he suddenly said, "The entry of the main motif, the trumpets stronger: one must hear the crescendo." And through that single remark the entire prelude was transformed. <78>

An excellently balanced and sympathetic view of Mahler in rehearsal and his contrasting behaviour in the concert comes from reviews of his 1907 concert in Helsinki:

(Mahler) is a formidable conductor, a real orchestra dictator, whom the players fear as if he were an absolute tyrant. "Unhappy the man who has him as his teacher," someone has written about him. He does not hesitate to take any measures to make the orchestra, its every player, follow his slightest demands. In the rehearsals he commands, roars and gesticulates and does not allow any kind of opposition. But this is the way he achieves results... Every sound, every phrase has to be performed exactly right. When he comes in front of the audience Mahler is a completely different man: there is none of the nervousness or ranting; then he stands calm, almost motionless before his troops and forces them to follow him with only slight movements of the hand. <79>

...In concert Mahler is not exactly the same man he is in the rehearsals. The lively influence on the orchestra appears to be quite insignificant, sporadic. But if an ordinary mortal wishes to try to understand and correctly evaluate Gustav Mahler, he should attend the rehearsals.
Incites the orchestra, there one can open one's eyes to what the highest form of conducting and musical profundity mean. In the concert, before the large public as witness, he withdraws slightly into his shell. What has been discussed with the orchestra in the intimacy of the rehearsals remains a half secret between the conductor and his orchestra. During the concert he remains at a distance and standing in the heights of his artistry, detached, still. Only now and then does lightning break out from the professor-like outer manifestation of Mahler. He knows that the orchestra is well versed in what it is doing. They play with fearless feeling and are therefore capable of accurately rendering all finesse. But supposing that it would forget its high standpoint, its artistic enthusiasm, then Mahler has got his lightning available. <80>
Chapter 4

Mahler's Performance Materials

This chapter discusses the known scores and parts which Mahler used for his concerts and the kind of information which can be obtained from them about Mahler's performance practice. In doing this it has to be borne constantly in mind that Mahler marked his scores and orchestral material for his own use and that of the players he worked with. Although the markings appear at first sight to be very detailed, they are not much more specific than those written by Bach or Haydn since Mahler was always at hand to interpret them. On rare occasions, as in his own works, Mahler did write a note in a score to explain to a copyist what he meant but, of course, he had no difficulty himself in interpreting his own marks. <1>

The sources themselves are catalogued in Chapter 15 and general information about each one is summarised there.

4.1 Mahler's Markings in Scores and Parts

Different conductors write different things in the scores from which they conduct. Some have an intricate system of hieroglyphics to indicate which instruments are playing, others amplify dynamics by writing them in large letters in the margins. Some write notes to remind them about tempi and other practical matters. Fritz Busch wrote
few bars, Klemperer indicated the periodic metre, Walter wrote remarks to help him with the expressive content of the music, and Scherchen wrote so many marks of all kinds that the original printed notes became illegible. Mahler's scores do not resemble the scores of any of these conductors. There is not a single metronome mark in any of the ones listed in Chapter 15, bowings are indicated only sporadically, periodic metre is indicated only in a few places in the first movement of Beethoven IV, there are no poetic remarks dealing with expressive content, and very few of the marks are intended to remind Mahler of dynamics, or tempi, or the entry of instruments. <2> Mahler also appears not to notice discrepancies in scores between different editions or between printed score and parts.

Instead of all these possibilities, we find in Mahler's extensively annotated scores changes of dynamics and instrumentation denoted in this study by the term Retuschen. So extensive are Mahler's Retuschen that for most of the scores he was obliged to enter his changes into a set of orchestral parts before the rehearsal. Many conductors have had their own orchestral materials with their preferred bowings, with instructions as to repeats, and other valuable markings. <3> Mahler's orchestral parts have all these, plus his Retuschen, and have moreover many extra rehearsal numbers to enable him to rehearse in minute detail without wasting time. <4>

If Mahler's care to prepare to the utmost were not obvious from a perusal of the sources, we have the witness of Förster who knew Mahler well in Hamburg:

In those days I found Mahler always at the writing desk. He was never satisfied with the score, perfecting it to the last detail with regard to dynamics and execution; he also transferred every one of his rigorously measured signs to the individual orchestral parts. One can imagine how much
... Mahler's enemies - what great man has none? - did not know better than to speak of unusual tempi, of arbitrary modifications, of straining after effect. None of them surmised, with what feeling of responsibility (Verantwortungsgefuhl) Mahler approached his task, with what pedantic strictness and exactitude he reflected on every nuance, the least of the marks which he copied into the score and parts.

So he found it necessary, for instance in Beethoven's Ninth, even in the first movement to depart from the traditional tempo; he allowed himself a few Retuschen and doublings in the orchestra; in the finale he made a part of the orchestra play "in the wings". But all this only with the object of making the wonderful work sound with the most consummate sound shape (Klang-gestalt).

4.2 The Extant Sources

4.2.1 Materials Sent to Mahler's Publisher by Alma Mahler

Alma Mahler reports that, during his final illness, Mahler entrusted his re-touched scores of Beethoven and Schumann and some other symphonies to me. 'They're valuable,' he said. 'Have them printed.'

This view has been disputed, Otto Klemperer claiming

...that Mahler explicitly said, 'These Retuschen I have made for myself, not for anyone else. When I conduct, I can take responsibility for them.' And I can tell you his personality was such that when he conducted, one didn't feel them as Retuschen. ... That they were published was just financial. After his death his widow, Alma, sold his versions to Universal Edition.

Whatever the truth of the matter, Alma sent a number of Mahler's conducting scores and parts to Universal Edition. Receipt of these was acknowledged by U.E. in a letter of 17 June 1927, now in the U.E. Archive. The materials listed in the letter were:

**SCORES**

Beethoven * Symphonies I & II (in one volume) P.23, P.24
The scores of the starred works were offered back to Alma in the same letter. A second letter to Alma from Universal Edition, also dated 17 June 1927, states that Erwin Stein had assessed the value of the materials which Alma had offered to U.E, and was accompanied by a contract for the limited "publication" of some of the retouched versions. U.E. also undertook to publish information about them in their journals *Pult und Taktstock* and *Der Anbruch*. <11>

With the exception of Beethoven IX, all the orchestral materials remained in the U.E. Archive, and most of the scores either remained there, or were returned to Alma and are found today in other archives. Unaccounted for at present are those sources in the above list which have no catalogue numbers in the right hand column: scores of the Overtures Leonore II and III, Schumann II, two scores of Schumann III, <12> and the set of parts of Beethoven IX.
On 23 June 1927, a contract was proposed to Alma Mahler, regarding the following works: <13>

Beethoven
Symphonies VII & IX
Coriolan Overture
Weihe des Hauses Overture
Leonore II Overture
Egmont III Overture! <14>

Schumann
Symphonies I - IV
Manfred Overture

Schubert
Symphony IX

The materials which were to be rented were to be copies made by Universal Edition. Conductors were only to be allowed to perform the versions from these copies and were not to be allowed to make further copies.

4.2.2 Scores and Parts Currently in the U.E. Archive in Vienna

The Universal Edition Archive, lodged in the Musiksammlung of the Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek contains the following materials: <15>

Beethoven
* Coriolan Overture P.5
* Egmont Overture P.9
* Weihe des Hauses Overture P.18
* Symphony V P.30
* Symphonies V & VI P.29, P.32
* Symphony VII P.34
* Symphonies VII & VIII P.33, P.38
* Symphony IX P.40

Bruckner
Symphony V P.43

Schumann
* Manfred Overture P.50
* Manfred Overture P.51

Smetana
The Bartered Bride Overture P.58

Orchestral materials used by Mahler:

Beethoven
* Coriolan Overture P.6
* Egmont Overture P.11
* Leonore II Overture P.13
* Leonore III Overture P.14
* Die Weihe des Hauses Overture P.18
* Symphony III P.26
* Symphony V P.31

Bruckner
Symphony IV P.42
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Only the materials marked with an * were on the list of works received from Alma in 1927.

4.2.3 Scores in the Library of the University of Southampton

The second major collection of materials is in the Special Collections Archive of the University of Southampton where a number of Mahler's retouched scores were placed by Anna Mahler and Donald Mitchell in 1973. Only one of these, Beethoven I & II, P.23-4, had been among those offered by Alma to U.E. in 1927. Apart from the exceptionally fine copyist's version of Beethoven IX, P.41, which contains mainly Retuschen identical to those in P.40, these scores contain earlier versions of Mahler's Retuschen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bach</td>
<td>Cantata No 19</td>
<td>P.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Coriolan Overture</td>
<td>P.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King Stephan Overture</td>
<td>P.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Die Weihe des Hauses Overture</td>
<td>P.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piano Concerto V</td>
<td>P.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symphonies I &amp; II</td>
<td>P.23, P.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symphonies III &amp; IV</td>
<td>P.25, P.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symphony IX</td>
<td>P.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>Symphony IX</td>
<td>P.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Symphony II</td>
<td>P.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4 Scores in Other Libraries

Scores of Schumann I & IV are at present in the Osborn Collection which is lodged in the Beinicke Rare Book and Manuscript Division of Yale University Library.

The Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich, has a score of Schubert IX
the New York Philharmonic Orchestra during Mahler's tenure as Music Director. This score agrees in all substantial detail with the set of parts in the U.E. Archive. <16>

The archive of the Vienna Philharmonic Society contains the following:

Beethoven Overture, Weihe des Hauses, score P.16
String Quartet, Op.95, score and parts P.21/2.

The Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek itself owns an E-flat clarinet part for Beethoven's Overture, Die Weihe des Hauses in Mahler's handwriting, P.19; and a score of Egmont Overture, P.10, is in the Mengelberg Archive in The Hague.

4.2.5 Scores in Private Collections

Mahler's handwritten E-flat clarinet part for Beethoven III, P.27, is in private hands, having been sold at Sotheby's in 1985. Also in private hands are continuo parts for two Bach Cantatas, P.2/3, and the score of Schubert's Death & the Maiden Quartet, P.46.

4.3 The Missing Sources

It is clear from the discussion above, and indeed from a consideration of Mahler's repertoire, that there are other scores and sets of orchestral parts which have disappeared. It is to be hoped that these will eventually be discovered and made available for study. With a few exceptions, those materials which are already known have not been written in since Mahler's death, and they will form a standard for judging the authenticity of any further scores and orchestral parts.
I consider the following to be among those materials which are missing:

**Bach Cantatas:** The three continuo parts are a mystery unless Mahler had an opportunity to perform them, perhaps in Hamburg. I am convinced that Mahler had full scores of these and perhaps other works.

**Beethoven Symphonies:** Somewhere there is a score of the *Eroica* Symphony to match the parts, P.26. For the verification of certain details, it would be most useful to locate the set of parts of Beethoven IX handed over by Alma to U.E. in 1927. Further, Mahler almost certainly possessed another score and a set of parts of the *Pastoral* Symphony; and there may also be missing scores and parts for Symphonies I, II, IV and VIII.

**Beethoven Overtures:** We have orchestral parts for Leonore II & III, but the scores to match these, which were listed by U.E. in 1927, have disappeared.

**Bruckner IV:** There must have been a score to match Mahler's revised parts, P.42.

**Mozart Symphonies:** Mahler must have had scores to match his sets of parts of Symphonies 40 and 41.

**Schumann Symphonies:** Mahler's scores and parts of Symphonies II & III have disappeared, even though there are copyists' scores available from U.E. One score of Schumann II is missing and, according to the list prepared by U.E. in 1927, <17> there are two scores of Schumann III. One of these probably has the Hamburg stamp and completes the set.

**Wagner, Meistersinger Overture:** In addition to the rest of the set of parts, a score is probably still to be located.
As far as those works of Mahler's repertoire are concerned for which I have been unable to unearth sources, the following would be worthy of study and several are as likely to be discovered as those on the above list:

Brahms: Symphonies I & III
Haydn: Symphonies 103 & 104
Mendelssohn: Symphony III
Schubert: Symphony VIII
Tschaikowsky Romeo & Juliet & Francesca da Rimini <18>
Wagner Symphonies II, V & VI
Weber Overtures & Siegfried Idyll

Euryanthe & Der Freischütz Overtures

4.4 What We Learn From Mahler's Scores and Orchestral Materials

For a detailed knowledge of Mahler's Retuschen and performing practice both scores and parts are valuable. Due to the shorthand methods used by Mahler in his scores, an understanding of the markings in one score can often throw light on the interpretation of the same markings in another score. In the course of the present investigation this was the case with the many E-flat clarinet parts notated by Mahler.

Most of the scores have no rehearsal letters or bar numbers printed in them, and the provision of handwritten rehearsal letters is an indication that the score has been prepared for use in a rehearsal. The addition of numbers indicating how many bars have elapsed since the last rehearsal letter shows that orchestral parts have been prepared from the score. The presence of supplementary rehearsal letters or numbers which is characteristic of many of the scores, e.g. Beethoven VII, P.34, which has no less than 146 of them, enables us to match the score with a set of orchestral parts.
contain a finished revision by Mahler, and it is questionable whether they represent his performing practice in full. Others can be seen to be more fully worked out, not only by their more extensive revisions, but also by practical considerations. Instances of this include supplementary rehearsal numbers which show that the score is intended to be used for intensive rehearsals, or the indications for re-tuning the timpani which make practical Mahler's changed notes in Schumann I, P.53, and Beethoven VII, P.34. The latter would not be needed by Mahler, but they serve as an indication to the copyist responsible for preparing the parts.

Mahler's handwriting and many different coloured inks can sometimes be used to establish the order in which he made changes. This is one of the more tantalizing aspects of the sources: the coloured inks and pencils can usually only be distinguished in the presence of the actual source, occasionally only in an extremely bright light, <19> and comparison between sources in different libraries and cities is difficult. Much time can be spent in attempting to make sense of the different inks and pencils, without arriving at any conclusion.

From orchestral parts we obtain other information. We can usually distinguish between Retuschen added by Mahler and those added by copyists, and also see what has been written in by players in rehearsal. In the latter case, a comparison with Mahler's own score can help with this determination. The score and parts of Schumann I, P.53-4, demonstrate this clearly in several places. <20> In certain passages which have been revised more than once, a comparison of different orchestral parts and the score can help to establish a chronology.
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actually happened, as opposed to a score which may contain Retuschen
which Mahler only contemplated but never executed. However, care must
be exercised in making decisions about those features of a score which
do not appear in the parts or in the case of inconsistencies between
parts, as these can merely indicate that the players did not bother to
write verbal requests into the part, relying successfully or otherwise,
on their memory. Players vary a lot in this respect. Repeats and cuts
usually do not come into this category.

From the amount of wear and tear received by a part we can tell how
much it has been used. This has been especially useful in attempting
to assess the size of the string forces which Mahler used. <21> Of
particular value are those back desk string parts which contain
Retuschen from an earlier period of which no trace remains in the front
desks.

4.5 How Mahler Marked His Scores and Parts

The vast majority of the scores studied here have writing in them only
in Mahler's hand: indeed it would be surprising were it otherwise as he
was the only person who knew his intentions. The consequence of this
is that he often used a special, but consistent, shorthand notation for
his Retuschen. Those means by which Mahler indicated his intentions are
summarised below:

- The omission of notes is often indicated by circles drawn around
  them, and bleibt (= stet) written by the circle indicates that
  Mahler has changed his mind.
clarinet by means of a circle with a horizontal line through it, and the end of such a passage by a cross. <22>

- In early scores Mahler indicates doubling players by the word Verstärkung. <23>

- In later scores Mahler indicates the participation of the doubling players by means of rectangular brackets placed around the notes to be doubled.

- When Mahler employs the second wind player to double the first, rather than the third player, he writes a 2.

- In early scores, when Mahler employed an extra horn pair it was usually assigned to reinforce Fg1/2 and he had therefore only to put brackets around the notes to be reinforced. Later scores have extra brass parts written on empty staves or in the top and bottom margins.

- Sometimes Hr3/4 are indicated by "3.4" written in the bassoon stave.

- Some scores, e.g. Schumann I, P.53, have numbers written near the rehearsal letter to indicate how many bars have elapsed since the previous letter. This is part of the process of marking up the orchestral parts.

4.6 Evidence Used in Dating and Establishing Chronology of Retuschen

None of the evidence described here establishes conclusively on its own a date for Mahler's Retuschen contained in a source. The following
of importance, since this varies from work to work.

4.6.1 Stamps

Many of the scores and parts which Mahler used contain dealers stamps. Seven different stamps have been encountered:

- Rózsavölgyi és Társa / Budapest

- Joh. Aug. Böhme / Hamburg / Musikalienhandlung

- Kaiserl. u. Königl. Hof-Musikalienhandlung / Albert J. Gutmann
  Wien, K. K. Hofopernhaus (surrounding a double eagle in a circle)

- Emil Berté & Cie, Wien

- Musikhaus Alexander Rosé / WIEN, I. Kärntner-Ring 11.

- G. Schirmer successor to / J Schuberth & Co.

- G. Schirmer / 35 Union Sq. N.Y.

Of these, by far the most common are the Hamburg and Budapest stamps.

Mahler also had his own rubber stamps:

- Gustav Mahler / Wien (autograph facsimile)

- Mahler (autograph facsimile)

- GUSTAV MAHLER / WIEN

A more thorough study than is currently available of other manuscripts and scores from Mahler's library would probably assist in establishing whether these stamps were all used during the same time period or not.
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Certain orchestral materials bear the stamps of orchestras, the first three being those of the Vienna Philharmonic:

- PHILHARMONISCHE GESELLSCHAFT

- Philharmonische / Gesellschaft (in a rectangular box with chamfered corners)

- Philharmonische / Gesellschaft (a circular stamp)

- Philharmonic Society of New York (with a lyre)

- New York Philharmonic Society (with dragon's teeth)

4.6.2 Writing Implements

Mahler marked his scores with many different coloured inks and pencils; but there is often no reason for this except that it denotes what writing implement he had available at the time. Some generalizations can be made, for instance that he used ink only at his writing desk and pencil in rehearsals; but the same conclusion could also be reached by looking at the care or haste with which a change has been made. Mahler's early scores are mainly marked up in pencil and because of frequent erasings are difficult to read, as in Coriolan, P.4, Schubert IX, P.47 and Beethoven VI, P.32. The initial markings in later scores have often been copied from earlier versions and when Mahler did this, probably to enable a copyist to prepare orchestral parts, he often used red ink. Beethoven VII, P.34, and Schubert IX, P.48, demonstrate this clearly. Sometimes we can also see where Mahler occupied himself with a certain aspect of the score at one sitting, as in Beethoven II where the clarinet parts have been expanded in several places in the same red ink, or the development section of the first movement of Schumann I,
The score of Schumann I, P.53, is particularly interesting in that it appears to contain earlier marks in pencil which were subsequently inked-in in red; though certain Retuschen, such as the replacement of Vn1 divisi by Vn1 & Vn2 at the beginning of the slow movement, were entered in red ink only, making it possible that Mahler employed them only in New York.

Also interesting is the use of the blue/black pen in Beethoven IX, p.40, which seems to indicate changes which Mahler made at a very late stage of his revision, probably in New York: interesting mainly in the fact that the discovery of late changes establishes that Mahler's Retuschen were not fixed.

In some scores, such as Beethoven II, P.24, the order of the use of the different coloured implements can be deduced from internal evidence, but as Mahler did not deliberately take up a different coloured pencil at each sitting, the deductions are rarely of sufficient value to report as generalisations.

Where a chronology can be clearly established for Mahler's employment of different writing implements on the same page and where it adds significantly to our understanding of his process, this has been noted in the descriptions of the scores below, but this task was not made a prime focus of the study.

4.6.3 Handwriting

Mahler's handwriting did not only evolve gradually, but changed according to the writing implement he was using. Although in later
Kurrent for odd words, or even letters within a word.

Mahler's musical script also varied, but the style of the earlier sources, which have many marks in pencil, e.g. Coriolan, P.4, is quite different from that of a later source which uses thick black ink and other implements, e.g. Manfred, P.51.

4.6.4 Identification of Mahler's Copyists

Mahler often employed copyists to prepare orchestral parts and sometimes for making clean copies of scores. The latter is true in the case of Beethoven's Weihe des Hauses Overture, P.17, and Smetana's Bartered Bride Overture, P.58, and I suspect also that the copy of Beethoven IX, P.41, was made expressly for Mahler.

Many copyists were involved and, as in the case of Mahler's rubber stamps referred to above, more research is needed in other areas to establish who these were. The same copyist prepared the extra brass parts for Beethoven III & VII, though a completely different hand is discernable in the preparation of the extra horn parts for Beethoven V.

The most distinctive, and neatest musical handwriting to be found is that of H.G.Boewig, 2nd violinist and librarian of the New York Philharmonic Orchestra. To Boewig Mahler entrusted the making of the fair copy of the first movement of his own Ninth Symphony which served as the Stichvorlage. Boewig's handwriting is easily identified: it appears in many of the sources and is an important means of establishing Retuschen which Mahler incorporated in performances in New York. His cello part for the finale of Beethoven VII is reproduced as Ex.25.1.
Players' marks include the addition of Retuschen which Mahler decided in rehearsal, and other marks which are useful in assigning a period of use to a set of parts. These include signatures, dates and places, sometimes found at the end of parts, which establish the use of a part at a particular Mahler concert. The use of different languages also helps. Although many of the American players with whom Mahler worked wrote German and French, the evidence of comments in English helps to establish the use of an orchestral part in New York. There are also some comments to be found in Russian, dating from Mahler's concerts in St. Petersburg. Players' timings have been analysed in an attempt to establish tempi.

4.6.6 Mahler's Concert Programmes

In attempting to establish the date of a source, regard was had to the concerts at which Mahler performed the work. This gives us an earliest date and sometimes, as in the case of Schumann IV, P.57, a sole date for Mahler's use of the source.

4.6.7 Size of Sets of Parts

Dating has also been established or confirmed by comparing sources which share similar characteristics. For instance, during this study it emerged that, in Hamburg, Mahler had access to an orchestra which comprised a woodwind and brass complement of 3,2,3,3; 4,3,3,1. He could then use a second horn pair and a third trumpet, piccolo, E-flat clarinet and third bassoon or contrabassoon. He used the E-flat clarinet and piccolo to reinforce the upper woodwind and the third and fourth horns to reinforce the bassoons. The third trumpet was often
Later, in Vienna, Mahler could not only count on having a full set of doubling woodwind players, but also several extra horn and trumpet pairs, as in Beethoven III, P.26, and then the doubling woodwind largely took over the role previously assigned to the E-flat clarinet, and the extra trumpet parts became less anachronistic.

In a similar fashion the knowledge that Mahler’s Viennese sets of parts generally contained string parts in the ratio 9,9,6,5,5, and that the string complement of the New York was 16,14,12,10,8 helped in establishing when a set was first put into commission.

4.7 General Dating of Sources

In attempting to assign dates to the sources used in this study, all the above evidence has been taken into account. In many ways the process depends as much upon familiarity with all the sources as on scientific justification. More detailed information on the probable periods of use by Mahler of individual scores and sets of orchestral parts is given in the chapters on the works concerned; but the main groupings are summarised here.

4.7.1 Scores with Budapest Stamps

Mahler bought a complete set of Beethoven Symphonies I - VIII in Budapest, though the only one which he had the opportunity of conducting there was Beethoven V. Thus it was probably in Hamburg where Mahler first began to use most of these scores. The early score of
and earlier too in Mahler's performance in Budapest.

4.7.2 **Scores with Hamburg Stamps**

The group of scores with Hamburg stamps comprises:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composers</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Stamps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Coriolan Overture</td>
<td>P.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>King Stephan Overture</td>
<td>P.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Weihe des Hauses Overture</td>
<td>P.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>String Quartet</td>
<td>P.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>Symphony IX</td>
<td>P.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Symphony I</td>
<td>P.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Symphony II</td>
<td>P.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Symphony IV</td>
<td>P.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since we know that Mahler performed Coriolan Overture, the Schubert works, and Schumann I during his time in Hamburg it has been assumed that these were the scores used. The scores of the other two Beethoven overtures are bound together with Coriolan and do not have the same extensive markings, thus providing us with no reason to suspect that Mahler performed them in Hamburg. As far as the Schumann symphonies are concerned, they were also probably part of a complete set which Mahler acquired at the same time. The score of Schumann II contains a very small number of Retuschen and was undoubtedly replaced by another score which has since disappeared, whereas those of Schumann I & IV were employed up to the end of Mahler's career.

4.7.3 **Scores and Parts with Viennese Stamps**

In Vienna Mahler re-assessed his Retuschen and purchased new scores of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composers</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Stamps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Coriolan Overture</td>
<td>P.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Leonore II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Leonore III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Weihe des Hauses</td>
<td>P.16, P.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony IX</td>
<td>P.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruckner</td>
<td>Symphony V</td>
<td>P.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>Symphony IX</td>
<td>P.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.1 - Mahler's Performance Materials
As indicated, the scores of Leonore II & III have disappeared. Others, such as Beethoven III, V, VI & VII were probably also purchased in Vienna and have either disappeared (Symphonies III & VI), or contain no stamps (Symphonies V & VII).

Many of Mahler's sets of orchestral parts also date from his time in Vienna:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composers</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Parts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Coriolan Overture</td>
<td>P.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Egmont Overture</td>
<td>P.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Leonore II</td>
<td>P.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Leonore III</td>
<td>P.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Weihe des Hauses Overture</td>
<td>P.18, P.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>String Quartet, Op.95</td>
<td>P.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony III</td>
<td>P.26, P.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony V</td>
<td>P.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony VII</td>
<td>P.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Symphony 40</td>
<td>P.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Symphony 41</td>
<td>P.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>Symphony IX</td>
<td>P.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Manfred Overture</td>
<td>P.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Meistersinger Overture</td>
<td>P.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Symphony I</td>
<td>P.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Symphony IV</td>
<td>P.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smetana</td>
<td>The Bartered Bride Overture</td>
<td>P.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no question that these parts were used in Vienna and for all subsequent performances. Though it cannot be established definitely when most of them were actually prepared, it is my opinion that Mahler used them from the beginning of his association with the Vienna Philharmonic. <24>

4.7.4 Score and Parts with New York Stamps

In New York Mahler acquired a score of Smetana's Bartered Bride Overture, P.58, and sets of parts of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composers</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Parts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruckner</td>
<td>Symphony IV</td>
<td>P.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Symphony I</td>
<td>P.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Symphony IV</td>
<td>P.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smetana</td>
<td>The Bartered Bride Overture</td>
<td>P.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mahler's Retuschen were entered into the score and parts of the Smetana
opera, and Mahler's changes in this work probably date back to his experience with it in the Vienna and New York opera houses. The Bruckner and Schumann Symphonies were prepared afresh, although in the case of Schumann Mahler was still using scores which he had bought in Hamburg.
5.1 Mahler's Beethoven Performances

The odd numbered Beethoven Symphonies formed the backbone of Mahler's repertoire. Though he does not seem to have been concerned to conduct all of the Beethoven Symphonies, and certainly not in a complete chronologically ordered cycle, only his own works and those of Wagner received more concert performances by Mahler than certain Beethoven scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Performance</th>
<th>Number of Performances</th>
<th>Beethoven Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Overture, Leonore III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Overture, Coriolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Symphony V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Symphony VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Symphony VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Symphony III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Symphony IX &lt;1&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These Beethoven performances straddle Mahler's entire career.

Mahler's first performance of a Beethoven symphony was of the Ninth, in February 1886. In Budapest he had the opportunity of conducting the Fifth Symphony for the first time in 1890, and in Hamburg in 1892 he gave his first performance of the Eroica. Between 1892 and 1897, Mahler also conducted several performances of the Fifth, Sixth, Seventh and Ninth Symphonies in Hamburg, often combining one with a performance of
By the time Mahler was conductor of the Vienna Philharmonic, his interpretations of Beethoven were well grounded in experience and he conducted all the Symphonies, plus several Overtures and Concertos and the String Quartet, Op.95, at Philharmonic concerts between 1897 and 1900.

In New York, during the 1909 to 1910 season, Mahler conducted five Friday afternoon concerts devoted entirely to Beethoven:

19 Nov 1909  Symphony II
             Leonore III Overture
             Fidelio Overture
             Leonore I Overture
             Leonore II Overture

31 Dec 1909  Egmont Overture
             Coriolan Overture
             Violin Concerto
             Symphony IV

14 Jan 1910  Symphony VI
             Symphony V

4 Mar 1910   Namensfeier Overture
             Piano Concerto IV
             Symphony VII

1 Apr 1910   Choral Fantasia
             Symphony IX

Apart from this cycle, Mahler gave only symphonies 3,5,6,7 and 9 in New York. Although the concert of 13 December 1910 was originally advertised as offering Symphony VIII, in the event the Pastoral was substituted, and Mahler never conducted Beethoven I or VIII in America.

Many witnesses have testified to Mahler's gifts as a Beethoven interpreter. The best qualified, Otto Klemperer, stated in an interview given in 1929:

"As my strongest musical impression I have to record after all my first hearing of a Beethoven Symphony conducted by Gustav Mahler. And this despite the fact that as a conductor I would probably do it differently today and
Klemperer had heard Mahler conduct Beethoven VII in Prague in May 1908 and much later stated:

"It was phenomenal. For me there was only one thought - to give up this profession, if one couldn't conduct like that.

"People are always telling me, 'Oh, I heard the Seventh Symphony conducted by so-and-so and it was wonderful.' I say, 'You must not tell me such things. I have heard the same symphony conducted by Mahler and I know.'..." <4>

5.2 An Examination of Previous Studies

There have been several brief studies of Mahler's Beethoven Retuschen. One, by Egon Wellesz, in his book Die neue Instrumentation, deals with the Ninth Symphony and his comments are discussed here in Ch.26.4.2. Igor Markevitch describes some of Mahler's Retuschen in his Encyclopaedic Edition of the Beethoven Symphonies. <5> He considers some worthy of adoption, but on the grounds of sonority and thematic integrity argues strongly against others. <6>

The most substantial essay is by Ernst Hilmar, Director of the Music Section of the Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, where many of Mahler's scores have been placed. <7> Hilmar's article concerns itself mainly with general aspects of Mahler's Retuschen and descriptions of some of the sources. He points out the greater number of strings available to Mahler than to Beethoven, citing as evidence the size of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra in 1898 <8> and discussing Mahler's reduction of strings in the first movement of the Seventh Symphony <9> as one of his means of redressing the balance of wind and strings and of extending the dynamic range.
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woodwind and horns; and the E-flat clarinet is briefly mentioned. Mahler's use of dynamics for both vertical and horizontal differentiation is mentioned, and his extension of dynamic nuances in solo passages. Hilmar is of the opinion that the grounds for many of Mahler's changes are impossible to explain today, since they originated from specific acoustic problems or had to do with the quality of the orchestra. Among examples given of Mahler's excessively subjective interpretation Hilmar quotes the changing of trumpet dynamics in b.34-40 of VII/1 and the brass dynamics at the beginning of V/4. These seem, however, to me to be normal changes, instituted only to keep the brass from over-powering the rest of the orchestra.

The essay is an excellent brief, though intense, introduction to the subject and includes, in very good photographic reproductions, eleven pages from Mahler's scores and parts. Because of its brevity, however, it does tend to be a tour of the more sensational aspects of Mahler's Beethoven Retuschen which only hints at the real problems inherent in bringing the works themselves to performance.

An article by Volker Kalisch <10> describes pages 74 and 75 of P.34 which comprise bars 101-137 of the Finale of Beethoven VII. The disadvantage of this study which is critical of Mahler's work is that it only deals with 36 bars and Kalisch is unable to discuss them in the context of either the whole symphony or Mahler's Beethoven Retuschen generally. Kalisch concludes with the unhelpful remark that Mahler's instrumental Retuschen in Beethoven's symphonies reveal the criteria according to which Mahler instrumented his own works.
5.3 The Sources

5.3.1 Scores and Orchestral Materials of the Symphonies

There is a complete matching set of scores of the first eight symphonies which was used extensively by Mahler. The title page of each symphony contains the elaborate stamp of Rózsavölgyi és Társa, Budapest and these scores are accordingly referred to here as the Budapest scores. (However, it must be remembered that, with the exception of the Fifth and Ninth, Mahler did not actually conduct any Beethoven symphonies before his Hamburg period.) There are four volumes, each containing two symphonies. The two volumes comprising the first four symphonies are in the library of the University of Southampton, and the remaining two volumes are in the U.E. Archive in Vienna. The early score of the Ninth Symphony, P.39, does not have a Budapest stamp on it and may have been bought in Prague when Mahler conducted the work for the first time.

Mahler acquired further scores of Symphonies V, VII and IX and these are in the U.E. Archive. He must also have had another score of the Eroica and probably of the Pastoral, but these are now missing. He may have possessed additional scores of Symphonies I, II and IV; though given the nature of his Retuschen in these works the Budapest scores of these three may have served him well enough.

The following are the currently known primary sources of information about Mahler's Retuschen in Beethoven symphonies:

Symphony I: There are no marks in the only known score, P.23.
probably the basis of his interpretation in Vienna and New York. Mahler probably owned a set of parts, or at least two heavily edited clarinet parts.

**Symphony III:** The *Budapest* score, P.25, is not very copiously marked and it may be that the later score, or scores, which are at present unknown, will show that Mahler’s Hamburg Retuschen were more extensive than those in P.25. The source of information about Mahler’s Vienna and New York Retuschen is his orchestral material.

**Symphony IV:** This is the least problematical Beethoven symphony from the point of view of its instrumentation and Mahler’s *Budapest* score probably represents what he did. The small number of Retuschen are described in Appendix 6.

**Symphony V:** Uniquely, the *Budapest* score, P.29, of this work could have been used in Budapest. Information about performances from Mahler’s time in Vienna and New York comes from the later score, P.30, and the set of parts, P.31.

**Symphony VI:** Only the *Budapest* score is known. It is in many places difficult to decipher, although presumably Mahler would have had no trouble in this and it could therefore have served him in Hamburg in 1894 and throughout his career. To accommodate his Retuschen, Mahler must have had a set of parts; but this set has disappeared.

**Symphony VII:** Apart from the *Budapest* score, which gives evidence of having been used in Hamburg, we have a set of parts and a score, P.34/5, which were used by Mahler probably from the time of his first Viennese performance onwards. A further set of score and parts were made from P.34/5, and Mahler appears to have used these in Prague in

5.3.1 - Mahler and Beethoven
Symphony VIII: The Budapest score is all that is known. There are few Retuschen and these are catalogued in Appendix 8.

Symphony IX: For information about Mahler's Retuschen in the Ninth Symphony we have a score, P.39, that may have been bought in Prague and was probably used in Hamburg. P.40 appears to be the basis for his Viennese Retuschen and was also used in New York. A copyist's score, P.41, with some dubious variants and some errors was made from P.40 and appears to contain a few entries by Mahler himself. Unfortunately the orchestral materials are not to hand. They would enable us to clarify a few points which are obscure in P.40. They were almost certainly used by Schoenberg in a concert in which he conducted this work with Mahler's Retuschen in Vienna on 26 April 1915 <11> and may also have been used later by Zemlinsky in Prague.

5.3.2 Scores and Orchestral Materials of the Overtures

In the library of the University of Southampton is a volume of Beethoven overtures which was originally three volumes, each one bearing the stamp of the Hamburg music dealer Böhme. Volume I comprised the three Leonore Overtures, Volume II Fidelio, Prometheus, Coriolan and Egmont, and Volume III Die Ruinen von Athen, Namensfeier, König Stephan and Die Weihe des Hauses, of which only Coriolan, P.4, König Stephan, P.12, and Die Weihe des Hauses, P.15, have any marks in them. Further scores exist of Coriolan, Egmont and Die Weihe des Hauses. The following are the currently known sources of information about Mahler's Retuschen in Beethoven overtures:

Coriolan: Mahler's Hamburg Retuschen are in P.4. His later version, stemming from his time in Vienna, are found in P.5. A set of string
time. A score and parts exist in Prague which appear to have been made from P.5. Although this may have some of Mahler's blue pencil marks, no opportunity was found to check any divergences in detail and this source has not been taken into account in the present study.

Egmont: There are two scores with marks in them in Mahler's hand. The more far-reaching is in the Mengelberg Archive. However, the basic information on Mahler's Retuschen in the present study comes from the set of parts in the U.E. Archive.

King Stephan: The only source of information about Mahler's Retuschen in this work is the score mentioned above. Mahler only performed this overture once and the markings in P.12 are so few that they have been described only in Appendix 5.

Leonore II: I have found no score of this overture, only a set of parts which gives a full picture of Mahler's Retuschen.

Leonore III: No score has been found of this overture, but the set of parts which Mahler also used for his performances of Fidelio in the opera house gives copious information about his performance practice.

Zur Weihe des Hauses: There are three scores of this work and a set of parts. The first score, P.15, contains only a small number of marks. The third score, P.17, agrees with the parts and contains the hand of a copyist in addition to that of Mahler. I suspect the Retuschen were mainly carried over from P.16, which I have not seen.
Mahler's response to criticism of his Ninth Symphony Retuschen was printed and distributed at his concert on 22 Feb 1900 and it may be taken as his general viewpoint on the question. He also expressed himself informally to Natalie Bauer-Lechner in 1899 during a period of preparation for a performance of the Fifth Symphony with the Vienna Philharmonic:

Beethoven's First, Second and Fourth Symphonies can still be performed by modern orchestras and conductors. All the rest, however, are quite beyond their powers. Only Richard Wagner (who can incidentally be called the discoverer of all Beethoven's symphonies) and in recent times I myself have done these works justice. And even I can manage it only by terrorizing the players; by forcing each individual to transcend his little self and rise above his own powers.

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

There are at least sixteen spots in the Beethoven Symphonies known to all experienced conductors as places where it is difficult to make the instrumentation sound well:

**Symphony III, 1, 655-62:** After six notes Tr1/2 abandon the main theme and it disappears. According to Weingartner, Bülow already corrected this. <14>

**Symphony V, 2, 114-20:** The theme is in the bass and is easily
Symphony V, 2, 185-90: The canon between Vn1/2 and the woodwind is easily obscured by the brass.

Symphony V, 4, 431-2, 453-62: The moving parts are easily drowned by the harmony.

Symphony VI, 3, 168 et seq: The seventh in Cll is weak and Fl1 cannot easily be heard.

Symphony VII, 1, 34-41: The canon between Vn1/2 and Ww is easily obscured by Br.

Symphony VII, 4, 26-7: Hr1/2 are forced to abandon the melody and easily overpower the woodwind.

Symphony VII, 4, 373-87: The low-lying viola contributions are easily drowned by the crescendo in the wind.

Symphony VIII, 1, 190-7: The theme, in Fg1/2, Vc & Cb, is easily submerged by the weight of the rest of the orchestra.

Symphony IX, 1, 138-44: Beethoven's woodwind parts are unclear and liable to be drowned by the brass and strings.

Symphony IX, 1, 301-38: Taking Beethoven's dynamic nuances at face value is a sure recipe for a chaotic rendering.

Symphony IX, 1, 483-91: The woodwind are liable to become inaudible.

Symphony IX, 2, 93-108: Beethoven's scoring is notorious for enabling the strings and Hr1-4 to gain the upper hand at the expense of the theme.

Symphony IX, 4, 0-7 et seq: Tr1/2 are severely constrained by the...
Symphony IX, 4, 187-98: Beethoven's scoring leaves no opportunity for the main part to be heard.

Symphony IX, 4, 851 et seq: Cymbals and bass drum need restraint.

In the Overtures there are also a few genuinely problematic places:

Egmont, 259 et seq: The harmony is defective in the horns.

Weihe des Hauses, 41-52: The bassoon parts are usually inaudible.

Leonore II, 36, 38, 443-6: The wind can easily overpower the strings.

Leonore II, 348-51: The brass and strings easily overpower the woodwind.

Leonore III, 192 et seq: The harmony can overpower the melody.

Leonore III, 328: F1 and Fg can be covered by St.

Leonore III, 534-7: The woodwind and brass can overpower the strings.

All of these problems are dealt with by Mahler and his solutions are generally good; though some depart so radically from Beethoven's style as to be unacceptable. These include b.373-87 in the finale of Symphony VII where Mahler completely destroys Beethoven's instrumental pattern, and the addition of trombone and tuba in the Ninth Symphony, in b.315 etc. of the first movement, and at the beginning of the finale.

It is easy to claim that Mahler goes too far in his Beethoven Retuschen, but one justification for his changes in spots which already sound good in the original is that had he made changes solely in those places where drastic measures are obligatory, his Retuschen would
There is a great deal of significance in the fact that most of the contemporary complaints against Mahler's Retuschen stemmed from the murmurings of the orchestral players which were communicated to the critics who in turn alerted the public. <15> For many of them are so well done as to be inaudible to all but those musicians intimately familiar with the instrumentation of the works. Of course, the addition of trumpets at b.93 in the Scherzo of the Ninth Symphony is not difficult to detect; but this Retusche was not confined to Mahler's performances. On the other hand, most of the Beethoven Retuschen, though involving much ink and pencil on the written page, are far more subtle, and it is doubtful whether even experienced musicians would be aware of Mahler's changes, for instance in b.34 and b.41 of Beethoven VII/1, or b.138-44 in Beethoven IX/1, and many other places. Yet it is in such and similar cases that Mahler legitimately transforms chaos into order and justifies his claim "not to have sacrificed or allowed to be submerged in a confused bustle of sound, the least of the Master's wishes." <16>

5.5 The Retuschen of Other Conductors

After Wagner, the classic publication on Retuschen in Beethoven Symphonies is Weingartner's well-known Beethoven Ratschläge. <17> It is a conservative approach which differs from Mahler in almost every particular, but which is certainly not free from subjective features, particularly in the advice given about the employment of supplementary hairpins.

We do not know what Mahler thought of Weingartner's Ratschläge or even
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whether he read it; but it Pfohl describes his reaction to his earlier pamphlet on conducting. <18> The highly polemical essay concerns itself mainly with a description of Bülow's conducting career, leading to a discussion of his later style and waywardness, and a description of how Wagner's advice in his essays on conducting had been taken to excess by the younger generation of conductors. Several instances of this are given but, except for his hyperactive podium style, none which could be unequivocally ascribed to Mahler. Pfohl reports:

"...In September 1896, Weingartner's book had hardly appeared than Mahler broke into my studio with the violence and tumult of a storm. He ran about the room forwards and backwards like an irritated tiger in a cage. He escaped it, to avail himself of the stool offered him, stamped, and screamed: 'Have you read Weingartner's book yet? What a 4th former (Quartaner), what a cretin (Trottel)!..." <19>

The impetus for both Weingartner's and Mahler's Retuschen in the Symphonies came from Wagner, through Bülow; and Wagner's contributions are discussed here in the relevant places. Although not all Bülow's Beethoven Retuschen are known, it is clear, and not only from Weingartner's diatribe, that in his later years he often took a more arbitrary position than Mahler. For instance, according to Strauss he "solved" the above mentioned problem in Symphony VIII by introducing the timpani in unison with the double basses. <20> Weingartner also alludes to this, without mentioning Bülow. <21> According to Weingartner, in b.470 of the Trio of the Ninth Symphony, Bülow changed the C of Fg2 to a B natural. <22> Several relevant Bülow Retuschen in Symphony IX are reported by Walter Damrosch and these are given in Appendix 9.

Among those conductors who have employed Mahler's Beethoven Retuschen Schoenberg and Zemlinsky have to be named first: they performed the Ninth Symphony with all Mahler's Retuschen. In modern times William Steinberg also used Mahler's score and the result can be heard on a
In the same way that Mahler himself took an independent attitude towards Wagner's and Bülow's Retuschen, so also those professional conductors who may legitimately be called his "disciples" declined to adopt Mahler's Beethoven Retuschen wholesale. Klemperer even found that:

Wagner's retouchings of Beethoven's Ninth sometimes go too far, especially in the scherzo where the second theme is scored for woodwind only and he added horns. Through them the whole movement takes on a sensuous character it doesn't really have. And Mahler went further. He made a number of retouchings in the Beethoven Symphonies and some of them are very bold. I've seen his score of the Ninth, though I've never performed it... Some of those in the Seventh Symphony appear to me to be absolutely right. Others, in the Ninth Symphony for instance, are, I believe, wrong.

As Heyworth notes, Klemperer's attitude to Beethoven Retuschen varied considerably in the course of his career, though he probably employed less than any conductor of his calibre and generation:

"...I don't do as much as Mahler did, and then only where I find it absolutely necessary. But in some passages, it is; if only because, for instance, there were in Beethoven's day no valves in horns and trumpets. Everything had to be played on a natural brass instrument which must have sounded terrible..." 

Klemperer continues by mentioning two Retuschen which are characteristic of Mahler:

"...Where there is a melody or melodic theme in the first violins which I want to bring out, I also give it to the second violins, and the second violin parts I give to some of the violas, so that it is still there. <27> In the Eighth Symphony, in the first movement, there is a passage on the cellos and the basses, where all the other instruments have only harmony, and I add four horns, and that sounds very well. <28>

In his two recordings, Walter can be heard to use Mahler's Retusche in b.439-53 of the first movement of the Fifth Symphony; <29> but in a rehearsal of the Ninth Symphony Scherzo recorded in 1959 he can be
heard to explain that though he used to add the horns in the second theme he no longer does so. <30>
Chapter 6

Mahler and Schumann

6.1 Mahler's Schumann Retuschen as a Special Case

The case of Mahler's Retuschen in the works of Robert Schumann differs from that of his Beethoven Retuschen in several ways. Firstly, Schumann's passionate lyrical style is closer to Mahler the composer and thus Mahler's identification with Schumann is closer than with Beethoven. Secondly, the nature of Schumann's writing for orchestra means that it needs different remedies to make it sound according to Mahler's ideal. Thirdly, although most articles on Mahler's Retuschen have dealt with his Schumann Retuschen to the almost complete exclusion of consideration of other composers, this gives a misleading impression of their significance since Mahler did not actually conduct Schumann's orchestral works very much, when compared with the number of his Beethoven performances.

For these three reason Mahler's Schumann Retuschen must be viewed as a special case.

6.2 Mahler and Schumann as Composers

It has often been pointed out that Mahler's compositional style is rooted in the works of Beethoven, Schubert, Weber, Wagner, Liszt,
between Mahler and Schumann as composers, the nature of which will be sketched here since it throws light on Mahler's approach to the performance of Schumann's orchestral works. This kinship is of a general nature, since Schumann's approach to form was more conditioned by the outward formats of the classical style, whereas Mahler created his organic structures from first principles, rather than making them fit pre-existing moulds.

As demonstrated by the lyrical quality of their thematic material, in their orchestral works both composers were heavily influenced by Lieder. Mahler undoubtedly knew many of Schumann's songs and even, probably unconsciously, copied the ending of the ninth of the Dichterliebe, *Das ist ein Flöten und Geigen*, when he wrote a similar accompaniment to his *Des Antonius von Padua Fischpredigt*. A comparison of the two endings shows an almost direct quote by Mahler in the last five bars. Other songs by Mahler also employ similar textures to those of Schumann.

Mahler developed Schumann's use of chorales in the latter's Second and Third Symphonies, although the influence of Bruckner should be considered stronger in this respect. From Schumann Mahler also took the habit of incorporating more than one Trio into his Scherzi. The cadenza of the finale of Schumann I, while clearly itself influenced by passages in Beethoven IV, V and VI, points the way to Mahler's large scale cadenza in b.448-471 of the finale of his own Second Symphony.

Generally speaking, the most important facet of Schumann's style which Mahler shared was the intense passion and impulsiveness of many of their themes. This passion undoubtedly informed Mahler's own performances of Schumann's music. The archetype in Mahler for this
kind of theme is the second subject of his Sixth Symphony, b.76-90; and the same movement also contains a striking similarity with Manfred Overture when, during the development sections of both works, a peaceful passage is interrupted by thematic material based on similar motif shapes. These passages are Mahler VI, b.250, and Manfred Overture, b.131. It would not be too far-fetched to suggest that it was this kinship which impelled Mahler to intensify the dynamics of Schumann's theme and bring it in line with his own. <1>

Norman Del Mar has drawn attention to the similarity between b.34-36 of the first movement of Mahler VI and b.61-3 of Manfred Overture. <2>

Also in Manfred, b.90-3, we find Mahler rescoring Schumann to give the page the look and sound of the second movement of his own Fifth Symphony, b.325-9. See Ex.30.5.

The opening of Schumann's first symphony might almost have been written by Mahler had he been born 40 years earlier. The expressive feeling of the first page is akin to that of the introduction of another nature symphony - Mahler III. Comparing the two works we find fanfares at the start and then subsequently a great sense of strain which is not easy to bring off in performance in either work.

Schumann III contains a large number of stylistic suggestions for the later composer and it is significant that, according to Ernst Decsey, Mahler regarded it as Schumann's greatest work. <3> The five movement structure employed by Schumann is not entirely original, but the use in the finale of the fourth movement's theme is, and is a procedure copied by Mahler in his Fifth Symphony. The second movement of Schumann's symphony with its march-like material is prophetic of Mahler VII/2. In the finale of Schumann's symphony, apart from the trumpet fanfares which are also a feature of Mahler's style, there are two passages
129-34 may be compared with many passages of unison wind writing in Mahler's works such as Symphony V/5, b.318-28. The apotheosis of Schumann's finale, beginning in b.255, finds an intensification in the finale of Mahler I, b.631. <4>

Such echoes of Schumann's style in Mahler's own compositions suggest that in performance he was able to identify strongly with Schumann's aims, and justify many of the changes which he made to Schumann's scoring, which often go beyond the problem of bringing light into the texture to give Mahler's own view of Schumann's original intentions.

6.3 The Significance of Mahler's Schumann Retuschen

It cannot be said that Mahler performed Schumann's orchestral works as repertoire pieces, since he only gave a few performances of each work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PERFORMANCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symphony I</td>
<td>4 - between 1895 and 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony II</td>
<td>2 - both in October 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony III</td>
<td>2 - both in January 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony IV</td>
<td>5 - of which three in February 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manfred Ov</td>
<td>5 - of which three in October 1910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons with his performances of the Beethoven symphonies are revealing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PERFORMANCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symphony III</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony V</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony VI</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony VII</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony IX</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of Schumann II & III, Mahler must have worked on them during the summer of 1910 at a time when he was burdened with the
Symphony, and the preparation of the premiere of his Eighth Symphony. Assuming that the copyists' scores of Schumann II & III are totally authentic, there are certain features of their revision which are uncharacteristic of Mahler and he may well have had second thoughts about them had he lived to perform them in later seasons. In particular, the first movement of Symphony III could still stand thinning out: even with Mahler's Retuschen the lack of variety of texture and unremitting reinforcement of wind and strings prevent the movement from making its proper impact. The cuts and changes of harmony in the finale of Symphony II are also strange in the context of what we know of Mahler's other Retuschen.

The scores and orchestral parts of Schumann I & IV and the Manfred Overture demonstrate that Mahler took a long term interest in presenting them to best effect, and it may be that such will be seen to be the case with Schumann II & III when Mahler's original scores and materials come to light. But until they do, the evidence of Mahler's Retuschen in the other Schumann scores and the Beethoven and Schubert works must be admitted to be more complete and more impressive.

6.4 An Examination of Previous Studies

When nearly all scholars, including Mahler specialists, refer to Mahler's Schumann Retuschen, their knowledge of them has been gleaned from three source documents. These are the writings of Erwin Stein, Mosco Carner and Egon Wellesz. An exception to this rule is Brian Schlotel.
Stein's article, *Mahlers Instrumentations-Retuschen*, was published in German in 1927, <6> and an English translation appeared in 1953. <7>

Stein's remarks are based on seeing original sources in the U.E. Archive shortly after they were sent there in June 1927 by Alma Mahler. He claims that

Mahler's sole motive was his respect for the music concerned. His modifications were intended, not to produce some special sonorities, 'original' and out of style, but simply to clarify what, otherwise, would have remained obscure. It was not a question, then, of Mahler's personal artistic interpretation, but purely a matter of fact and technique.

This might well be questioned in terms of the far-reaching revisions of Beethoven VII and IX and Schubert IX; but Stein confines his investigation to the Mahler's Retuschen in the Schumann symphonies, referring to selected passages from Schumann I, II & III. <8> By implication, he finds these revisions to be the most valuable of the collection and concludes that:

Mahler's re-scoreings do not represent individual interpretations of the works in question, but constitute their objective restoration. A congenial musician who happened to know the orchestra better than Schumann fully realized the master's intentions - which had been clear from, but not in, the original scores.

Considering its length, Stein's is an excellent account which was obviously intended to appeal to conductors and encourage rental of the U.E. material.

6.4.2 Egon Wellesz

After introducing and discussing Mahler's Retuschen in Beethoven IX as an example of the sound ideal of the period between 1900 and 1920, Egon Wellesz discusses Mahler's Schumann III Retuschen in *Die neue*
is good but limited to a few points. He describes the removal of the wind from the opening eight bars of the finale as:

in my opinion the introduction of an effect, which appears to be based more on Mahler's nature than Schumann's, and which in any case is more than the restoration of clarity in the instrumentation. \(<10>\)

6.4.3 Mosco Carner

In his article *Mahler's Re-scoring of the Schumann Symphonies* Carner, working from U.E. copyists' scores, restricts himself to a consideration of the symphonies and classifies Mahler's changes under seven headings. \(<11>\) The examples are well chosen from all four symphonies and cover the material well. Unlike Stein, Carner comments on the subjective nature of some of Mahler's changes, particularly his over intensification of dynamics. However, Carner accepts as *perfectly reasonable* Mahler's addition of the horn motif in the second Trio of Symphony II.

Whereas Stein clearly considers that the Mahler revisions should be used in preference to Schumann's originals, Carner merely suggests occasional performances in Mahler's revision.

6.4.4 Brian Schlotel

Schlotel, in his essay *Robert Schumann: The Orchestral Music*, conducts his own independent investigation of the UE copyists' scores, and although he expresses surprise that Mahler did not always remove some of the doublings in the Fourth Symphony he concludes that Mahler's Retuschen are generally beneficial. \(<12>\)
The main difference between Schumann's orchestral writing in his Symphonies and that of, say, Beethoven lies in its fundamental lack of clarity and variety in the textures. Apart from the demonstrable fact that Beethoven knew how to write for natural brass and timpani and Schumann did not, much of the thickness is believed to be due to the fact that Schumann himself was a poor conductor. Apparently the bad experiences which he had in conducting his own works caused him to double all the voices as much as possible in a misguided attempt to guard against "accidents" in performance. The problem is at its most acute in Symphony III and particularly in the strenuous first movement.

Because of the greater fundamental clarity and variety inherent in the originals, Mahler's Beethoven Retuschen are, even in the Ninth Symphony, rarely such as to be immediately perceptible to non-specialists, though on paper they look more audible than they are. His Schumann Retuschen, on the other hand, often make fundamental changes to the sound of the orchestra which transform the obscure into the cogent, and fully justify Stein's comments quoted above.

In line with the current climate of musicological thinking with regard to "authenticity", Schumann's Symphonies are today most often given in the composer's unretouched scoring. With great artists such as Karajan and the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra this can be an entirely successful venture: but with a lesser ensemble, unable to effect the re-balancing of parts required on almost every page, or a conductor without total mastery over the orchestra or without the sensitivity of ear and knowledge of the demands of Schumann's structures, the attempt is doomed to failure at some point or other. Such a sensitive ear,
Of the many examples discussed in later sections, the following should be pointed out as being of prime importance in any consideration of Mahler's deliverance of Schumann's music from obscurity:

**Symphony I**

1st mvt: The contours of the fundamental motif of the first subject (b.39-40) are often blurred by Schumann's careless instrumentation. Mahler rectifies this in b.63-66, b.166-73 and b.209-13.

1st mvt: The bringing into relief of the main motif in b.281-9.

4th mvt: The remodelling of the timpani part in b.81-96.

**Symphony II**

1st mvt: The thinning out of the brass in the opening bars.

2nd mvt: The thinning out of the textures of b.90-7, b.217-33, b.362-end.

4th mvt: the removal of Tr1/2 & Pk in b.324-51.

**Symphony III**

1st mvt: The recasting of b.62-70, b.273-80, b.403-10 and b.539-43.

4th mvt: The timpani low E-flat in b.50-end.

5th mvt: The recasting of b.138-41.

5th mvt: The revised brass parts of b.315-20.

**Symphony IV**

1st mvt: The remodelling of the timpani in b.345-8.

4th mvt: The completion of the string chord in b.207.

4th mvt: The changes of scoring from b.211-end.

**Manfred Overture**

The supplementary dynamics of b.26-31, b.44-9 and b.197-9.
The clarification of the woodwind parts in b.25, b.38 and b.207.

Among those changes which may be described as welcome but arguably unnecessary are the substitution of *pizzicato* for *arco* in the second and third movements of Schumann III, and the majority of Mahler’s changes to Manfred Overture. Regrettable are the cuts and changes of harmony in the finale of Schumann II, the trumpet at b.411 of the first movement of Symphony III, and the cymbal with which Mahler opened Manfred Overture.

6.6 The Retuschen of Other Conductors

What is strange about the investigations of all the previously mentioned writers is that they give no indication that many of Mahler’s changes are neither unusual for the time, nor original. The best current source for information on the practice of other conductors which corrects this impression is the thesis of Asher George Zlotnik. Zlotnik’s thesis contains the result of enquiries made of living conductors regarding their attitude to retouching in Schumann and discusses examples of changes made by many conductors since the time of Schumann, including Mahler. As an appendix he includes a translation of Weingartner’s *Ratschläge*.

The main findings of Zlotnik’s thesis are that Mahler was not alone in his attempt to revise the scoring of Schumann, nor was he by any means the one who took the most liberties in doing this. For this we have to look at the total rewriting of the Symphony III by Frederick Stock who added piccolo, cor anglais, two extra trumpets, tuba, cymbals, bass
changes in the actual notes. According to Zlotnik, Glazounov also produced a revised version of Symphony III, but this has disappeared.

Extracts from several scores are reproduced, among them Niels Gade's writing out of the pauses at the end of the Scherzo of the D-minor Symphony and Bruno Walter's scores which are difficult to read due to his messy writing, but which show an approach independent of Mahler's detailed changes. The first page of Toscanini's score of the E-flat Symphony has so many points in common with it that it was undoubtedly influenced by a study of Mahler's version. Fritz Busch's score of the d-minor Symphony shows an independent but punctilious approach and incorporates material from Schumann's original version.

According to Boult, Nikisch did not make many changes, and information has not been found relating to any changes which Bülow might have made. Weingartner's published modifications, which are less extensive than Mahler's, have been employed by many conductors including Szell. Zlotnik's thesis does not go very far into detail beyond listing changes of certain conductors and a comparative and evolitional study of the musical approaches of major conductors to Schumann is still needed.

One conductor who follows many of Mahler's modifications in the only Schumann symphony which he conducts is Giulini. He has recorded the E-flat Symphony twice with these modifications, although less are to be heard in the second version which also contains a few of his own contributions. <16>
Chapter 7

Mahler's Editing of String Parts

7.1 The Size of the String Complement

It has often been assumed that Mahler's heavy editing of wind parts and the doubling forces which he employed were due to his orchestras having extra large numbers of strings. This has been inferred from the general tendency of the period towards composing for large orchestras which reached a peak in Mahler's Eighth Symphony, the so-called Symphony of a Thousand, which was first performed by a string complement of 24,20,16,14,10. <1>

Rarely in fact do composers specify the size of the string sections required for their works. Berlioz was among this select group, asking for a string complement of at least 15,15,10,11,9 in the score of his Symphonie fantastique. <2> The Peters Edition score of Wagner's Die Walküre contains the specification of 16,16,12,12,8, and this is also the complement specified in the score of Strauss' Till Eulenspiegel. The largest complement listed in a score is that in the Berlioz Grande Messe des Morts of 25,25,20,20,18, closely followed by the 20,20,16,16,12 demanded by Schoenberg for his Gurrelieder.

The difference in volume between 16 and 20 violins is small, since the laws of Physics dictate that to double the power of a section comprised of equally strong instruments the number of instruments must be
16. However, as the resultant increase in volume is a mere 3 decibels, any difference between 16 and 20 violins is a matter of tone colour.

The principle of Werktreue would require us to determine the size of the sections envisioned by Beethoven, Schubert and Schumann; but due to the non-ideal circumstances under which those composers worked any attempt at doing this rapidly loses scientific validity. A determination according to what sounds well can only be made on the basis of a given acoustic, as Mahler stated in justifying his intention of employing 20 violins for his performance of Beethoven's Op.95 quartet in the Großer Musikvereinsaal. <3>

The following may be taken as representative of the extant sets of string parts which Mahler used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF</th>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>NO. IN SET</th>
<th>NO. MOST USED</th>
<th>STAMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.11</td>
<td>Egmont</td>
<td>10,9,7,6,5</td>
<td>8,8,6,5,5</td>
<td>GM/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.13</td>
<td>Leonore II</td>
<td>9,8,6,6,4</td>
<td>9,8,6,6,4</td>
<td>GM/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.14</td>
<td>Leonore III</td>
<td>9,9,6,5,5</td>
<td>9,9,6,5,5</td>
<td>GM/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.18</td>
<td>Weihe des Hauses</td>
<td>9,9,7,6,6</td>
<td>8,7,4,5,4</td>
<td>GM/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.22</td>
<td>Beethoven Op95</td>
<td>9,9,6,5,5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.26</td>
<td>Beethoven III</td>
<td>9,9,7,5,5</td>
<td>8,8,6,4,4</td>
<td>GM/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.31</td>
<td>Beethoven V</td>
<td>9,9,6,6,5</td>
<td>8,8,6,6,4</td>
<td>GM/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.35</td>
<td>Beethoven VII</td>
<td>9,9,6,5,5</td>
<td>9,9,6,5,5</td>
<td>GM/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.42</td>
<td>Bruckner IV</td>
<td>8,7,5,5,4</td>
<td>8,7,5,5,4</td>
<td>NYPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.44</td>
<td>Mozart K.550</td>
<td>9,9,6,5,5</td>
<td>9,9,6,5,5</td>
<td>GM/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.45</td>
<td>Mozart K.551</td>
<td>9,8,6,5,4</td>
<td>9,8,6,5,4</td>
<td>GM/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.49</td>
<td>Schubert IX</td>
<td>9,9,6,5,5</td>
<td>9,9,6,5,5</td>
<td>GM/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.52</td>
<td>Manfred Ov</td>
<td>9,8,6,5,5</td>
<td>9,8,6,5,5</td>
<td>GM/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.54</td>
<td>Schumann I</td>
<td>9,8,7,6,5</td>
<td>8,8,7,6,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.57</td>
<td>Schumann IV</td>
<td>8,7,6,5,4</td>
<td>8,7,6,5,4</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From those parts which were only used with the New York Philharmonic Orchestra, P.42 and P.57, we can establish an intended size of string sections of 16,14,12,10,8, which represents the normal size and proportions for a present day large orchestra. From programme listings it can be established that the New York Philharmonic Orchestra string sections comprised 16,14,10,10,8 during the 1909-10 season, and
The size of the string complement had already been reduced by Mahler at the beginning of his first season with the orchestra. The *New York Times* reported that:

There has been a diminution in the number of the stringed instruments, a change in the proportion; the greatest reduction has been in the double basses and there are now only eight instead of the fourteen that for years stood in a half circle behind the other players. The result is a loss of the preponderantly string tone, the thick and solid quality that was one of the characteristic features of the Philharmonic's playing. The general effect is now more brilliant; and the change will not please some. <5>

The reasons for this were probably in part a reflection on the poor quality of the double bass players in the orchestra when Mahler became its conductor, <6> but it also demonstrates the difference in sound between Mahler and his predecessor Safonoff, whose repertoire seems to have been based on Tchaikovsky.

The parts for Schumann I were used with the New York Symphony Orchestra in November, 1908. This orchestra was probably of comparable size to the New York Philharmonic at the time; that is, of the size implied by the number of parts, 16,16,14,12,10.

The rest of the parts have Viennese stamps on them and thus represent the size of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra when Mahler was at its head. The sets with the largest number of parts are exactly the size required for a strength of 17,17,11,10,10, as quoted by Hilmar from programme booklets of 1898. <7> The implication is that some of the parts from the other sets may have been lost.

Apart from the small difference in tone colour mentioned earlier, in terms of numbers alone there would be little difference in the loudness of the string sections of the three orchestras discussed above. As to
Armed with this knowledge of the size of the string complements in Vienna and New York we can sometimes identify those Retuschen which were written into or removed from the parts in New York from the fact that the back desk parts remained untouched.

7.2 The Use of a Reduced Complement

In certain parts of certain works, Mahler was in the habit of reducing the size of the string sections. He did this in the opera house, probably following the example of Wagner who notates numbers of strings meticulously throughout his mature works. <8> In New York, the critic Krehbiehl reported that in a performance of Fidelio at the Metropolitan Opera Mahler had used his string forces in whole or detachments as he thought best from time to time. <9>

The nine works in which we know Mahler reduced the strings in places are:

- Beethoven
  - Overture Leonore III, P.14
- Beethoven
  - Symphony III, P.25
- Beethoven
  - Symphony VI, P.32
- Beethoven
  - Symphony VII, P.33/4
- Beethoven
  - Symphony IX, P.39/40
- Mozart
  - Symphony 40, P.44
- Mozart
  - Symphony 41, P.45
- Schubert
  - Symphony IX, P.47
- Smetana
  - The Bartered Bride Overture, P.58/9.

Full details of these reductions are given in the chapters on the works concerned.

The two Mozart symphonies are special cases. From a consideration of the large number of string parts in Mahler's set for K.550, we can deduce that it was probably only in New York that he played the whole
with a full string section and doubled wind, as befits its different character; but he did reduce the strings for certain passages in the first movement after the manner of a concerto grosso. <11>

In the other works listed above, although Mahler used the reduction of strings as a means of obtaining variety of texture in pianissimo passages, it was not something that he did in any routine fashion. <12> The fact that Mahler’s scores and parts of Beethoven V have none of these reductions, even in the transition to the finale, is witness to this. <13>

Mahler uses the same device of reduction of strings in his own works, though more commonly in the first four symphonies than elsewhere, either by noting die Hälfte or by dividing the sections. In his Fifth Symphony we find directions for specific numbers of players, namely 6,4,4,3,2. <14> His use of reduced numbers in his Retuschen is also a feature of the early scores; but, although Mahler appears not to call for this feature in scores which he revised for the first time later in his career, the orchestral materials do not show that Mahler abandoned this practice in later years, indeed, the examples of Beethoven VII and Beethoven IX show that he continued to refine his approach.

7.3 Bowings

It was not Mahler’s normal practice to write copious bowings in scores, and it is to the orchestral parts that we must turn for definite information. Many of the parts are Breitkopf Edition which have bowings printed in them and Mahler accepted these in the main. As he was himself not a string player, he undoubtedly took advice on this
Among Mahler's close friends were the violinists Natalie Bauer-Lechner and Arnold Rosé. Rosé was Mahler's brother-in-law and first solo violin of the Vienna Court Opera and Philharmonic Orchestra. Theodore Spiering, the concertmaster of the New York Philharmonic was auditioned by Mahler in the presence of Rosé. <16>

Carl Flesch auditioned for the post of concertmaster in Vienna and describes his meeting with Rosé just before playing for Mahler:

He (Rosé) gave me a friendly explanation of the demands that Mahler, who did not know much about violin technique, used to make during auditions. He attached the greatest significance to the steadiest possible bowing in sustained notes and therefore considered the beginning of (Act 3, scene III) of Siegfried as a touchstone for the bowing technique of an orchestral violinist. <17>

Naturally, Mahler asked the advice of his two concertmasters in determining bowings. La Grange reports that in July 1899 Rosé helped Mahler to establish bowing marks in the score of his own Third Symphony, <18> and Rosé would have been involved in making decisions for most of the works for which we have orchestral parts.

However, unlike changes of instrumentation which need to be copied into the parts and the special problems attendant upon an unperformed work, bowings do not need to be decided in advance of rehearsals; and, given the large number of rehearsals available to Mahler, deciding these was probably done on the spot. Benjamin Kohon reports that with the New York Philharmonic Mahler would decide bowings in rehearsal <19> and with this in mind we can readily understand the paucity of bowings in Mahler's conducting scores.
7.3.1 Unusual Bowings

Among the bowings which we find in the scores and parts there are some unusual ones which are worth reporting. Some of these are bowings which would almost certainly not be suggested by a string player without exhortation from the conductor:

Beethoven Leonore III, P.14; 364-77: Mahler’s bowing guards against the violins rushing, with four up bows in the first two bars and all downbows from bar 370.

Beethoven V/4, P.30; 350-1: All downbows, probably for the same reason as the last example.

Beethoven V/1, P.30/1; 44: Mahler reverses the normal bowing to place a downbow and accent on the first note of the Ur-motif. This is also a feature of the earlier version, P.29 in bar 245 and following.

Beethoven V/2, P.31; 1: Mahler ties the upbeat into the first note of the first bar with a downbow, unifying this with its later appearance in bar 157-8.

With great effect Mahler emphasises a sforzando with a downbow, even where this means reversing the normal bowing:

Beethoven V/4, P.31; 122 et seq: Mahler has placed sf under all the detached crotchets in the strings and reinforces this by downbows, the upbow being used for the long notes. See Ex.23.1.

Beethoven VII/4, P.34; 5 et seq: Mahler begins up, reversing the bowing to give a good sforzando.

Mozart K.550/2, P.44; 48, 50, 119 & 121: Mahler groups the last five notes in one upbow with tenuto marks.

7.3.2 Consecutive Downbows

A common feature of bowing style in many of Mahler’s performances was a series of consecutive downbows. Sometimes this is uncontroversial:

Beethoven III/2, P.26; 103: The last two notes, when played down in the same bow, prepare well the subito piano of b.104.
powerful emphasis to the beginning of each note:

Beethoven V/1, P.31; 188-90: Vn1/2. See Ex.23.3.
Beethoven IX/4, P.40; 594-602: Vc/Cb.

In the last example, the composer expects the notes to be detached; but in the example from Beethoven V and in the following passages it can only be a very live acoustic which prevents the inevitable gaps between the notes from being noticeable:

Beethoven III/1, P.26; 256-9 etc, & 681-3. See Ex.22.6 & Ex.22.11.
Beethoven, Leonore II, P.13; 222-4.
Beethoven, Weihe des Hauses, P.17/8; 89-90: Vn2, 94-5: Va, & 99-100: Vnl.
Beethoven V/4, P.30/1; 106 (last note) - 108: Vc/Cb, & 118 (last note) - 120: Vn1/2. See Ex.23.1.

Mahler's bowings for the Minuet of Mozart's G minor Symphony, P.44, rely on the use of the downbow for heavy emphasis, See Ex.27.7; and he even applies the retaken downbow in the theme of the last movement of Beethoven III, P.26, using five consecutive downbows, beginning with its first appearance in Vnl in bar 60. This bowing is used thereafter for every appearance of the theme.

While this emphatic style does not sound perverse in Beethoven's energetic works, it can sound too strenuous in the works of more lyrical composers like Schubert and Schumann:

Schubert IX/1, p.48/9; 672-5: See Ex.29.5. It seems here as if Mahler has no alternative than to use this bowing to match the brass voices of the last 10 bars, but one is aware of its "over-blown" nature.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.51/2; 19: The syncopated accents in Vn1/2, Va & Cb are easily accommodated and the inevitable gap between the notes would be filled in by the woodwind who are on the beat.

Schumann I/1, P.54; 0-2: Here Mahler's strings are already
Consecutive downbows do not promote that variety of nuance which comes from alternating up and down strokes; and, in addition to the wearisome effect which they have on the ears, their execution is very irritating to the players. The passage which perhaps exemplifies this best also contains multiple changes of bow. This is another irritating style when carried to excess, which does not guarantee a closer approach to Beethoven's intentions.

Beethoven III/2, P.26; 150-1, See Ex.22.15.

7.3.3 One Note - Two Bows

In order to give emphasis to a note and make it louder throughout, the device of last resort is to use more than one bow to a note. Soloists do this on occasion in order to be able to dominate the accompaniment, or sustain a long note; and they take great pains to cover it up by choosing the right moment to do it. In the orchestra, this device can easily be made inaudible by ensuring that the players stagger the bow change and it can be most impressive in sustained passages. Ernst Decsey recounted that when Mahler was rehearsing the Adagio of his own Third Symphony in Graz in December 1906

...it happened to him that the strings did not produce an even, loud, long-held tone. He tapped the stand and explained to the musicians: "That happens because you play your violins in an academic style. But one should never play academically! In long held fortissimo notes merely bow calmly up and down: the more often the bow moves over the string, the more beautiful. Admittedly the school teaches: downbow, upbow! But then the bow has no more power at the tip - you do it correctly when you follow life and practical experience instead of the professors." <20>

This device is routinely used at the beginning of Beethoven V and
players to sustain longer and louder and to arrive at the end of the note in the desired part of the bow for the next note:

Beethoven, Weihe des Hauses Overture, P.17/8; 200-2.

It works in strenuous passages where Beethoven requires an almost superhuman effort:

Beethoven IX/1, P.40; 24-6. See Ex.26.13.

But its use in normal melodies is more questionable:

Beethoven, Weihe des Hauses Overture, 33: Vnl.

Beethoven VII/1, P.35; 17: Vnl.

This style of bowing is employed in the Trio of Beethoven VII where it is not so much out of place and promotes a good rhythm:


Where Mahler uses this device most effectively is to gain power in passages where long notes are followed by short. By changing bows somewhere in the long note and saving part of the new bow for the shorter note, the players can easily avoid the accent which could accompany the shorter note when allocated a whole up bow:

Beethoven III/2, P.26; 114. See Ex.22.13.

Beethoven III/4, P.26; 103. See Ex.22.18.

Beethoven IX/1, P.40; 327-9. See Ex.26.21.

The critic of The New York Press noted in Mahler’s Beethoven VII performance in his first concert with the New York Philharmonic in March 1909

...the beautifully sustained A in the trio of the scherzo, which was kept sounding smooth and unwavering by dividing the violins into several groups, each of which groups was asked to change from upward to downward bow or vice versa on different bars. <21>
7.3.4 Staccato Bowings

The normal style of bowing employed by Mahler is, of course, "on the string" and this is most appropriate for massed strings, with special effects sparingly used in the classical and early romantic repertoire. This accords well with the compositions of the Germanic school: Beethoven's use of sul ponticello occurs only in his A minor Quartet, Op.132, and even Wagner's direction for special effects are rare. Traditionally, "off the string" spiccato styles have been reserved for solo playing; though with the rise in virtuosity of orchestral players in ensembles like The Academy of St Martin's in the Fields, modern players have imported solo styles into ensemble works. <22> However, the style in Dresden, Berlin and Vienna for orchestral playing has been to use "on the string" bowings in most staccato passages, <23> so that when Mahler wants something different he notates it in his parts.

The Vnl part of Schubert IX provides several good examples of "off the string" staccato:

- Schubert IX/2, P.49; 163. See Ex.29.6.
- Schubert IX/4, P.49; 169 & 385. See Ex.29.9.

Mahler's usual term for an "off the string" staccato is springender Bogen:

- Beethoven VII/1, P.33: 181.
- Beethoven V/2, P.31: 123.
- Beethoven, Leonore III, P.14; 278: Vnl.3. See Ex.19.2.

In New York, the term springender Bogen was written into the parts by players as jumping bow:

- Schumann IV/4, P.57; 59: Vnl.3.

7.3.4 - Mahler's Editing of String Parts
Sometimes the players use the term *saltando* to describe the same style:

Beethoven VII/1, P.35; 185: Vc2.

However this term is used by a player more accurately in the *Eroica*:

Beethoven III/2, P.26; 8: Last three notes in same downbow.

---

7.4 Special Effects

7.4.1 Fingerings

Rarely are fingerings marked in Mahler's orchestral parts since these are usually left to the players to arrange. However, although in Europe Mahler was able to take for granted a style of fingering which gave licence to a rich portamento, in New York he had to ask specially for this portamento as Hermann Borodkin, viola player in the Philharmonic Orchestra, relates:

"He insisted on certain slides in his (own) music. Sometimes in a slow movement in other composers he would do that too. For instance, he said you couldn't shift an octave without a slide (because) nobody sings that way."

One fingering is particularly interesting:

Mozart K.551/1, P.45; 157-9: See Ex.28.3 for Vn1.3. The fingering implies the use of the A string, and the separation after the second note forbids a portamento in returning from fifth to third position.

7.4.2 Specification of String

Mahler occasionally specifies the string on which a melody is to be played. Sometimes this is for colour, and at other times it determines a portamento effect.
string brings its characteristic richness and projection of tone:

Beethoven, Leonore II, P.13; 244-52: Vn1.3 & Vn1.8.

Beethoven III/2, P.25; 17: Vn1.

Beethoven, Leonore III, P.14; 405-11: Vn1.

Beethoven IX/3, P.40; 148 (last three notes): When played in fourth position, no portamento is involved here, though a slide between the first two notes of b.149 would be in character.

Mahler occasionally specifies the D-string:

Beethoven, Leonore III, P.14; 412: The subito pianissimo causes Mahler to direct the violins to play on the D string in order to thin out the tone.

Beethoven VI/2, P.32; 79 (last crotchet): Mahler indicates the D-string for Vn1.

The A string on the violin is used in preference to the E string in order to soften the tone and to avoid the sudden change in tone quality which comes from changing between the E and the A strings during a phrase.


Mozart, K.550/1, P.44; 7 & 170: Mahler directs Vn1 to play a harmonic A. As this is to be found on the A string, it is quite possible that Mahler had the whole theme up to the middle of bar 9 played on the A string too; but this is impossible to know with certainty.

Mahler also specifies strings for the cello:

Beethoven Coriolan Overture, P.6; 302-9: Vc1 3za corda. This promotes a portamento between the Ds and the A-flats, and the G and the E-flat.

Schubert IX, P.49; 253 et seq: Vc1. The melody begins on the D string, giving a more subdued tone than on the A string. From the entry of the oboe, the A string is resumed.

Beethoven VII/4, P.35; 131: G string. 138-45: C string. This gives maximum power to the rising sixths and promotes a rich portamento.
As in his own works, Mahler specifies the position of the bow over the string for special effects, in pianissimo passages using the term Griffbrett to direct the players to play with the bows over the fingerboard:

Beethoven III/2, P.26: 154.
Beethoven IX/3, P.40: 3, 99 & 125.
Schumann II/1: 1.
Schumann IV/4, P.57: 39.

The opposite instruction, Am Steg, to play close to the bridge, is met with only in Schubert IX:

Schubert IX/4, P.48/9; 433-56: Mahler wants a mysterious, eerie sound.

7.4.4 The Addition of Appogiaturas

In his own works, to give more intensity to a string passage Mahler often adds appogiaturas in multiple stops. This practice, which became ever more intense as he developed, is found at its zenith in the finale of his Ninth Symphony, and was also an occasional feature of his additions to other composer's works:

Mozart K.551/2, P.45; 95: Vnl has two semiquaver appogiaturas d' and f' to intensify the last appearance of the theme. <25>

Schubert IX/1, P.48/9; 237: To intensify the top of the phrase, Vnl has an appogiatura b'', and Vn2 has an appogiatura g'', both semiquavers. This is also found in b.555.

Schumann I/2, P.54; 15: This melody is played by Vnl and Vn2 in octaves, but only Vnl is given Schumann's original, notated here by Mahler as two demisemiquavers - g and g'.

7.4.3 - Mahler's Editing of String Parts
Occasionally, Mahler replaces *arco* by *pizzicato*. This lightens the texture considerably in most of these places:

Beethoven IX/4, P.39; 415-8 & 423 (2nd half) - 429: All strings.

Mozart K.550/1, P.44; 1: Vc/Cb pizz on first note of movement only.

Schubert IX/3, P.47/8: Mahler replaces *arco* by *pizzicato* extensively in the Trio for all strings.

Schumann Manfred Overture, P.50/1; 119-20 & 124-5: Vc/Cb *pizz*.

Schumann II/3; 62: Va, Vc & Cb.

Schumann II/4; 46-55: Vn2, Va, Vc & Cb.

Schumann III/2; 16-22: There is an alternation of *pizzicato* and *arco* in all strings. <26>

Schumann IV/3, P.57; 65, 73, 80-1 etc: Vc/Cb; 112a: Vn2, Va, Vc & Cb.

---

**7.5 Altered Dynamics**

As with the wind instruments, Mahler frequently changes dynamics in the strings to enable important melodies to be heard. A few examples will illustrate some of the more interesting cases.

Beethoven, Weihe des Hauses Overture, P.17/8; 253-4: *fp* at the beginning of each bar and *ff* for the scales. This allows the woodwind and strings to balance each other in their antiphonal scales.

Beethoven III/1, P.26; 113-6: *mf* in bar 113, with crescendo in bar 116, restoring the *ff* in bar 117, allows the woodwind to be heard.

Beethoven III/1, P.26; 186 et seq: Vn1 and Vn2 alternate in this passage. Mahler reduces the dynamic of the syncopated crotchets to *mf*, to allow the semiquaver figure to emerge *ff*.
notes of the melody. Woodwind are marked \textit{fff} and these changes, together with \textit{sfp} in Vnl/2, allow them to emerge from the texture.

7.6 Octave Transpositions

Mahler transposes violins an octave higher to avoid a sudden change in octave:

Beethoven, Weihe des Hauses Overture, P.17/8; 63 (2nd half) - 65 (1st note): Vnl and Vn2 8\textit{va}. Vnl returns to the original after the 1st note of bar 65 and Vn2 after the 3rd crotchet of bar 64.

Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5; 207: Vnl and Va 8\textit{va} to prevent a change of octave, the first note of the bar omitted from Vnl to give time for them to prepare the high F.

Mozart K.550/1, P.44; 211-4: Vnl 8\textit{va} to keep them in the same octave, and prevent the sudden unison with Vn2 which Mozart had written.

Schubert IX/1, P.47/8/9; 412-3: Vnl 8\textit{va} to follow the pattern established in previous bars.

Schubert IX/4, P.47/8; 22 - 25 (1st note): Mahler raises Vnl 8\textit{va} in order to avoid any anticlimax from the sudden lowering of octave in Schubert's original. He supports this in Vn2, by altering the part in b.23-5 so that they take over the original Vnl.

Mahler raises Vnl & Vn2 8\textit{va} to gain more brilliance:


At the other end of the scale, Mahler was clearly without double basses able to play below E when he prepared the \textit{Pastoral} Symphony, since he transposed the part up an octave:

Beethoven VI/1, P.32: 175-9.

7.5.0 - Mahler's Editing of String Parts
7.7 Strings Doubling Strings

7.7.1 Unison Violins

Natalie Bauer-Lechner relates that in 1899, after a rehearsal for a concert with the Vienna Philharmonic which included Brahms III, Mahler gave as his opinion that:

...A radical improvement in the tone-quality of the violin section, giving a thrilling brilliance of tone, is achieved by letting the second violins play in unison with the first in vivid and dominating passages. Nor is this effect to be accounted for merely by the increase in numbers; it must be the effect of some acoustic law that the sound-waves encountering each other from both sides produce such a lively and brilliant tone quality. <27>

From this quotation, as well as from the few photos of Mahler with an orchestra, <28> we are reminded that his practice, as was then normal, was to have the second violins on his right, and it might be interesting to speculate whether Mahler would have made the same observation had his violins been massed together. There is, however, no recognised scientific basis for his statement; even though there are many musical reasons to commend the traditional layout for most orchestral music written up to and including Mahler and Elgar. All we can state is that Mahler was certainly very fond of the effect of unison violins, since of all the changes which he makes to string parts in his Retuschen this is one of the most common.

From an examination of the available scores and parts, it is moreover apparent that this unison of violins is a feature more typical of Mahler's approach to Retuschen after 1899 than before. To establish this with certainty we should need to have access to more materials used before then; but discrepancies in this feature are conspicuous in...
Mahler's change often merely involves Vn2 abandoning the original part and joining Vn1:

Beethoven II/1, P.24: 266 (second note) - b.268.
Beethoven V/4, P.30/1: 4-22 (1st note), b.210-228 (first note), & b.302 (last crotchet) - b.308 (1st note).
Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.51/2: 257 (last crotchet) - b.276.

Sometimes Mahler raises the second violin part by an octave, substituting for the original octaves a unison with the first violins:

Beethoven, Egmont Overture, P.11: 58 (last note) - 73 (first note) & 192 (last note) - 200 (first note).
Beethoven III/1, P.26: 557-60.
Beethoven V/2, P.30/1: 185 (2nd note) - 192 (1st note).
Beethoven V/4, P.30/1: 34-40 & 240 (last note) - 243.
Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5: 427 (2nd note) - 432.
Schumann IV/1, P.57: 345-7.

Where the original second violin part cannot be omitted, Mahler adds this to the duties of the violas:

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.4/5; 42-5 (1st half of each bar): Vn2 join Vn1 for the first half of each bar, returning in the second half to their own part.
Beethoven II/1, P.24: 158 - 166 (1st note) & 170 (last crotchet) - 178 (first crotchet).
Beethoven III/4, P.26: 344 (2nd note) - 348.
Schumann I/1, P.54; 126-9: Vn2 8va in 128-9, Va plays original Vn2 part from the 4th semiquaver of 127.

More often than not this requires the viola section to be divided:
Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.4/5: 270-3.


Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5: 278-299.

Schumann I/2, P.54: 1-23 (1st note).

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.50/1/2: 169 (last note) - 183 (1st note). <29>

7.7.2 Other String Doublings

When he wishes the part to receive more prominence, Mahler uses violas to double violins, and vice versa. Violas and cellos also support each other:

Beethoven, Leonore III, P.14; 77-8 & 81-2: Va doubles Vc, 8va where necessary.

Beethoven, Weihe des Hauses Overture, P.17/8; 277 & 279: Va divides and adds Vn2 part, Vc divides and adds Va part.

Beethoven III/1, P.26; 188 (2nd quaver) - 190 (1st quaver): Va doubles Vn2, returning to the original part on the second crotchet of 190. The same is found in 192-3, 200-1 & 204-5.

Beethoven V/2, P.20/30; 114-120: Va doubles Vc, 8va where necessary.

Beethoven VI/5, P.32; 77 (last note) - 78 (3rd note): Va doubles Vn1 to achieve a satisfactory balance with the wind.

Beethoven VI/5, P.32; 172-4: Vc doubles Va, though since there is no problem with audibility there would seem to be only disadvantage in this change in that it dilutes the characteristic sound of the viola's C string.

Mozart, K.551/1, P.45; b.9 - 17 (1st note) & 197 - 205 (1st note): Va 8va to join Vn2, Vc takes over original Va part.

Mozart, K.551/1, P.45; b.49-55 & 237-43: Vn2 is already more brilliant here, so Mahler uses Vc to reinforce Va from the 4th quaver and give body to the sound.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.50/1/2; 211 & 213: Vc divided, VcI doubles Vn2 in 211 and Va in 213.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.50/1/2; 216 (2nd crotchet) - 218 (3rd crotchet): Vn2 doubles Va.

7.7.1 - Mahler's Editing of String Parts
7.7.3 Large-scale String Unisons

Sometimes, in reassigning parts, Mahler creates powerful unisons:

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.5; 113-7: Vn2 join Vnl in b.113, from b.114 dividing and also playing the lower octave. Va doubles Vnl 8va bassa from b.114.

Beethoven, Leonore III, P.14; 378-83: Vn2 join Vnl, putting all the strings and woodwind in "unison", the original Vn2 part being well covered by the brass.

Beethoven III/1, P.25/6; 144-6: On the second two notes of each bar Vn1 doubles Vn2 and Vc doubles Va.

Beethoven III/4, P.26; 1-3: Vn2 doubles Vnl, Va 8va until the 5th note of b.2. Vc adds Va original until the 1st crotchet of b.2.

Beethoven VI/4, P.32; 23-4: Vn2 doubles original Vnl part, Vnl loses lower octave, Va adds top F. The same in b.27-8 & b.31-2.

Schumann IV/1, P.57; 101-2: Vn2 and Va join Vnl. The same in b.105-6, b.109-10 & b.113-4.

Schumann IV/4, P.57; 196 (2nd note) - 203: Vn2 doubles Vnl, Va taking over the original Vn2 part. Vc plays the original Vn2 part 8va bassa.

7.8 Strings Reinforcing Woodwind

Mahler uses Vnl to reinforce Fll:

Beethoven, Weihe des Hauses Overture, P.17/8; 167: Vnl abandons the Bs to reinforce Fll in the second half of b.167 & b.169, and in b.170.


Cellos and violas are used to reinforce the bassoons:

Beethoven, Weihe des Hauses Overture, P.17/8; 41-52: Vc reinforce Fg.

Beethoven, Weihe des Hauses Overture, P.17/8; 218 (2nd half) - 220: Va and Vc reinforce Fg.

Beethoven V/4, P.30/1; 317: Vc reinforced Fg at one time.
7.9 The Removal of Notes from String Parts

The most common reason for the removal of notes from string parts is to make them easier to play:

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.5; 64: Vc omits 1st quaver.

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.5; 236-7: Vn1 omitted after first note, which is a quaver, and Vn2 take over Vn1 part. This enables Vn1 to prepare for the e'''-flat which Mahler assigns them in b.238.

Beethoven, Egmont Overture, P.11; 153: First note omitted from Vn1 to enable them to prepare the pianissimo better.

Beethoven II/2, P.24; 75: Vnl omit 1st three notes to enable them to prepare the piano better.

Beethoven VI/1, P.32; 427-428 (1st note): Vn1 removed and notes added to Vn2. This enables Vn1 to enter with more poise in b.428.

Beethoven VII/3, P.34/5; 25, 137: The grace note is removed from Vc/Cb. As it requires a shift in position, the original is awkward; and with the note in the timpani anyway, Mahler must have found it an unnecessary complication in these exposed places.

Beethoven IX/1, P.40; 159 (last note): Vn2 removed, making it easier for them to prepare for the sextuplets.

Beethoven IX/1, P.40; 426: Notes 3-5 removed from Vn1 to enable them to prepare a piano entry at the end of the bar.

Unnecessary string doublings are removed in soft passages:

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.5; 136-9: The redundant doubling of Vc by Vn2 is removed. In any case, Vn2 have to pause in Beethoven's original when the line goes below the G string.

Schubert IX/1, P.47/8/9; 256-67: In the early score, Vn2 is removed from 256-65. This is an awkward passage which can easily get too loud. From the 2nd crotchet of b.266, Vn1 rest until b.267, and Vn2 are reinstated. Vn2 are also omitted from the 2nd note of b.276 until b.277. In the
Schubert IX/4, P.48/9; 560-9: Vn2 is removed.

Mahler also removes notes from Schumann's string parts where they unnecessarily reinforce wind and blunt the colour contrast:

Schumann IV/1, P.57; 59-60 & 63-4: Vn2 removed after 1st note, Va removed. (In b.63, Va play 1st note only.)

Schumann IV/4, P.57; 28 & 30: Vnl removed.

Schumann IV/4, P.57; 104 - 110 (1st half): Va removed.
Chapter 8

Mahler's Treatment of Woodwind

Mahler's treatment of woodwind parts in his *Retuschen* has two main purposes, to clarify and make audible parts which are in danger of not being heard in the original, and to restore the balance with the strings that the composer intended. Many of these changes involve several members or all of the woodwind section, and these are discussed first, followed by sections on individual instruments. The important E-flat clarinet parts are treated separately in Ch.9.

8.1 Mahler's General Treatment of Woodwind

8.1.1 Change of Dynamics

In common with many conductors, Mahler raises woodwind dynamics to enable important entries to be heard, as a few examples from Beethoven VII will illustrate:

Beethoven VII/2, P.34/5; 210: Fll *mf* instead of *p*.

Beethoven VII/4, P.34/5; 63 & 67: Fgl *f* instead of *p*.

Beethoven VII/4, P.34/5; 165: All Ww *fff* instead of *p*.

Beethoven VII/4, P.34/5; 202: Fll *mf*; Ob, Cl, Fg *pp*.

Sometimes Mahler merely reduces the dynamics of the accompaniment, as in these examples from Beethoven III:

Beethoven III/2, P.26; 74-5: St cresc in b.74 replaced by
Beethoven II/2, P.26; 90: pp in strings in b.90 and cresc of b.92 deferred to b.95. Cresc in Tr and Pk delayed until b.96. All these changes allow the woodwind to dominate.

Beethoven III/4, P.26; 171: St have p and C11/2 fp to allow the other Ww to dominate.

Often Mahler does all this in conjunction with actual changes to the scoring, as in many cases the dynamic range of the instruments is inadequate to solve the problem.

In order to allow other instruments to be heard, Mahler frequently changes woodwind dynamics when they are holding powerful chords against moving parts. The most common instruction of this kind is fp at the beginning of a chord:

Beethoven V/1, P.30/1: 44 & 48, etc.

In fortissimo passages Mahler uses fpp:

Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5: 15, 17, 19 & 21.

When the harmony in the woodwind, being higher than the melody, is likely to drown the latter, Mahler changes a uniform fortissimo into piano at the beginning of the passage with a crescendo to forte:

Beethoven VI/5, P.32: 77 (last note) - b.80.

The use of fpp crescendo ff during a chord is also valuable, as it enables the chord to make its presence felt without dominating the texture all the time:

Beethoven VI/5, P.32; 190-1, 192-3, 219-20, 221-2, 223-6: The music is in two bar periods with the theme in the basses, who are in grave danger of drowning. By these wind dynamics, which are also in the brass instruments, Mahler avoids this and underlines the climactic ninth chord of bar 227.
8.1.2 Doubling by Second Players

Often when the original score has an important melody played only by the first player, Mahler will add the second player, sometimes abandoning the original part for the second player where it would contribute little to the overall effect.


Beethoven II/1, P.24; 1st mvt, bars 63-5, 107-10 and 279-82: F12 is much more gainfully employed by Mahler in doubling F11 than in Beethoven's original.

Schumann I/2, P.53/4; 40 - 41 (first note): F12 doubles F11. F12 originally had the same as Ob1 and Mahler wishes to emphasise the trill.

Beethoven II/4, P.24; 12-8 and elsewhere: F11, Ob1 & Fg1 all doubled by second players.

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.5; 167-76: F11 & Ob1 are joined by F12 & Ob2 who in Beethoven's original are unemployed in this passage. C12 & Fg1 abandon their original notes and join C11 & Fg2 respectively.

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.5; 60-1: F12 joins F11, Ob3 joins Ob1 and C12 joins C11. (Fg1/2 are already in unison.)

Beethoven III/2, P.26; 92-5: Ob2 doubles Ob1.

Beethoven III/2, P.26; 194: F12 doubles F11.

Beethoven VI/2, P.32; 68: F12 doubles F11.

Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5; 177-8: F12 doubles F11.

Beethoven V/4, P.30/1; 72 - 79 (1st note), 329 - 332 (3rd crotchet) & 346-9: F11/2 abandon their parts and play in unison with F1.

Beethoven VI/4, P.32; 82 et seq: Pi zu 2.

8.1.3 Use of Extra Players

In those scores which Mahler used in Hamburg <1> we find him requiring the participation of a third flute or piccolo, an E-flat clarinet and a third bassoon or contrabassoon. This implies that he did not have
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and New York, he was able to call on two players for each written part, and this difference of circumstances accounts for many of the differences between the early and late sources. Thus, in a score used in Hamburg, what appears to be a particularly audacious Retusche which Mahler abandoned later was simply due to the players available.

Notable passages which illustrate this are:

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.4: 78-83, 110-7 & 206-11. See Ch.16.

Beethoven VII/1,4, P.33: See Ch.25.3.


When they were available, Mahler brought the wind section up to double size. These players worked from an extra set of parts in which were indicated the places where they were to play. The fact that these parts do not show as much wear as the main woodwind sets could be taken to indicate that Mahler did not always use doubling players even when he could have done; but the most likely explanation is that there was no need for a great deal of handling, since the marks in the doubling sets are far less extensive than in the main sets.

The works for which we know Mahler used a double set of woodwind are:

P.5
P.11
P.13
P.14
P.17/8
P.26
P.30/1
P.34/5
P.40
P.45
P.48/9
P.50
P.56/7
P.58/9

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture
Beethoven, Egmont Overture
Beethoven, Leonore II
Beethoven, Leonore III
Beethoven, Weihe des Hauses Overture,
Beethoven III
Beethoven V
Beethoven VII
Beethoven IX
Mozart, K.551 <2>
Schubert VIII <3>
Schubert IX
Schumann, Manfred Overture <4>
Schumann IV
Smetana, Bartered Bride Overture
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unemployed more of the time than Weingartner recommends in his books on Retuschen. Mahler's Retuschen in Leonore II, P.13, give many examples of this selectivity:

34-42: Ww doubled, with the exception of 36-9 where the strings need help to be heard.

138 (2nd half) - 142 (1st note): Fgl/2 doubled. The bassoons have to balance with the violas and basses.

225 (last 2 notes) - 226: Fll/2 & Fgl/2 doubled.

292 & 304: Fgl/2 only doubled.

428: Only the last note is doubled, to give maximum impact to the sforzando.

Sometimes Mahler extends the dynamic range for only a few notes:

Beethoven, Leonore III, P.14; 475: Fl2-4 double Fl1, Ob2-4 double Ob1, and Fg3/4 double Fgl/2.

Beethoven, Weihe des Hause Overture, P.17/8; 88: Mahler doubles only the first note at the beginning of the fugal exposition. <5>

Beethoven III/2, P.26; 198: First two notes doubled. <6>

Schubert IX/3, P.48/9; 79 & 83: Ww doubled on last note of bar only.

Mahler also saves his doubling instruments for motivic interjections:

Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5: 2nd half of 153, 155, 159 and 161.

To give a more impressive diminuendo, Mahler sometimes has the doubling instruments stop before the end of a note:

Beethoven V/2, P.30/1; 86: Cl3/4 stop one quaver before the end of the phrase. 156: all the doubling woodwind stop six quavers before the end of the phrase.

Schubert IX/1, P.48/9; b.131: Ww3/4 play only until the middle of the bar.

Mahler uses the entry of the doubling players to intensify a climax:

Smetana, Bartered Bride Overture, P.58/9; 313: Ww3/4 begin on the 2nd crotchet of the bar. Mahler reserves the entry of Ww3/4 until 17 bars into the fortissimo tutti.
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In cases where the doubling players enter during a crescendo, Mahler has them enter piano and continue the crescendo.

Beethoven, Leonore III, P.14; 26, 65 & 606: Ww3/4 enter on the 2nd note. In 606, Ww1/2 are already playing forte, so the entry of Ww3/4 piano and the following four bar crescendo is an impressive lead to the climax of the work.

Beethoven IX/4, P.40; 180 et seq: Ww3/4 enter p cresc poco a poco but stop after the third crotchet of 187, entering again, also p cresc poco a poco, on the last crotchet of 191 until 194.

8.1.4 Change of Octave

In order to make the whole wind section more penetrating when the same theme is played by all instruments, Mahler will change the octave disposition of some of the instruments:

Beethoven, Weihe des Hauses, P.17/8; 117 - 119 (first crotchet) and 120 (second crotchet) - 122 (first note): Ob1 and Cl1 8va. (Cl1 until 9th note of 123.)

Beethoven, Weihe des Hauses, P.17/8; 253-4: Ob1 and Cl1 8va except last three notes of bar 254. <7>

Beethoven V/4, P.30/1; 257-9: Fl1/2, Cl1/2, Fg1/2 8va.

Mozart K.550/2, P.44; 58 & 60: Fl, Ob2 raised 8va and Fg1 added in unison with Cl2.

Schumann IV/4, P.56/7; 228 - 230 (1st note): Ob2 8va bassa from 3rd note, Cl1 8va alta from 2nd note.

Smetana, Bartered Bride Overture, P.58/9; 170 (2nd note) - 176: Fl2 joins Fl1. Ob1 8va from bar 174. Cl2 plays Cl1 original, Cl1 8va from 3rd note of bar 174. Fg2 joins Fg1.

Smetana, Bartered Bride Overture, P.58/9; 221-8: Ob1 and Cl1 8va until first half of bar 224 and Cl2 8va in bars 226 and 227.

8.1.5 Creation of Unisons

Mahler adds or changes notes to parts to create powerful unisons involving the whole woodwind section where the composer has not done so:
(first quaver): Obl/2 & Cll join F12. C12 joins F12 8va bassa. The Cs which have been abandoned in Obl/2 & Cll/2 are adequately represented in the brass and the contribution of the flutes and bassoons is much enhanced by this change.

Beethoven III/1, P.26; 516-8: Melody completed in Cll/2 and Fgl/2. Although involving a top Bb for both Fll and Fgl, these additions do not sound anachronistic and help the balance considerably.

Beethoven V/4, P.30/1; 43: F12, Ob2 and Fg2 added to first players from 2nd note, and Cll/2 reinforce Ob1/2. Coming after a powerful tutti, these additions are necessary in a reverberant acoustic to enable the melody to be heard.

Beethoven VI/4 P.32; 39 (2nd half) - 41: F12, Ob1/2 and Cll/2 join Fll and are reinforced by Eb clarinet. This is the only time that the wind play this phrase, and Mahler makes sure that we do not miss it.

8.1.6 Schalltrichter Auf!

Schalltrichter auf! is an instruction found frequently in Mahler's own scores to get more volume from an instrument, most commonly in connection with the French horns. In the works of other composers, Mahler sometimes requested the woodwind players to lift the bells of their instruments in this way. One score has this request written in by Mahler:

Beethoven IX/1, P.40; 304 & 329: Cll-4.

Other indications are little drawings of upturned instruments written into in orchestral materials by players:

Beethoven V/4, P.31; 26 & 132: Ob1.

Schubert IX/2, P.49; 38, 69, 223 & 233: Cl2.

Sometimes we find the remark Lift the bell:

Beethoven III/2, 130: Ob1.

Beethoven V/1, P.31; 110: Ob3. Also followed by ffffff.
Mahler's first concern is for clarity and only secondly for actual tone colour. If, in his view, the instrument assigned to a part is not loud enough, and increasing the written dynamic or doubling are not adequate solutions, he will reinforce it by another colour.

Beethoven III/1, P.26; 243 - 248 (1st crotchet): Ob1/2 & Cl1/2 reinforce each other and Hr1-3 reinforce Fg1/2. Ww doubled.

Beethoven V/4, P.30/1; 120 (last crotchet) - 121: Mahler reinforces Fg1/2 by Ob1/2 and adds Cl1/2 to reinforce the resultant oboe part. All Ww doubled.

Beethoven VI/4, P.32; 126 (2nd crotchet) - b.128 (1st crotchet): Cl1 reinforces Ob1 and Ob2 & Cl2 play Cl1 original.

When Mahler finds that an instrument is too loud and cannot be made soft enough by reducing the written dynamic, he will substitute a softer toned instrument if the part is not already represented elsewhere in the score. In these situations we find that Mahler is interested in balance and uniformity of texture and he is quite happy to substitute the flute or clarinet for the oboe which is the prime offender:

Beethoven, Leonore II, P.13; 103 - 106 (first note): Ob1/2 removed and Cl1/2 8va to replace them.


Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5; 54 - 57 (first note) & 400: Fl2 replaces Ob1, in this case unifying the timbre.

Beethoven VII/4, P.34/5; 371-92: Ob1/2 replaced by Cl1/2.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.51/2; 111-2: Ob1/2 replaced by Cl1/2.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.50/1/2; bars 118 - 119 (1st crotchet): Ob1 replaced by Cl2.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.50/1/2; 288, & 290: Cl1/2 replace Ob1/2.

Schumann I/1, P.53/4; 18 - 19 (5th quaver): Ob1 removed;
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8.1.8 Reinforcement of Strings

Mahler uses the woodwind to reinforce the strings:

Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5; 88: Fl1-4 and Ob1-4 reinforce Vn1 and Cl1-4 reinforce Va. This is the beginning of a powerful statement of the main theme of the movement, made gigantic by Mahler's extensive changes.

Beethoven VII/4, P.34/5; 114-20: Ob1-4 reinforce Vn2 and Cl1-4 reinforce Va who are also doubled by Vc. 333-9: In the recapitulation Cl1-4 reinforce Vn2 and Flg1-4 reinforce Va/Vc.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.50/1/2; 25 (last crotchet): All Ww reinforce Vn1.

8.1.9 Second Player Substituted for First

In order to give the first player a rest, and an opportunity to prepare for a more important entry, Mahler sometimes substitutes a second player. These are eminently practical but inaudible changes which affect only the players:

Beethoven, Leonore III, P.14; 328-9: Fl1 rests while Fl2/4 play the scale. Fl1 then enters in bar 330 ppp ohne Ausdruck!

Beethoven VI/3, P.32; 122: Cl2 substitutes for Cl1, to recognise the different function of this bar from the solo which follows in the next.

Beethoven IX/1 P.40/1; 257-8: Ob2 takes over from Obl.

Sometimes Mahler divides a line between two players to bring out the duet inherent in the writing and allow the first player to breathe:

Beethoven VI/1, P.32; 488-92: Cl1 and Cl2 play a bar each, in alternation.

Beethoven IX/1, P.39, 345-7: Flg2 and Ob2 relieve the first players, producing a hocket effect. See Ex.26.48.
8.1.10 Removal of Woodwind

Mahler removes woodwind when he finds the texture too thick in pianissimo:

Beethoven VII/3, P.34/5; 276-84: All Ww removed, except Fl in 276. <8> Mahler makes a much more dramatic effect here and ensures Beethoven's non crescendo.

Mozart K.550/2, P.44; 123: All Ww except Fl1 and Fgl removed. Mahler has marked pp in the strings and wants a much quieter ending to the movement.

Schumann IV/2, P.56/7; 48-53: Ww removed selectively. See Ch.34.2.4.

Schumann IV/4, P.56/7: 145 (2nd crotchet) - 148 (1st quaver): Fl2, Obl/2, Cl1/2 (Cl1 from b.146), Fgl/2 removed at one time. Mahler's dynamic here is ppp.

In Schumann's music, Mahler removes woodwind to give variety of texture:

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.50/1/2; 181 (last crotchet) - b.182 (first crotchet): Fl1/2, Obl/2, Fgl/2 & Hrl/2 removed. The antiphonal writing of strings and wind is thus made clearer.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.50/1/2; 218 (last crotchet) - b.222 (first half): Fl1/2, Obl/2 & Cl1/2 removed. This leaves a statement of the passage by the strings, immediately followed by a version in the woodwind which now makes a much better impact.

8.2 Flute

8.2.1 Extension of Compass of Flute

In his essay on the Ninth Symphony, Wagner addresses the problem of the compass of the flute in classical works, advocating the addition of b'''-flat to Beethoven's compass in order to avoid a melody dropping down an octave whenever it goes above a'''. <9> Mahler takes this
Beethoven III/1, P.25/6; 516: To avoid a gap in the texture, Fl1 plays b'''-flat.

Beethoven III/1, P.25/6; 482-4, 657-8 & 661-3: Sometimes Beethoven not only avoids the flute's top Bb, but rearranges a whole phrase simply because of its unavailability. Mahler employs the b'''-flat and brings the phrases into line.

Beethoven III/1, P.25/6; 316-8: Mahler rewrites Fl1/2 to be an octave above Cl1, using b'''-flat, filling out the melody to avoid the prominence of the original Fl1/2 and Obl parts.

Beethoven III/4, P.25/26; 320-1: Fl1 reinforces Obl at the octave.

Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5; 164-170: Fl1-4 unite on the upper octave, even though this requires b''' from all.

Beethoven VII/2, P.34/5; 83-98: Beethoven is considerably hampered by the lack of notes above a''', but Mahler completes the passage so that both Fl1 and Fl2 play the higher octave in unison until b.90, thereafter continuing in octaves. <10>

Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5; 368: Even in pianissimo passages Mahler is not afraid to use b'''-flat in Fl1.

Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5; 344: Mahler also adds an a''' where Beethoven had the note at his disposal. See Ch.25.2.5.

Beethoven IX/1, P.39 & P.40: Apart from agreeing with Wagner's concern that there be no sudden gaps in the texture, Mahler frequently assigns b'''-flat to the flutes, making several changes in the slow movement which require this note, in order that the flute be playing one octave above Cl1. See Ch.26.6.5.

Beethoven IX/1, P.39; 58: Although he later changed his mind, in this early revision Mahler went far beyond Wagner in taking Fl1 up to c'''''-sharp.

Mozart, K.550/2, P.44; 58: Mozart is more conservative in his flute parts than Beethoven, but this does not prevent Mahler from filling in a gap in the melody and using a'''-flat.

Schubert IX, P.48/49: Schubert also avoids the notes above a''''; but Mahler supplies them to bring the melody in line with the other woodwind. Examples of this are: 1st mvt, 555; 3rd mvt, 219-20; 4th mvt, 32, 285-6 (Fl1/2 both added), and 1101.
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version, Mahler completely rethinks this, avoiding the high notes of both trumpet and flute.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.52 only; 10: Mahler gives d'"-flat to Fl1.

Schumann I, P.53/4: Schumann was inconsistent in his use of high notes. In this work, for instance, he employs the b'''-flat in b.86 of the Finale, though not in b.328-9 of the Scherzo. Mahler rectifies this, and also completes the melody in the Finale by the addition of a top C in b.87. More daring, but sounding much better than Schumann's original, is the piano b'''-flat in b.110 of the slow movement.

8.2.2 Flute Reinforcing Violins

Mahler's changes to flute parts often reinforce violin lines at the unison:

Beethoven VII/1, P.33: 109.

Schumann I/1, P.53/4: 330 (last note) - 332 (2nd note).

More often, however, the reinforcement of Vnl is at the octave:

Beethoven IV/1, P.28: 190-5.

Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5; 164 - 165 (1st note): Fl1-4.

Mahler often raises Fl2 an octave to bring it into unison with Fl1, allowing both flutes to reinforce Vnl at the octave, and abandoning the ineffective unison reinforcement of Vnl by Fl2:

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.50: 78 (2nd note) - 80 (1st note).

Schumann III/1: 3-5.

8.2.3 Flute Reinforcing Piccolo

Sometimes Mahler is not satisfied with the contribution of the piccolo and supports it by flutes in the same octave:

Beethoven, Egmont Overture, P.11; 299-300 & 305-6: Fl1/2 continue in unison with Fl.
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8.2.4 Introduction of a Third Flute

Mahler employed a third flute in Schumann scores to play parts originally written for oboe:


Schumann II/1, P.55: 127-8, 129-30, 151-2 and 153-4, Ob1 is replaced by Fl3, making three part flute chords and unifying the colour. This is an early score.

8.2.5 Introduction of Piccolo

In his early scores, Mahler was unable to call on a full complement of doubling players and he used the piccolo to advantage:

Beethoven VII/4, P.33; 173-5: The gap in the flute parts is filled in by Fl2 and a piccolo.

Beethoven IX, P.39/40: In P.39, Mahler introduced the piccolo in the first and second movements, and also extended its contribution to the finale. In both P.39 and P.40, Mahler employed two piccolos from b.851 of the finale. See Ch.26.

8.3 Oboe

8.3.1 Extension of Compass of Oboe

Although f'''' had already been employed by Mozart in his Oboe Quartet, the top note employed by Beethoven in his orchestral oboes parts is d'''''. In order to stay within this range, Beethoven is often obliged to compromise in voice leading, so Mahler adds notes between d''''' and f'''''.
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raises Obi an octave in order to preserve the same disposition of the woodwind throughout the passage.

Beethoven VI/4, P32; 39: In rewriting the woodwind entry here, Mahler gives Obi f'''.

Beethoven VII/4, P.34/5; 166: Mahler recasts the whole passage and in the process takes Obi an octave above the original and calls for f'''

8.3.2 Oboe Reinforcing Flute and Clarinet

Many of Mahler's Retuschen are designed to make the woodwind more penetrating, so that they balance with the strings in loudness. To achieve this, he sometimes takes the oboes away from a part which is already adequately represented without them and reinforces the flute part:

Beethoven V/3, P.30/1; 181 (3rd crotchet) - 183: Obi joins Fll and the E-flat clarinet. Mahler wants to make this theme dominate the whole texture, so he also reduces the strings to mf.

Schubert IX/1, P.47/8/9; 303-11: Obl/2 join Fll/2 from the second note. All Ww doubled from 303, so they have a chance of being heard through the strings. In P.47 the E-flat clarinet was also involved here, reinforcing Fll.

Schubert IX/3, P.48/9; 49-50: Obl reinforces Fll.

In Schumann, where Cll/2 are often written an octave below Obl/2, Mahler, in reinforcing Fll/2 by Obl/2 raises the original parts of Cll/2 an octave to replace Obl/2:

Schumann IV/1, P.56/7: 291-6.

On rare occasions, Beethoven does not employ the oboes in thematic material in tutti passages. Mahler in writing oboe parts in these places causes them to reinforce the clarinets:

Beethoven III/1, P.26: 113-6.

Beethoven III/4, P.26; 227-230 & 235-8: Here Mahler destroys Beethoven's plan for the alternation of clarinet and oboe in the two phrases of the theme; but in fairness
8.3.3 Removal of Oboe

By far the most common of Mahler's oboe Retuschen is to remove the instrument altogether. He does this in soft passages to prevent it protruding from the texture. Some typical examples where Mahler removes reinforcements, leaving behind a lighter texture in the wind without changing the voice leading are:

Schubert IX/1, P.48/9; 368-72: Obl/2 and Hr1/2 removed, and dynamics are changed to ppp, leaving Cl1/2 with the same notes as the original part of Obl/2.

Schubert IX/2, P.48/9; 120-3: Obl/2 removed, leaving F12 and Cl1 with the same notes. Mahler's dynamics are here pp.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.50/1/2; 8-10: The removal of Obl/2 clarifies the upper woodwind texture considerably.

Smetana, Bartered Bride Overture, P.58/9 390-1: Obl/2 removed, leaving Cl1 with the same notes.

Sometimes there are no other instruments holding exactly the same notes as those removed from the oboes:

Beethoven, Egmont Overture, P.11; 287-92: Obl/2 removed to preserve the hush of the transition. No harmonies are changed, though the disposition of the voices is altered in the process.

Beethoven V/3, P.30/1; 213 - 217 (first note). By this removal, the third of the chords of 214 & 216 is not sustained in the accompaniment.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.51/2; 282: Obl removed so as not to obscure the F11 and Cl1 part. The notes are still present in Fg1, two octaves lower.

Sometimes Mahler reduced the dynamics of the oboe parts to ppp, only resorting to removal when this proved inadequate.

Beethoven III/1, P.26: 342-3, 346-7 & 350-1.

Sometimes Mahler removes the oboes, not only to get a softer texture,
Schubert IX/2, P.48/9; 356: Ob1/2 removed to prepare for entry of Ob1 in b.357.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.51/2 199-200: Ob1/2 removed to prepare for their entry in b.201.

Schumann IV/4, P.56/7; 169 & 171: Ob1/2 removed from the first half of each bar to emphasise the dynamic change and add colour to the sforzando.

8.4 Clarinet

8.4.1 Change of Tessitura of Clarinet

The compass of the clarinet in Beethoven’s symphonies extends to the written e''', and Mahler rarely needs to exceed this in order to redeploy the instrument in his Retuschen. The clarinets in classical works are most commonly written below or at the same pitch as the oboes, and only rarely above; but Mahler, when he wants to increase the penetrating tone of the woodwind, frequently raises the octave of the clarinets so that they play at the top of the stave with the flutes. This gives the texture a new brilliance. A good example is:

Beethoven, Egmont Overture, P.11; 9-11: C1l/2 8va putting them in unison with Fl1/2 and Ob1/2 in bars 10-1. C1l/2 original assigned to Tr1/2.

Sometimes Mahler makes C1l/2 reinforce Fl1/2 only:

Beethoven, Leonore II, P.13: 462-477. (Ww doubled.)


Schubert IX/1, P.48/9; 90-4: C1l/2 join Fl1/2, leaving Ob1/2 an octave lower.

Sometimes the flutes are already in a higher octave and Mahler’s change puts the clarinets in unison with the oboes:

Beethoven, Weihe des Hauses, P.17/8: 217 - 221 (1st note) &

8.3.3 - Mahler’s Treatment of Woodwind
Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.5; 110 - 112 (1st note): Cll/2 original is taken over by Hr3/4. This thickens the harmonic texture of the passage considerably.

Schumann I/1, P.53/4; 396 (last note) - 403 (first note): The horns already fill in the gap between the high woodwind and the bassoons, and the raising of Cll/2 an octave removes some of the original thickness.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.52 only; 197-8: In the second half of these bars, Mahler adds Cll/2 in octaves to reinforce Fl1/2 and Ob1/2. Together with the reinforcement of this motif by Vn2, these changes make the second half of the bar higher in intensity than the first.

In the cases quoted so far, the bassoons have a different line from the rest of the woodwind; but, when the original score has the whole woodwind section playing in octaves, Mahler's changes sometimes have the effect of leaving a two octave gap between the upper woodwind and the bassoons:

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.50/1/2: 35 (last note) - 36.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.51/2: 147 & 149.

Schumann IV/1, P.56/7; 120 (last note) - 124: Cll 8va to reinforce Fl1, rather than Ob2 as in Schumann's original.

Schumann IV/1, P.56/7; 313-32: Cll-4 8va. In this passage, Fl1/2 are already written high and Mahler reinforces Ob1/2 and Vn1.

To avoid this, Mahler fills in the gap with brass tone:

Beethoven III/2, P.26; 130-4: Cll-4 8va, Hr3/Cr4 replace Cl until the first quaver of 134.

Schubert IX/1, P.48/9; 228 - 240 (1st note): Cll/2 join Fl1/2, and the gap between this and the bassoons is filled by Tr3/4.

Beethoven VII, with horns and clarinets in A, gives Mahler the opportunity to raise Cll/2 an octave without always leaving a gaping hole:

Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5: 432-446.
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Mahler, using his revised clarinet parts to give extra penetration to the woodwind lines, reinforces the flutes:

Beethoven, Leonore II, P.13; 151: Cl1/2 reinforce Fl1/2.

Beethoven V/4, P.30/1; 245, 247 & 248: Cl1/2 reinforce Fl1/2 in second half of each bar, reinforcing Ob1/2 in 249, so as to lead back gracefully to their original part.

8.4.3 Clarinet Reinforcing Oboe

Sometimes Mahler adds notes to the clarinet parts to reinforce oboes:

Beethoven V/4, P.30/1: 48-9.
Beethoven VI/4, P.32; 73 & 75: Cl1 reinforces Ob2.
Beethoven IX/4, P.40: 320 (last note) - 330 & 541-94.
Schumann I/1, P.53/4: 117 (last note) - 119 (third note).

For further examples of this See Ch.21.2.2.

8.4.4 Clarinet Reinforcing Bassoon

The only instance in the available sources of clarinets reinforcing bassoon occurs in b.190-1 of Beethoven V/I, P.30/1, where Mahler uses Cl1/2 to reinforce Fg1/2.

8.4.5 Clarinet Reinforcing Viola

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.50/1/2; 21-2: This is a rare case of Mahler using clarinets to reinforce the violas.

8.4.6 Removal of Clarinet

Because of its wide dynamic and pitch range, the clarinet is Mahler’s workhorse and only rarely does he remove it in order to thin out the
8.5 Bassoon

8.5.1 High Notes of Bassoon

As far as Beethoven was concerned, the top note of the bassoon was a', although he does not write above g' in his Seventh Symphony. Mahler has no problem with this limitation, except in the Ninth Symphony where he frequently extends the range of the bassoon. Mahler also extends the range in other works to avoid sudden discontinuities in the melodic line:

Mozart, K.550/2, P.44; 58, 60 & 108: Mahler introduces a'-flat and b'-flat.

Schumann IV/4, P.56/7; 82: Mahler allows Fgl to enter in an exposed passage on b', but this is reinforced by Va, Vc and Hr1/2.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.51/2; 157/8: Mahler completes the line of Fgl so that it continues to reinforce Vc, even where this involves a c''-flat.

Schubert IX/1, P.48/9; 74-5: Mahler goes further and assigns c'' to Fgl. Mahler here transposes Schubert's original an octave higher; but since it is reinforced by Tr3/4 it is not an exposed passage.

8.5.2 Low Notes of Bassoon

Since the middle of the eighteenth century, the bottom note of the bassoon has been B''-flat, though at the time of Beethoven, there were two notes unavailable in the lowest octave. These were B' and C'-sharp. It is for this reason that Beethoven avoids C'-sharp in
the instrument was fully chromatic and he naturally gave the second bassoon C'-sharp. This was normal procedure.

8.5.3 Bassoon Reinforcing the Bassline

Because of its compass, the natural instruments for the bassoon to reinforce are the viola and the cello, and Mahler often uses it so in places where an important and rapidly moving bass line in the strings is otherwise in danger of being drowned by chords in the wind:


Beethoven III/1, P.26: 362-5.

Beethoven V/2, P.29/30/1: 114-21. Mahler has also added Va.

Beethoven V/4, P.30/1; 28-33: Fg1/2 join Cfg and Vc/Cb.

These are all well known troublesome passages; but Mahler goes further in reinforcing the bass line in the Seventh Symphony:

Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5; 97 (last note) - 100: Fg3/4 reinforce the basses in their hardly ever heard canonic response. Mahler does not make his task any easier by doubling C11/2 and reinforcing Fg1/2 by Hr3/4, thereby emphasising the melody of Vn1.

Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5; 165 (last two notes) - 170 & 377 (last two notes) - 383 (1st note): Mahler here seeks to make more evident the canon between the violins and the basses which is rarely observed due to the heavy reinforcement of the violins in three octaves by all the woodwind.

In three cases, Mahler reinforced a basso ostinato by the bassoons in order to keep it in the foreground. In all these cases the passage occurs just before the Coda, or the Recapitulation where the harmonic tension is approaching a climax:

Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5; 409-22: Mahler tried many alternatives in order to keep the ostinato figure in the foreground. See Ch.25.2.5.

8.5.2 - Mahler's Treatment of Woodwind
8.5.4 Bassoon Reinforcing Cello

Not involving a bass line, in Schumann's Manfred Overture, P.50/1/2, Mahler sought to make the cello arpeggios more audible in b.19 by adding Fg1/2.

8.5.5 Introduction of Third Bassoon / Contrabassoon

In the scores of his early revisions of Coriolan Overture, P.4, and Beethoven VII, P.33, Mahler occasionally indicates parts for a contrabassoon. In Coriolan the contrabassoon also plays Fg3. The contrabassoon part of Beethoven IX was also expanded. This is typical of Mahler's Hamburg Retuschen and is discussed in the chapters on the respective works.

8.5.6 Removal of Bassoon

Mahler sometimes removes the bassoon from pianissimo passages where it reinforces the basses.

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.4/5: 310.

Beethoven II/1, P.24: 180 (second note) & 181.

Beethoven IX/1, P.40: 513-6.

Schumann I/4, P.53/4; 149-50, 153-4 & 157-8. Mahler has marked St ppp.

Smetana, Bartered Bride Overture, P.58/59; 128-9: St again marked ppp by Mahler.

In all these cases, Mahler must have wanted the strings to play so softly that the bassoons were unable to do anything but protrude.
out a texture which he wants played very softly and which he considers
to be over burdened with detail. A typical example is:

Schumann I/4, P.53/4; 21-4 and 192-5: Mahler also removes
Cl1/2 and marks the remaining instruments pp.
Chapter 9

The E-flat Clarinet

This chapter summarises information about Mahler's use of the E-flat clarinet in his instrumental Retuschen. Greater detail about the specific parts which Mahler supplied to be played in various compositions is given in the chapters on individual works.

9.1 The E-flat Clarinet in the Symphonic Repertoire

The first use of the E-flat clarinet in symphonic music was by Berlioz in his Symphonie fantastique of 1830. In his Traité d'instrumentation et d'orchestration he writes:

The small clarinet in E-flat has piercing sounds which it is easy to make sound vile from the A above the stave. Therefore it has been used in a modern symphony to parody, to debase and, if you will excuse the expression, to degrade a melody; since the dramatic sense of the work obliges this strange transformation. <1>

In the Symphonie fantastique, to which Berlioz refers above, the E-flat instrument is called for only in the finale, where it is played by the first player. Although Berlioz only has one section where it is employed soloistically <2> he uses the E-flat clarinet to the end of the work, often doubled at the octave by the piccolo.

Liszt employed the E-flat clarinet in Mazeppa, but only as a tutti instrument, a process which also led to its inclusion in many scores.
excellent arrangement of Weber's *Invitation to the Dance*.

Like Liszt, Strauss also makes hardly any use of the E-flat clarinet for solo work. The instrument appears, for instance, only as a tutti instrument in *Eine Alpensinfonie* and *Ein Heldenleben*. In *Till Eulenspiegel's lustige Streiche*, Strauss uses the D clarinet and, in his revision of Berlioz's treatise, writes that:

> The clarinet in D is little used, though it should be more so; its sound is pure and possesses a considerable pungency, and could thus be turned to excellent account on many occasions... I myself have put it to good use as a comedian in my *Till Eulenspiegel*. It has here an uncouth, droll comicality. (derb-drollingen Komik) <3

Here Strauss quotes bars 46-50 of the work and the passage that begins 17 bars before the *Epilogue*, and it is interesting that Herman Martonne relates how Mahler, when rehearsing the New York Philharmonic Orchestra, replaced the D clarinet in this last-mentioned passage by the B-flat clarinet, requiring the written c''', presumably to achieve a more strained sound on the extreme high notes than that produced by the D clarinet. <4

The use of the E-flat clarinet for the portrayal of the grotesque or the vulgar finds a place in Mahler's symphonies. A characteristic example of this occurs in b.118-9 of the third movement of the First Symphony. Mahler employs the E-flat clarinet in a sardonic vein "mit Humor" in b.52-6 of the Scherzo of his Second Symphony; and bars 445-55 of the third movement of the Ninth Symphony provide further evidence of his parodistic use of the E-flat clarinet. These examples are representative of Mahler's employment of the instrument in satirical or humoristic situations; but he uses it elsewhere to give a reliably penetrating high pitch to the woodwind section, particularly in strengthening the flutes, e.g. Mahler IX/3, b.583-7; but, unlike the
routine fashion, Mahler's mature use of the E-flat clarinet is sparing. A glance at the E-flat clarinet parts of Das Lied von der Erde and Symphony IX, both works contemporaneous with Mahler's concert activities in New York, reveals this clearly.

9.2 Mahler's use of the E-flat clarinet in his Retuschen

In at least nine works from his orchestral repertoire Mahler added a part for E-flat clarinet to the complement already required by the composers. Definite evidence of this exists in Beethoven Symphonies III, V, VI, VII and IX, Coriolan and Weihe des Hauses Overtures, Schubert IX and the Prelude to the first act of Wagner's Die Meistersinger.

Although Mahler calls for the D clarinet in the finale of his Sixth Symphony, and this out of choice for colour rather than convenience, since up to that point in the work he had used the E-flat instrument only, his additions of a high clarinet to other composers' works concern the E-flat clarinet exclusively, indicating that for this application he intended to use the clarinet with the most penetrating sound.

This deduction can also be made from a consideration of the pitch range of Mahler's E-flat clarinet parts in his Retuschen, which is not wide. See Ex.9.1. for the written pitches. The bracketed pitch ranges are employed only rarely.
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9.3 Extant E-flat Clarinet Parts

The E-flat clarinet parts of Beethoven III, P.27, Weihe des Hauses Overture, P.19, and Meistersinger Overture, P.60B, are the only ones which are available for study at present. The Meistersinger part is in the U.E. Archive, together with other woodwind parts for the Prelude; while the parts for Die Weihe des Hauses and Beethoven III have been separated from the other orchestral parts with which they were used.

The part for Die Weihe des Hauses is in the Musiksammlung of the Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, and that for the Eroica is in private hands in Vienna, having been purchased in 1985 at Sothebys. <5>

These three parts are all handwritten by Mahler on similar paper and all bear the same stamp GUSTAV MAHLER / WIEN. They are all in Mahler’s mature music script and handwriting style, and the inclusion of other instrumental cues shows that they have all been copied from scores. Blue-black ink was used for everything except for the rehearsal letters and numbers which match the other extant orchestral parts. These are written in blue pencil.

The part for Beethoven III appears to have been copied out in one sitting, without any subsequent alterations by Mahler. Several missing accidentals were supplied in another hand, probably by a player. The part for Die Weihe des Hauses has a few trivial copying errors which were rectified subsequently, plus the addition of a note in b.263. Mahler later added a whole section to the part for Die Meistersinger Prelude in b.41-58; and, instead of finishing at b.187 as originally intended, the E-flat clarinet continues through to the end.
Vienna. Scores for the Beethoven and Wagner works are not to be found at present, so there is no means of checking this; but the lack of significant changes in the parts and the fact that they were written after the extensive orientation numbers had been decided supports this view.

9.4 Mahler's Early E-flat Clarinet Retuschen

It is unlikely that E-flat clarinet parts from Mahler's time in Budapest and Hamburg will emerge, although it would be interesting to have access to them, at least for the purpose of clarifying details of Mahler's practice at that time. The parts which we know about from scores are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Symphony</th>
<th>Match Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>P.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>P.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>P.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>P.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>P.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these scores, the E-flat clarinet is used to strengthen the upper woodwind voices in the absence of a complete doubling complement of players, and consequently the instrument is employed much of the time.

9.5 Mahler's Later E-flat Clarinet Retuschen

From his time in Vienna onwards when Mahler had free access to doubling players, the notes in the E-flat clarinet parts become more sparing. The parts concerned are:
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The lack of indications in the later scores of Beethoven VII, P.34, Beethoven IX, P.40, Coriolan Overture, P.5, and Schubert IX, P.48 can probably be taken to imply that Mahler had abandoned the instrument in those works.

9.6 Mahler's E-flat Clarinet Notation

Unlike his habit when adding an extra pair of horns, Mahler did not write the notes for the added E-flat clarinet parts into the top or bottom margins of his scores; and this fact, and the missing accidentals in the Beethoven III part, suggest strongly that Mahler wrote the notes for the E-flat clarinet straight into the parts.

In the scores the clearest sign that we find for the use of the instrument is the indication "Es-clar" at the start and an "x" at the end of a passage, placed above the Flute stave. Beethoven V, P.30, has this in b.181-95 of the Scherzo and it is also to be found in the Weihe des Hauses Overture, P.17. The Budapest score of Beethoven V, P.29, has x Es in b.27 of the third movement.

Often Mahler uses a circle with a horizontal line through it to indicate the entry of the E-flat Clarinet. This sign is found in Beethoven VII, P.33, Beethoven IX, P.39, Coriolan Overture, P.4, and Schubert IX, P.47, all of which represent early versions of Mahler's Retuschen. The disposition of this sign could lead the reader to assume that it indicates woodwind doublings; but clear evidence that it represents the E-flat clarinet is found, notably in the Budapest score.
where the sign is usually found written over the flute part in such a
way that it clearly means a reinforcement of Fll only. Also in this
score, in b.207 of the Trio the sign is found above Ob1 for four bars
with an arrow pointing up to Fll at the second note of b.211. The sign
which corresponds to the horizontal circle, and which indicates the
ending of an E-flat clarinet reinforcement is the plus sign; but Mahler
does not always employ this.

9.7 The E-flat Clarinet in Beethoven III

According to La Grange, the rehearsals for Mahler’s first concert as
conductor of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra on 6 Nov 1898 provoked
an anonymous attack in the Deutsche Zeitung two days before the concert
in which, among other things, the writer attacked Mahler for employing
the E-flat clarinet in Beethoven III and Coriolan Overture, causing him
to abandon his intention to employ it. <7> But Mahler clearly
reintroduced the instrument, if not in Vienna, at least in New York, as
proved by the testimony of the bassoonist Benjamin Kohon, discussed
below.

The only currently available score of Beethoven III, P.25, which was
used by Mahler was bought in Budapest. It is not copiously marked and
only one instance of the participation of the E-flat clarinet is
indicated. This is in the second movement where it reinforces Fll from
the second half of b.167 for seven notes and effects a great
improvement in the audibility of the main line. The recent
availability of the actual part, P.27, which Mahler used in association
with a score which has disappeared, has enabled this and many other
is reproduced here as Ex.22.3. According to the evidence of P.27, Mahler uses the E-flat clarinet mainly to reinforce F11. An exception is to be found in bars 146-9 of the slow movement where F12 is reinforced.

In reading P.27 one may be surprised by the small number of entries actually written for the instrument, and the discreetness of its contribution. In bars 37-9 of the first movement Mahler uses it for five notes only and with only a *forte* dynamic marking. Similar restraint is shown in bars 96-101 of the slow movement where it should be noted firstly that Mahler has not used the E-flat clarinet in the similar passage at bar 76 and, secondly, that the dynamics are *p cresc f*.

Another surprise is that Mahler sometimes uses the instrument to reinforce F11 in a situation where both flute parts are of equal importance. This happens in the first movement at bars 245-6 and 276-80. In the latter case the fact that the notes of Ob2 have also been changed from e to f makes it clear that Mahler wished to minimise the semitone clash in the upper voices.

Mahler often uses the instrument as a last resort to clarify Beethoven's texture without having to divert instruments which are already gainfully employed. To the case in the slow movement, referred to above, can be added b.360 and b.363 in the first movement, and the three note entry in b.392-3 of the finale.

In the taped interview mentioned above, Benjamin Kohon pointed out that Mahler in his New York performances used the E-flat clarinet in the section of the *Finale* which begins at b.211; although how Mahler used it at this juncture is not made clear by Kohon. On the tape Kohon sings
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"He added an E-flat clarinet to that to give it a shrill sound. He said that was a Hungarian tune and it should sound gypsy-like." <8>

On its own, this evidence would lead one to assume that Mahler reinforced F12 with the E-flat clarinet; but in fact P.27 clearly shows that he used the instrument to reinforce the scales of F11 in bars 213, 221, 241 and 245. It is interesting that, in contrast to what Kohon implies, Mahler does not use the E-flat clarinet to bring out the Verbunkos melody, but the countermelodic interjections which Beethoven considered significant enough to require the attention of the first flute, when he entrusted the main melody to the second player. Mahler has already dealt with both flute parts by adding the auxiliary players, yet further emphasises the countermelody with the E-flat clarinet.

9.8 The E-flat Clarinet in Beethoven V

The use of the E-flat clarinet in Beethoven V was noted by Viktor von Herzfeld in writing about Mahler's Budapest performance of 24 Feb 1890 <9> and the Budapest score, P.29, has several passages in all four movements marked for reinforcement by the instrument.

The indications are not so numerous in the later score P.30, and the entry of the E-flat clarinet in bars 181-96 of the third movement, reinforcing F11, is written into the part of C14. It could be inferred from this that Mahler had refined his later reading to the extent that an additional player was not required exclusively for the E-flat instrument. The New York critics do not mention the E-flat clarinet in connection with this work.
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9.9 The E-flat Clarinet in Beethoven VI

No orchestral materials of Beethoven VI are available for study and the only known score is the early and undoubtedly superseded version dating from Mahler's Budapest and Hamburg years, P.32. In this score, the E-flat clarinet is indicated by the circle with a horizontal line and used to reinforce F11, and in the fourth movement we find the indication *zu 2 mit Es-clar* in b.82, where the piccolo first enters.

9.10 The E-flat Clarinet in Beethoven VII

In the *Budapest* score, P.33, the participation of the E-flat clarinet is indicated by the circle with a horizontal line and the plus sign. The part mainly reinforces F11. The later score, P.34, has no indications for the instrument.

9.11 The E-flat Clarinet in Beethoven IX

Mahler's early score of Beethoven IX, P.39, contains extensive indications of use of the E-flat clarinet. In the first and second movements, the circle with a horizontal line through it and the plus sign are used to denote doubling of F11 or Ob1; and its use is also indicated by *Es cl*. There is often no mark to show how long the reinforcement is to continue, and the circle and plus signs are not
1st mvt, 402, 404 & 406: Fl1 reinforced.

1st mvt, 488-92: Two E-flat clarinets are called for: Eb-C1 reinforces Fl1 which is already doubled, and Eb-C12 reinforces Ob1 and C11. Although the score is far from clear, it appears that Ob1 and C11 are already tripled. The later score, P.40, uses four of each of Beethoven's original instruments in this episode.

4th mvt, 0-25? reinforcing Fl1 in the Schreckensfanfaren; 164-20? in the fortissimo statement of the Freude theme; 643-6? at the words "Ueber Sternen muss er wohnen".

There are no indications for the instrument in the later score, P.40, and no part for it is known to exist.

9.12 The E-flat Clarinet in Coriolan Overture

Mahler used the E-flat clarinet only in his early version of this work, P.4. It is indicated by the circle with a horizontal line through it and the plus sign, and by Es-Clar in b.88. It was used to reinforce Fl1 or Ob1. Although the marks are extensive, there is often no specification of where the reinforcement is to cease.

9.13 The E-flat Clarinet in the Weihe des Hauses Overture

The part, P.19, agrees with the score, P.17; but whereas the score only indicates where the instrument is to play, the part shows that the instrument reinforces Fl1 exclusively. The part is reproduced as Ex.20.1.

As in other examples, Mahler's reinforcement of Fl1 has been carefully thought out. Only in one passage is it surprising that he does not use
chosen instead to reinforce the flutes by Vnl. <10>

9.14 The E-flat Clarinet in Schubert IX

Mahler used the E-flat clarinet only in the Hamburg score of this work, P.47. The circle with a horizontal line through it and the plus sign are the usual indications, though in b.225 of the Finale Mahler also writes *Es-clarinett*. The instrument reinforces Fl1 or Ob1, and there are no woodwind doublings in the score.

9.15 The E-flat Clarinet in Die Meistersinger Prelude

The available orchestral parts for the *Meistersinger* Prelude are incomplete, so any deductions about their use are more speculative than those made in the above discussion of the Beethoven works.

It would appear that Mahler used four clarinet players in the *Meistersinger* Prelude: two for Cl1, one for Cl2 and the fourth player for the E-flat clarinet part. From the evidence of the orchestral part written out by Mahler, P.60B, which is reproduced as Ex.36.1, we can see that most of the time the original E-flat clarinet part reinforces Fl1; but that in the passages which were added later, the instrument reinforces Ob1, necessitating the use of lower notes than Mahler normally required in his other E-flat clarinet parts.
9.16 Conclusions

Many of Mahler’s Retuschen involve redressing the balance between wind and strings in classical works which at their creation had been played in smaller halls, with less refined sounding wind instruments and with smaller string sections than Mahler was used to.

The mature use by Mahler of the E-flat clarinet, in the Beethoven works generally to strengthen the highest flute part, could be interpreted in two ways. On one hand it could be seen as a further intensification of his attempt to highlight the wind instruments against the rich string textures of the period, and thus to re-create the sound which he imagined the composers intended: and on the other, this feature of Mahler’s Retuschen could be viewed as Mahler adapting the sound of classical works to his own aesthetic sound ideal. But the fact that Mahler wrote out his E-flat clarinet parts directly from the score suggests that his employment of the instrument was to intensify the work which he had already sought to achieve by means of his other modifications and doublings of the wind parts, and supports the first interpretation. Had Mahler really intended to bring Beethoven’s scoring in line with his own sound world he would surely have incorporated the E-flat clarinet at an earlier stage of his mature revisions of Beethoven’s works and would probably have employed it less sparingly, following the example of his own symphonies, each of which supports the use of the instrument as an essential colour.

The most extensive work for which we have access to Mahler’s E-flat clarinet part is Beethoven III and throughout the whole symphony his use of the instrument can reasonably be described as restrained. At no
by its sound, or do other than reinforce other woodwind. This fact supports the view that critics' complaints about its employment were based on seeing the instrument on the platform and on the reports of players, rather than hearing it; for it is doubtful whether its use would otherwise have been detected.
Chapter 10

Mahler's Treatment of Brass

Mahler's brass parts are among the most audible of his instrumental
Retuschen, and a discussion of those which involve several different
brass instruments is here followed by sections on the treatment of the
individual instruments. The reader is referred to the chapters on the
works concerned for further details of the passages quoted. Unless
otherwise stated, pitches referred to are written pitches.

10.1 Wagner's Recommendations

Wagner deals with the problem of the restricted scale of the natural
trumpet and horn in his study on Beethoven's Ninth Symphony and
recommends for these instruments:

- downward transposition of the second part by an octave to
  avoid sudden unisons in parts which are mostly an octave
  apart and large jumps in the second part, <1>

- reduction of dynamics to avoid sudden changes in texture
  due to modulation of the music into tonalities where the
  natural instruments are powerless to contribute, <2>

- addition of notes in some cases of the last-mentioned,
  <3>

- addition of notes to reinforce woodwind, <4> and

- filling in of notes where the original obscures the true
  rhythm of the passage. <5>

These remarks form the starting point for Mahler's procedures.
10.2 Mahler's General Treatment of Brass

10.2.1 Alteration of Dynamics

Today most brass players are aware of the problem of balancing their parts with the rest of the orchestra and automatically moderate their tone where required; but it was not always so, as the writings of Weingartner and Strauss confirm. <6> Like these conductors, Mahler was in the habit of writing supplementary dynamic nuances in his orchestral parts to inform the players of the required dynamic proportions.

It is interesting to compare the instructions of Mahler and Strauss in the brass dynamics at the beginning of the Finale of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony. See Ex.23.5. Whereas Strauss inserts ffp cresc in the brass and timpani parts in the long notes of bars 6, 8 and 10 with f on the following quavers, Mahler leaves these long notes forte in the horns and trumpets, using fp to moderate the trombones and timpani, and beginning the quavers piano with a crescendo through to the next long note. Mahler also has these crescendi in the strings and, from the upbeat to b.13, requires all the strings to play fff with the brass moderated to mf. Strauss on the other hand puts no extra dynamics in the strings and encourages the brass and timpani to play ff from the upbeat to b.13.

More often than not the correct brass balance can be achieved by the insertion of a simple mf or p in the part and these are so common and trivial as to warrant no comment; but several examples of other dynamic changes in the brass are worthy of special mention:

Beethoven II/1, P.24; 334-40: In b.334 Mahler notates a crescendo for the whole orchestra, arriving fff in b.336.
Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.5; 34: Hrl-4, Trl/2 & Pk have a diminuendo, arriving mf for the detached quavers of b.35. At the end of the passage Mahler adds a crescendo in b.38-9.

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.5; 84-91: Mahler prescribes a moderation of Beethoven's uniform ff for Trl/2 to a general level of f with sf on each dotted minim. This keeps the trumpets out of the way of the melodic movement while emphasizing the two bar periodic structure.

Beethoven, Egmont Overture, P.11; 317-22 & 323-8: Mahler moderates Trl/2 & Pk to mf, allowing them to make a crescendo in the quavers with climax in b.321 and then a two bar diminuendo. This is now a conventional interpretation, and it may indeed have been inherited by Mahler from a previous generation.

Beethoven, Leonore II, P.13; 118-25: Mahler inserts ffp in Psl-3 and fp in Trl/2 on the long notes. The rhythmic motifs played by Trl/2 in b.122 & 124 are allowed to ring out f, while the moderations of the long notes prevent the trumpets from drowning the horns and violins.

Beethoven, Leonore III, P.14; 65: Beethoven introduces Trl/2 & Psl-3 with a uniform ff. Mahler moderates the force of their entry to piano with a crescendo of four bars up to the ff statement of the Allegro theme. This, together with other devices which he uses, is an effective means of grading the crescendo; but one which makes the entry of the brass less gaunt and Beethovenian.

Mozart, K.551/1, P.45; 39 et seq: Mahler moderates the volume Trl/2 and Hrl/2 to piano but inserts accents (*) on each note to ensure that they are nevertheless contributing to the rhythmic structure.

Smetana, Bartered Bride Overture, P.58/9; 162-3: Mahler removes the accents in Psl-3 to bring variety into the otherwise heavily accented texture.

10.2.2 Natural versus Valve Instruments

In adapting natural brass parts for instruments with valves, Mahler follows Wagner's advice to avoid large leaps and sudden unisons where the composer did not have available to him the necessary notes to allow horns and trumpets to play in octaves. This is carefully done and sometimes the leaps are deliberately left unchanged. Other Retuschen in the horn and trumpet parts are have the purpose of continuing a
natural instruments, or of reinforcing another instrument in order to remedy a defective balance. In all these cases Mahler prefers that the horns and trumpets contribute to the texture and therefore to the intensity of the tone colours, even though the actual notes employed may create anachronistic timbres.

Beethoven VII/4, P.34/5; 113: Beethoven was obliged to exclude Hr1/2, Tr1/2 & Pk, none of which could play a note which fitted the G-sharp major chord. Coming, as it does, in the middle of a powerful tutti, this bar can sound extremely awkward with the sudden loss of the brass and timpani; and Mahler, in common with Weingartner and others, fills in with notes not available to Beethoven.

Schumann I/1, P.53/4; 0-2: The famous original opening of Schumann’s First Symphony, which required stopped tones from the horns and is unplayable on the natural trumpet. It was therefore rewritten by Schumann a third higher, but restored in Mahler’s reading.

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.5; 286-9: Mahler was fastidious in the changes which he made: in b.286 he rewrites Tr1/2 to reinforce Vnl one and two octaves lower; but in bars 288-9 he prefers to leave Beethoven’s original Cs and relies on changes to the horns to strengthen the leading voice. This not only avoids the monotony of the notes available to Beethoven, but also grades the diminuendo which begins in b.286 by means of a gradual change of colour as well as a reduction in dynamic force. See Ex.16.3.

10.2.3 Brass Reinforcing Brass

In passages where the natural instruments are prevented from joining in the melody, Mahler will sometimes rewrite the parts to allow their participation, even where no increase in clarity is called for:

Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5; 441 (last 2 notes) - 446 (first note): Tr1/2 reinforce Hr1/2. Hr3/4 support this by reinforcing Fgl/2.

Sometimes Schumann’s brass writing is clarified by Mahler by reinforcing horn parts by other brass instruments:

Schumann I/4, P.53/4; 317-8 & 321-2: Schumann allocates the main melody to Fgl/2 and Hr3/4. Mahler, deleting Schumann’s
removal of the inessential notes is a fundamental feature of this Retusche.

Schumann III/5; 287-96: Tr1/2 abandon the original in favour of reinforcing Ps1 and then reinforce Hr1-4 for the whole of the following fanfare.

Schumann III/5; 315-20: In b.315-7, Ps1/2 reinforce Hr3/4 and, in b.317-320, Tr1/2 reinforce Hr1/2. In bars 317-8, Ps3 reinforces Cb and Fg1/2. These changes bring out the imitations of the part writing in a unified colour and lead much more convincingly to the final page of the work.

10.2.4 Substitution of Instruments

When, because of a practical difficulty, a composer writes an incomplete part for an instrument, Mahler sometimes substitutes a different instrument:

Schumann I/4, P.53/4; 142-8: In Schumann's original, Ps1/2 reinforce the upper strings. The passage is too high for Ps1 who drop down an octave. In Mahler's version, the high notes are played by Tr2, imparting continuity to the line.

Beethoven IX/4, P.39/40; 654 - 622 (1st half): Beethoven apparently considered the first two notes too high for Ps1 and gave them to Tr2. However, Tr2 soon gets into difficulties with the limitations of the natural scale. In P.39 Mahler completed the scale in Tr2 and left Ps1 alone. Later he omitted Ps1, with consequent improvement.

10.2.5 Brass Reinforcing Strings and Woodwind

The use of the brass to remedy defects of balance caused by lack of power in the woodwind or strings is often criticised as a vulgar expedient, and most of Mahler's Retuschen which fall into this category need care in their execution if they are not to sound crass:

Mozart K.551/4, P.45; 389-400: Despite his general sensitivity to Mozart's textures, Mahler's addition of Hr1/2 to the four note tag of the finale to bring out every entry of this theme is a radical departure from Mozart's original. Tr1/2 complete this in b.400-3. Despite the seeming vulgarity of this change, it is difficult not to respond positively to it when heard as the crowning glory of the fugal finale.

10.2.3 - Mahler's Treatment of Brass
to participate and builds up the climax of the *Finale* powerfully. See Ex.22.19.

Beethoven V/4, P.30/1; 317-9: Mahler at one time had Hr3/4 double Fg1-4 which he had already reinforced by Vc. Indications in the score and parts shows that Mahler at least contemplated using Ps1-3. Karpath describes how, at his performance in Vienna of 5 Nov 1899, Mahler added horns to the bassoons at this point and it was most likely the slow decay of the preceding chords in the Musikverein which caused Mahler to experiment by adding cellos, horns and trombones. <7> The parts show many alterations, so that it is not clear what combination of instruments was employed at what time; but the horns and trombones were eventually abandoned.

Beethoven IX/4, P.40; 187-202: This is perhaps the passage giving the most problems of balance in all the Beethoven symphonies, and Mahler's additions in the horns and trumpets are extensive and highly successful.

Schubert IX/1, P.48; 608-12: Tr3/4 and Hr3/4 join Trl/2 and, with doubled wind and a powerful string section, this need not sound worse than extremely powerful. When the opening theme of the movement returns in bar 662, Mahler again employs all the trumpets and horns with more controversial results. See Ch.29.

Schumann I/1, P.53/4; 281-9: Mahler reinforces the woodwind with horns and trumpets and successfully brings out the thematic content. See Ch.31.4.

### 10.2.6 Exchange of Brass Parts

In two passages in the first movement of Beethoven VII, Mahler reassigns prominent horn melodies to the trumpets:

Beethoven VII, P.34/5; 89-96: The high notes of the horn parts may have been the cause of Mahler exchanging the notes of Trl/2 with those of Hrl/2; though at the end of the movement he adds Trl/2 to Hrl/2 without redeploying the horns. It is difficult to understand what this change achieved, except perhaps a more certain execution.

Beethoven VII, P.34/5; 399: Trl/2 take over the part of Hrl/2, and a more certain execution was more definitely the cause of this change. It is an entry which, because of its extreme height and the *pp* dynamic, is often insecure. Trumpets can manage the high notes with greater ease, though whether they would have been quiet enough for Mahler is open to doubt.
The selective removal of brass parts often brings more clarity to a passage than any addition would.

Beethoven V/2, P.30/1; 114-123: These bars are specifically discussed by Wagner, <8> who recommends moderating the tone of Trl/2, since Beethoven is only able to employ them sporadically. Mahler, by his deletion of Trl/2, avoids their entering only where coincidentally convenient and underlines the structure by the remaining entries at the beginning and end of the passage.

Schubert IX/3, P.48/9; 193: The deletion of Trl/2, Psl-3 and Pk is at first sight surprising; but it is probably designed to prevent the reverberation of the chords from covering the oboe and clarinet parts which follow.

Schumann II/1, 1-23: In the opening of this work it is notoriously difficult to obtain a real pianissimo with horns, trumpets and trombone all playing. In b.1-23, Mahler deletes Hrl except for the echoes of bars 13-4, and deletes Psl until bar 19. Despite the large difference this represents on paper, it is doubtful whether many listeners would notice anything other than an exceptionally magical start to the work.

Schumann IV/4, P.56/7; 21-4 & 212 - 219 (third note): Mahler deletes Trl/2, Psl-3 and Pk from b.21-4, and Hrl-4, Trl/2 and Pk from bars 212-9. These are good changes which throw the strings into relief, particularly the suppression of the dominant pedal of the second case.

Schubert IX/1, P.48/9; 134-8, 142-6 & 440-52: By his omission of Schubert's horn and trombone parts Mahler is here attempting to bring some variety of texture in passages of the second subject group which are played three times, both in the exposition and recapitulation. In these passages the half bar pulsation is already well established by the alternation of Vn and Vc, and Va has the octave pedal C firmly established, so that the use of horns and trombones is unnecessary.

10.2.8 Use of the Mute

Mahler introduces mutes for horns, trumpets and trombones in the following works:

Beethoven IX/2, P.40 6-15: Hrl-3 mit Dämpfer. This has been taken for a fundamental change in timbre; <9> but in practice, as in the cases discussed later where Mahler calls for stopped horn tones, the pianissimo dynamic is such that the only effect of the mute is to soften the tone.
bassoons. In making this assertion it is significant that no review of a Mahler performance of the Ninth Symphony ever mentioned this feature.

Beethoven IX/4, P.40; 331-441: Hr3/4 and Tr2 are muted and this is undoubtedly also intended to soften the tone of the instruments and prevent them from drawing too much attention to themselves.

Schubert IX/2, P.47; 160-1, 184-5 & 188-9: In the second movement of the early version of Mahler’s revisions, mutes are prescribed for both horns and trumpets which, apart from brightening the timbre slightly, would enable the players to tongue the notes firmly without playing too loud. Their sound is then reminiscent of military fanfares such as are found in Mahler’s own symphonies. <10>

Schubert IX/2, P.48; 321-32 Ps1-3 are muted. Considered in conjunction with the hand stopping of Hrl in the same passage, this is probably a device to achieve a softer pianissimo.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.51/2; 109-15 & 130-1: Mahler was seeking colouristic effects when he added mutes to the trumpets and trombones here. Together with the substitution of C1/2 for Ob1/2 in bars 111-2, the mutes give a more ethereal sound, appropriate to this calm episode in Mahler’s otherwise passionate interpretation.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.51/2; 283 & 285: The muted trumpets give a distant effect.

Schumann II/4; 135-178: Up to 164 Fg1/2 are reinforced by Ps1/2 muted and ff. Because Ps1/2 have to enter with their own part in 165, Trl takes over at that point. As Hrl/2 are marked fff by Mahler, and are probably making a raucous sound, the use of mutes may well be the only way the trumpets and trombones can match them.

Further information on Mahler’s use of the mute comes from Ferdinand Pfohl who writes that Mahler used them in Weber’s Overtures. According to Pfohl, in Hamburg, Mahler had the first horn pair play muted in the introduction to Der Freischütz Overture. Although this provides a distant echo effect in b.14-5, it is difficult to see the advantage of its continuation, since thereafter all four horns play as a group; but Pfohl may mean simply that b.14-15 were played muted, and this would make sense. Pfohl also mentions that the opening horn motif of the Oberon Overture was played muted. <11>
10.3.1 Use of Valve Instruments

The composers for whom we have details of Mahler's Retuschen were all writing for the natural horn, and Mahler did not hesitate to rewrite their horn parts for the instrument with valves, using the notes which were unavailable to the composer. In many of these cases, the notes which Mahler chose to employ are playable by hand stopping on the natural horn, but with an inferior tone quality and, in the cases of Beethoven and Schumann, an examination of their writing elsewhere demonstrates that they were themselves inconsistent in their decisions regarding the use of these notes.

Following Wagner's counsel, a typical change to a second horn part was to supply d' or f' where Beethoven was obliged to compromise and use the upper octave:

Beethoven VI/2, P.32: 47-51 & 69-75.

More controversial is the situation where Mahler, finding Beethoven to be particularly handicapped by the lack of the lower notes of Hr2, completes the second part in octaves with the first:


More ambitious are cases where Mahler gives both horns notes which were unavailable to Beethoven and completes the melody in both parts, thus allowing the horns to play a much more prominent role in the proceedings:

Beethoven VI/1, P.32: 43.
first horn to a'' in b.37 of the same movement and preserves the
contour of the melody in thirds which Beethoven abandoned for one
note.

Throughout Schumann's symphonies we find parts which imply the use of
the valve horn, together with a seemingly indiscriminate use of the
instrument to thicken the texture and Mahler, rightly taking this for
incompetence or indifference, feels himself free to change the horn
parts in many places. See Ch.31-4.

In contrast to his attitude to Beethoven's and Schumann's scoring,
Mahler was much more sensitive of the audibility of Mozart's horn parts
in K.550 and made no changes to the notes where the second part
involves a leap of a twelfth. He did, however make one change:

Mozart K.550/4, P.44; 33 & 53: g'' changed to b'-flat. The
original part had reinforced Ob2 and the changed version
fills in the middle harmony a little more.

10.3.2 Horn Reinforcing Woodwind

Beethoven, Weihe des Hauses Overture, P.17/8; 29-31: Hr1/2
reinforce Cl1/2.

Beethoven, Weihe des Hauses Overture, P.17/8; 32 (last 2
notes) - 34 (1st note): Cl1/2 8va and replaced by Hr1/2. In
the context this sounds well, even though Mahler extends
the range of Beethoven's horn writing considerably.

Beethoven V/1, P.30/1; 303-5: Mahler reinforces Fg1/2 by
Hr1/2. The heroic character of the passage demands the
sound of the horns, and the implied change of crook does
not make this too much of an anachronism.

Beethoven II/1, P.24; 146 - 153 (1st minim): Hr1/2
reinforce Fg1/2. Mahler was either unable or unwilling to
double the woodwind here and since he has added Cl1/2 to
Ob1/2 at this juncture, the bassoons already sound weaker
than in the original.

Beethoven II/4, P.24; 276-7: Hr1/2 reinforce Cl1/2 and Fg1,
continuing the line of the previous two bars. This latter
is an important modification which allows the main motif to
emerge. Despite being higher than Beethoven's usual

10.3.1 - Mahler's Treatment of Brass
Mahler appears to be the originator of this frequently heard Retusche which allows the horns to take an active part in the passage without the repeated concert e'' of the original drowning out the wind melody.

10.3.3 Horn Reinforcing Strings

Beethoven V/2, P.30/1; 192-4: Hrl-4 reinforce Vc/Cb. Preceded by a reinforcement of Vnl/2 by Trl/2 two bars earlier, the modification brings this section of the first theme well to the fore; but, although arguably good from a structural point of view, it does not sound Beethovenian, the implied *Horns in A-flat* sounding exotic in the context.

10.3.4 Introduction of a Second Horn Pair

Mahler adds a second pair of horns to Beethoven V, VI and VII, Coriolan Overture, and Schubert IX. These parts are in manuscript and are generally written in F. Details are given in the chapters on the works.

Mahler's practice in this is different from that of Weingartner and other conductors in that, instead of rewriting the original pair extensively and then using the extra instruments to double when necessary for balance, he retains the original horn parts largely intact, adding the second pair of horns to reinforce other instruments. Thus the second horn pair is often accorded a totally different role from the original horn parts and, in contrast to the classical style, the dual function allotted to the instrument sometimes confuses the texture.

Beethoven V, P.30/1: The extra pair is employed throughout.

Beethoven VI, P.32: No parts are available for study and the only score which is known is probably not the one which Mahler used for his later Retuschen. This score shows
Beethoven VII, P.34/5: Hr3/4 play only in the outer two movements; but the notes assigned to them have been changed frequently.

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.4/5: Mahler revises Hr1/2 considerably in places, adding melodic notes and Hr3/4 mainly doubles these, or reinforces Fgl/2.

Schubert IX, P.47/8/9: Hr3/4 are employed extensively throughout the work.

10.3.5 Introduction of Multiple Horn Pairs

Sometimes Mahler adds more than one horn pair to Beethoven's original complement:

Beethoven III, P.26: There are four additional horn parts in Mahler's set, but their numbering implies that there were originally six, making nine for the work as a whole. The extra horns are employed sparingly in the first movement in bars 276-9 and 359-61, in the second movement in bars 130-50 and 159-68, and in the Poco Andante of the finale. See Ex.22.2.

Beethoven, Egmont Overture, P.10/1: Mahler employed six horns. Hr5/6 were provided with extra copies of the printed Hr1/2 parts and their main contribution was in the notorious passage beginning with b.259.

Beethoven IX, P.40: Mahler's later revision of the Ninth Symphony includes the addition in the first, second and last movements of two horn pairs in F to Beethoven's D and Bb horn pairs.

10.3.6 Use of Stopped Tone

The stopped tone, denoted by a plus sign, is frequently used by Mahler in his own works; but it is surprising that he uses it also in the works of earlier composers. He employs this as a very audible colouristic effect in forte:

Beethoven V/3, P.30/1; 38-41 & 90-3. See Ch.23.2.9.

Other uses by Mahler of stopped tones occur only in soft passages, where they would not have quite the same pungent nasal effect which
tone. These directions went unnoticed by the critics:

Schubert IX/2, P.49; 324-32: Mahler indicates in the parts that Hr1/2 are to be stopped. In P.47, the direction appears only in b.330-2. That this stopping does not cease on the re-entry of the main theme of the movement and the general dynamic level which Mahler indicates at this point, \textit{pp} for the theme and \textit{ppp} in the accompaniment, indicate that Mahler used this direction not as a colouristic effect, but as a means of achieving a softer \textit{pianissimo}.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.52; 298: The first eb'' of Hr1 is indicated to be stopped. It is difficult to imagine any use for this, other than to balance the entry of the seven note chord, of which this is the third note up.

10.3.7 \textbf{Schalltrichter Auf!}

Mahler also employed his famous injunction \textit{Schalltrichter \textbf{Auf!}} in his Beethoven Retuschen:

Beethoven III/1, P.26: 276.

Beethoven, Egmont Overture: We do not know for certain where Mahler asked for this, but it was probably in the \textit{Allegro con brio}. The New York Times Critic stated of Mahler’s six horns that Beethoven did not require that their playing should strain for the utmost sonority by raising the bells of their instruments. <12>

10.3.8 \textbf{Removal of Horn}

Mahler often removed notes from original horn parts where he felt they were an obstruction to clarity:

Mozart K.551/1, P.45; 218-9 254-65: Mahler omitted the horns in New York, in the process changing the harmony of b.218-9. The only possible explanation for this is that the horns were perhaps unable to play softly enough to balance with the other instruments to Mahler’s satisfaction.

Mozart K.551/2, P.45; 67-70: Horns also omitted in New York.

Schumann I/2, P.53/4; 43-55: This clarifies the texture and nothing is lost by this omission.

Smetana, Bartered Bride Overture, P.58/9; 211-20 & 285 -
10.4 Trumpet

10.4.1 Extension of Range

The highest note employed on the E-flat trumpet by Beethoven in his Third Symphony in Tr1 is e''', although he requires g''', in the Storm of the Pastorale Symphony. There are three places in the Eroica which he was either unable or reluctant to realize satisfactorily with the trumpets, and which do not sound well with the woodwind parts which he elected to substitute. In each case Mahler writes g''' to complete the melody:

Beethoven III/1, P.26; 442-4: Mahler raises Tr1 one octave above Beethoven's original.

Beethoven III/1, P.26; 657-63: Using g''' and other, lower, notes not available on the natural trumpet, Mahler completes the melody in both trumpet parts so that it follows the oboes. According to Weingarnter, this Retusche originated with Bülow. <13>

Beethoven III/4, P.26; 316: The trumpets have not played for nearly 200 bars, and Beethoven perhaps doubted their ability to enter with such a high note: Mahler has no such fears and preserves the melodic contour.

In Egmont Overture Beethoven also refused to use the written g''' on the F trumpet. Mahler employs this note consistently for Tr1 and also takes Tr2 lower than Beethoven:

Beethoven, Egmont Overture, P.11; 330-42: Unisons in the original are changed so that Tr1 plays g''', or Tr2 plays e as appropriate.

Mahler also writes high trumpet parts in his Schumann I Retuschen:

Schumann I/1, P.53/4; 5, 311 & 495-501: Mahler gives the trumpets melodic parts, even where these changes, written an octave below the flutes, introduce a'' and b'''.
10.4.2 Use of Valve Instruments

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.5; 42-4: Mahler adds notes where Beethoven was obliged to allow the trumpets to rest. These notes, twice b and b', and once b-flat and b'-flat, continue the melodic line and, together with other changes, keep the intensity of the texture up.

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.5; 103, 105 & 113: Although employing d' for Tr2 in b.113, Mahler does not do so in b.103 and 105, probably wishing to avoid the heaviness that it would introduce.

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.5; 151: Octave D-flats complete the trumpet line, continuing the established rhythm. The introduction of this melodic element to the trumpet part leads Mahler to change the notes of b.152 to crotchet Fs (unison with Vn and Va) and, in b.154, to add a D-flat in unison with Ob2, again avoiding the lower octave for reasons of brightness. It does not concern Mahler that the chord of b.152 now lacks a fifth, except in the timpani.

Beethoven III/2, P.26; 76-9: Mahler uses notes which were unavailable on the natural trumpet which, together with changes in the woodwind parts, make the melodic line clear. See Ex.22.12.

Beethoven VI/4, P.32: Mahler changes many notes in both trumpet parts, employing b-flat, b, c'-sharp, f', b'-flat, c''-sharp, f'' and g''. See Ch.24 for details.

Beethoven VI/5, P.32; 54-5, 100-6 and 162-3: The trumpets are assigned a melodic role, reinforcing the violins or the woodwind at the appropriate octave and in b.54/5 replacing Ps1/2. Beethoven employs the trumpets in this way in bars 108-9 and for the first phrase of bars 54-5, where the natural notes fit well; but Mahler's additions, although they allow the trumpets to take a more active part in the texture, have a marked anachronistic effect.

10.4.3 Trumpet Reinforcing Violins

Mahler sometimes strengthens the violin line with the trumpets in unison or at the octave.

Beethoven V/2, P.30/1; 185-92: Mahler rewrites Tr1/2 so that they trace an unadorned version of the main theme along with the original, which is already in the violins. See Ch.23.2.8 and Ex.23.4.

10.4.1 - Mahler's Treatment of Brass
octave lower, Trl has g'' which Beethoven chose not to use. In reinforcing the violins at the lower octave, Mahler prepares and emphasises more strongly the ninth of the tonic ninth chord at the climax of the whole work. Given the prominence of g'' in Vnl, this change may be rejected as stylistically unacceptable; but, if the trumpets do not play too loudly, they can contribute to the body of tone and remove some of the shrillness which results from Beethoven's placing the ninth only in the highest octave.

Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5; 34-40: In Beethoven's original Trl has a monotonous part which can sound aggressively insistent and which often obscures the canon between the violins and woodwind. Mahler changes the notes and dynamics of Trl to prevent the part dominating. See Ex.25.3.

Schumann III/1; 411-22: This is the most famous example of Mahler strengthening Vnl by Trl/2 in octaves. It is also rather unconvincing as Mahler does not go all the way towards creating a uniform texture. See Ch.33.2.2.

10.4.4 Trumpet Reinforcing Woodwind

Schumann III/5; 138-40: The octave leaps of Cl1/2 are transferred by Mahler to Trl. Cl1/2 are then employed with Obl/2 and Hrl/2 in reinforcing Fl1/2 which have the main voice. The resulting texture is much more open than the original.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.50/1/2; 262 & 270: Mahler adds the notes which Schumann, unaccountably omitted, completing the melody which the trumpets play one octave below the flutes. There is no good reason not to do this.

10.4.5 Additional Trumpet Entries

As well as modifying the parts written by the composer, with the intention of completing the line or making the part conform to the melody which it incompletely represents in its original form, Mahler adds new entries. It is often difficult to make a case for the admission of these new sounds to the classical orchestra.

Beethoven III/1, P.26; 202-5, Mahler adds trumpet parts by analogy with b.198-201. He also does this in bars 254-9 by analogy with the bars which precede and follow them. In the first of these cases the only reason why trumpets are absent from the original is undoubtedly the historical one;

10.4.3 - Mahler’s Treatment of Brass
though it may originally have been caused by practical constraints, one would not necessarily wish to forego.

Schubert IX, P.48/9; 480-92: Mahler writes a new part, employing notes unavailable on the natural instrument, part of which agrees with F11. See Ex.29.4. If played with the indicated dynamics, this part sounds well and was probably supplied by Mahler to match the Exposition, where less modification was required.

10.4.6 Introduction of Extra Trumpets

Mahler makes extensive use of a third trumpet in his Hamburg scores of Beethoven Coriolan Overture, P.4 and Schubert IX, P.47, and in most of his early score of Beethoven IX, P.39, assigning the instrument a melodic role in reinforcing violins and oboe parts. These are discussed in the respective chapters on the works.

Later Mahler Retuschen sometimes include an extra pair of trumpets.

Beethoven III, P.26: Tr3/4 were needed in only two short passages. See Ch.22.2.4.

Beethoven IX, P.40: In the first and last movements, Mahler adds a second pair of trumpets in F, often giving them a different role from the original pair, but using them sparingly. See Ch.26.6.2.

Schubert IX, P.48/9: Unlike their contribution to Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, it cannot be claimed that Tr3/4 are employed with restraint in this work, since Mahler had no qualms about using them frequently as melodic instruments, together with Hr3/4, and in such a way as sometimes to dominate the texture completely. See Ch.29.4.4.

10.4.7 Removal of Trumpet

Beethoven V/1, P.30/1; 373 - 374 (1st note): Tr1/2 and Pk removed to clarify the structure of the passage in which the trumpets should answer the violins and not vice-versa.

Beethoven VII/4, P.34/5; 37-43, 248-55 & 285-98: Although at first he contented himself with avoiding the leaps in Tr2, Mahler subsequently removed Tr1/2 and Pk, enabling these instruments to make a real contribution when they re-enter.
that Mahler removed Tr2 and Pk.

Schubert IX/1; P.48/9; 78-102: Mahler at one time contemplated adding notes in Trl/2 as far as b.88 to complete the melodic line which reinforces the strings, but subsequently deleted Trl/2 completely.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.50/1/2; 163 & 165: Mahler inserts a subito piano at the beginning of these bars, and the deletion of Trl/2 in P.51/2 materially assists this effect.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.50/1/2; 257: Mahler removes Trl/2 so as to allow them a chance to prepare their entry pp in b.258.

Schumann II/2: 93-7 220-3 & 362-81: Routinely in Schumann, Mahler removes trumpet parts where they are unnecessary.

Schumann III/1; 573-8: Mahler, deletes Trl/2 & Pk, reserving them for the fanfares which precede and follow this redundant passage.

Schumann III/5; 321-2: Trl/2 pause so as to make more impact with their entry in b.323.

Schumann IV/3, P.56/7; 47 & 159: Mahler deletes the first note of Trl/2. This simple and most effective change allows the rhythmic structure to follow the contour of the string parts.

### 10.5 Trombone and Tuba

The trombone was not admitted to symphonic literature before the works of Beethoven and Schubert; and both these composers use the instrument sparingly, Beethoven in only five movements out of thirteen in his 5th, 6th and 9th Symphonies. Schubert uses the trombones in all movements of his Great C major Symphony, often employing them to fill in the gaps in the natural horn parts - a more modern style than that of Beethoven, who was still apparently conscious of the traditional dramatic and religious uses of the instrument. Unlike the case of the horn and trumpet, in reviewing the trombone parts in the works of Beethoven, Schumann and Schubert, Mahler is not dealing with an "improved" or
technique which had happened since 1830.

10.5.1 Pitch Alterations

Beethoven, Leonore II, P.13; 39: Mahler gives Ps1 a instead of c' in order to reinforce the bass of the chord. The C is well represented in the other wind instruments.

Schubert IX/1, P.49; 676-7: Having removed the strings, Mahler deepens the tone of the wind texture by lowering Ps3 by an octave.

Schubert IX/1, P.49; 676-7: Having removed the strings, Mahler deepens the tone of the wind texture by lowering Ps3 by an octave.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.51/2; 256-7: Mahler lowers Ps1 an octave, proposing a logical progression of pitch ranges, trumpets being answered by trombones always at a lower pitch.

10.5.2 Rhythmic Alterations

Schubert IX/1, P.48/9; 634-45: For some reason, Schubert gave the trombones a rhythmically simplified version of the trumpet theme. Mahler preferred the cleaner sound of a unified rhythm over Schubert's original.

Schubert IX/4, P.48/9; 303: Mahler assigns Ps1-3 triplets to agree with the woodwind.

Schumann IV/1, P.56/7; 144, 205 & 218: Schumann, probably mistakenly thinking to make the part easier for the trombones has omitted the semiquavers. Mahler completed the rhythm to match the other brass instruments.

10.5.3 Trombone Reinforcing Woodwind

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.51/2; 178 (2nd crotchet) - 179: Mahler reinforces Fg2 with Ps3, since on its own the bassoon is not strong enough to provide a foil to the double basses, and the cellos are employed elsewhere.

10.5.4 Trombone Reinforcing Basses

Schumann I/4, P.53/4; 309-12: Ps2/3 reinforce Vc. This is the only thematic material in these bars; so the extra profile given to the theme by this change is a welcome alternative to reducing everything else, and brings a new colour into the texture.

10.5.0 - Mahler's Treatment of Brass
Most of Mahler's changes to trombone parts involve deletions of notes, particularly in the case of Schumann, whose use of the instrument often deprived the music of many possibilities of textural contrast.

Beethoven IX/4, P.40; 887-902: Ps1/2 are deleted from bars 887-95 & 898-902, while in bars 896-7 & 900-1 Ps1-3 reinforce the choral basses. This is a good change which gives solidity to the theme.

Beethoven, Leonore II, P.13; 236-44: Ps2/3 are deleted, since their notes are already well enough covered by Hr3/4.

Schubert IX/1, P.48/9; 94-122: The texture is much cleaner for the deletion of Ps1-3: in particular Va, Vc and Cb need no support here, and the bassoon triplets are heard better. The entry of the trombones is reserved for b.130 where they make a good effect.

Schubert IX/1, P.48/9; 155 (last note) - 174, and 185 (last note) - 192: Mahler suppresses the trombones in order to prepare the ear for their more important contributions from b.199 onwards.

Schubert IX/3, P.48/9; 262 (last crotchet) - 282, and 359-84: By removing the trombones Mahler frees and lightens the texture.

Schumann I/1, P.53/4; 271-85: Ps3 deleted and the bassline is thereby lightened.

Schumann I/1, P.53/4; 318 & 322: Ps1-3 deleted.

Schumann I/4, P.53/4; 25-8, 81-6 & 198-9: Ps1-3 deleted.

Smetana, Bartered Bride Overture, P.58/9; 297-304: Ps1-3 & Pk deleted entering p in b.305, thus preparing a more graduated approach to the climax of b.313.

10.5.6 Introduction of Extra Trombone & Tuba Parts

Mahler calls for trombone and contrabassoon to reinforce the bass line at b.114 of his early score of Coriolan Overture, P.4. In Beethoven VII, P.33, Mahler asks for trombone, contrabassoon and tuba in b.417 of the first movement and in b.388 of the fourth movement. Further details of these aspects of Mahler's Retuschen in these scores which date from his early years are given in Ch.16.3.3 and Ch.25.3.3. Without
really intended these instruments to play only in the short passages marked.

A similar problem in Beethoven IX, P.40, is discussed in Ch.26. Mahler introduced trombone and tuba in places where Beethoven did not contemplate their participation, namely in the first movement, at b.315, and in the fourth movement, in b.0-7, 17-25 & 208-15. Except in the Finale of the Ninth Symphony, no explicit indication is given for the cessation of these reinforcements, and neither orchestral parts nor critics' notices have been found to give support for the belief that Mahler actually put these Retuschen into practice. Hence, as in the case of some of Wagner's proposals for the Ninth Symphony, it is possible that they were never used. In execution they sound bad: the introduction of the sonority of the tuba into Beethoven is an unwelcome intrusion; and, although the addition of the trombone in the first movement of the Ninth Symphony allows an important but usually inaudible bass line to be heard, the use of the trombone solely at that point in the movement is not convincing from an aesthetic point of view, Beethoven having been very careful to employ trombones only in the Trio of the Scherzo and from half way through the Finale.
Chapter 11

Mahler’s Treatment of Timpani

The technique of timpani playing developed considerably during the nineteenth century, and Mahler takes advantage of this in his Retuschen. By his changes Mahler ensures that the contribution of the timpani is at all times a significant one. Using only notes which fit with the harmony, employing the instrument throughout a passage rather than sporadically, using hard sticks, these are all methods of allowing the timpani to play louder without clashing with the rest of the orchestra. Furthermore, the removal of the drums when the original does not allow them to make a clear contribution to the texture draws attention to the timpani when they do play. Like many of Mahler’s Retuschen, those for timpani were controversial.

11.1 Changes in Dynamics

The New York critics frequently accused Mahler of allowing, indeed of encouraging the timpanist to play too loudly:

Mr. Mahler... was especially prone to have the kettle drum brought out with a nerve-racking violence in many loud passages... <1>

...Those who think that Beethoven wished to have the ears of his auditors assaulted as they were last night by the kettledrum player must have been delighted by the bombardment to which they were subjected; others must have felt outraged... <2>

...It was alarming to hear in... Till Eulenspiegel and, to
Mr. Mahler to go on unchecked and unrebuked... <3>

...All through the evening the timpanist bombarded the ears of the hearers... <4>

...he uses for some passages two pairs of kettledrums, which make a noise that passes beyond the bounds of musical effect. Elsewhere he accentuates the stroke of the drums with nerve-racking results, as in the scherzo, especially at the very beginning, where the rhythm is marked as by the shots of a rifle... <5>

Natalie Bauer-Lechner reports Mahler's difficulty in achieving the quality of timpani sound which he wanted, even in Vienna, for a performance of his own Second Symphony in April 1899:

...the timpanist had a difficult part to perform; on account of this, there had to be several interruptions. In particular, he could not play as fast and as loud as required. When, at the passage where the graves burst open, Mahler called for the maximum power, he protested that the drum skin would break (the same thing had happened in Berlin). Mahler retorted that he should go ahead and break it, and didn't relax his demands by a hair's breadth - with the result that in one of the rehearsals, a drum-stick did actually break in two. Likewise, the cymbal player often did not strike hard enough. Once, Mahler scolded him severely for this. Having summoned all his strength for the cymbal-clash, the player demanded: "Is that loud enough?" Mahler cried: "Still louder!". Whereupon the other clashed his cymbals with shattering force and with an expression which seemed to say: "The Devil himself can't do better than that!" At this, Mahler shouted: "Bravo, that's the way! And now louder still!"... <6>

Benjamin Kohon, 2nd bassoonist in the New York Philharmonic Orchestra reports of his first concert with that ensemble that:

"He even got his timpanist from the Metropolitan to come over and play the Beethoven Seventh... The man we had then didn't give him the proper rhythm and the proper stroke and the proper volume. It was also one of those things where he wanted terrific climaxes, like he did in Beethoven Five, first movement." <7>

Not having been there, we cannot resolve the question, but the evidence of Mahler's scores and orchestral parts contradicts the critics' opinions that the timpani were too loud in Mahler's concerts and shows
orchestra, which are often also places where the brass need to be moderated, Mahler reduces the dynamics. There are many cases where Mahler does this:

Beethoven, Egmont Overture, P.9/11; 58 et seq: The entry of the trumpets and timpani is marked ff in the original. Mahler inserts a diminuendo in b.59 arriving piano in b.60, with a restoration of forte in b.61. This same procedure is repeated for the next phrase, and the dynamics of trumpets and timpani are set at mezzoforte from b.67.

Beethoven, Leonore II, P.13; 36/7: Horns, trumpets, and timpani have Beethoven's ff moderated to ffp by Mahler in both bars, allowing the string parts to come through.

11.2 Change of Timpani Tuning

The composers for whom we have information on Mahler's revisions wrote for hand tuned drums which took time to retune. Mahler, in changing or adding notes, requires the retuning of the drums during a movement in order that the notes which he uses fit the harmony:

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.4/5: In addition to the C/G of the original, Mahler asks for D, B, B-flat and F, but frequently does not allow time for retuning by hand.

Schubert IX, P.47/8/9: In addition to the C/G of the original, Mahler specifies E, Eb, D, B and A. The only change which is impossible to do in the time by hand is between the Scherzo and the Trio where Mahler needs C/G changed to E/A in eight bars.

Schumann I, P.53/4: Schumann's original score calls for timpani in Bb/F/Gb, to which notes Mahler adds D, Db, C and A. The retuning required in bars 152-152 of the finale (G-flat to A-flat and B-flat to C) is scarcely possible.

Schumann IV, P.56/7: The original tuning of D/A is changed by Schumann to D-flat/A-flat and E/B in the course of the first movement; but in bars 142-5 Mahler needs the upper drum changed again with no time for this to be done by hand. Schumann has used the D-flat drums for the beginning of a phrase in bars 142 and 144, but is unable to use a drum in the following bars, as he had no note to fit the chord. Mahler, deciding that use of the drums in bars 143 and 145 is more important, retunes the D-flat to C which...
In some of his scores - e.g. Schumann I, P.53, and Beethoven VII, P.34 - Mahler writes out the indications for re-tuning the drums. Not only is this an instruction to the copyist who prepared the part, but it demonstrates that he did not expect the player to have extra drums available. It thus appears that in many of the cases quoted above mechanically tuned drums are required for the performance of Mahler's revised timpani parts. The matter is not conclusive however, as a virtuoso timpanist is able to change the tuning of a drum in seconds by turning just one of the tuning keys. Admittedly the skin will then not be balanced, but the occasional note can pass for being in tune, and the player can then refine the intonation and balance of the drum head as further rest in the part permits. <8>

Pedal timpani had in fact been made in Vienna by Hans Schnellar, percussionist in the Court Opera and Philharmonic orchestras. They are described by Strauss in his 1904 revision of Berlioz' Instrumentation and Mahler knew and used them. He was the first to introduce these drums to America when he had a pair of them imported for the use of the New York Philharmonic. <9>

11.3 Change of Notes to Fit the Bass Line

Sometimes the notes given to the timpani by the composer do not fit with the bass line and Mahler changes them:

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.4; 264-7: In his early revision only, Mahler changed the notes to follow the bass line. Later he thought better of this change and left the original notes which agree with the pedal point.
upbeat. At the same point in the Recapitulation, Mahler makes the same changes (with a roll in b.311). For want of a D, he repeats the A in bars 6 and 305-6. Although this is generally an improvement over Schumann's original, the substitution of A for D is particularly unsatisfactory at the recapitulation, giving the effect of a D-minor chord in second inversion.

Schumann I/4, P.53/4; 155/6 & 163/4: Mahler changes the notes to A-flat and C respectively, thus allowing the timpani to delineate the sequential writing with its chromatically rising bass line.

11.4 Completion of Passages

Where the composer elected to omit the timpani during part of a passage because the tuning does not fit with the bass line or the harmony, Mahler adds them with the right notes:

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.4/5; 42-50: Mahler adds Fs in bars 42-3 and B-flats in the rest of the passage, following the rhythm of the horns. Having retuned the C drum to B-flat for b.44, Mahler leaves this note in b.45, even though it does not fit with the harmony.

Beethoven III, P.26; 202-5: Mahler changes the notes in b.198-201 to Gs to fit the bass line and continues with As.

A basic problem for the classical composer was in areas where the music moved away from the tonic key for which the drums were tuned. Since the two drums could not easily be retuned during a work, the composer was obliged either to make do with notes which did not fit the harmony, or omit the drums from the second subject group and development section. In passages in the dominant key, Mahler often changes the tuning of the drums so that notes can be added by analogy with what the composer has written in the tonic key:

Beethoven Coriolan Overture, P.4/5; 103, 105, 113: Mahler adds Ds by analogy with bars 231 and 233, and completes the part by the addition of Ds with the same rhythm as Tr1/2 in b.113.
added, one F per bar for four bars, then two notes per bar for two bars: bar 224 has Fs, while bar 225 has B-flats in P.4 and Cs in P.5. This later version saves the player from having to retune the C drum twice and fits the harmony better.

Beethoven IV/1, P.28; 137-40: All the notes in these bars, with the exception of the second note of b.139, are Cs, with the same rhythm as Trl/2. Thus Mahler, while adding notes in the same places that Beethoven uses them in the analogous bars 411-4, does not choose the same relative pitches.

Beethoven IV/1, P.28; 162, 166, 180 & 184: Mahler completes the timpani part with Cs, following the rhythm of Trl/2. Bars 180 & 184 differ from bars 454 and 458: where Beethoven has three notes, Mahler has only two with a rest on the third crotchets.

Beethoven V/1, P.29; b.94-122: In this early version only, Mahler added timpani in E-flat/B-flat by analogy with bars 346-374. <10>

Schubert IX, P.47/8/9; 156, 158, 186, 188: Ds are supplied instead of Gs to agree with the bass line. <11>

Schubert IX, P.47/8/9; 228-237: Gs replaced by Ds. <12> Crotchets of b.230 & 234 removed.

Schubert IX, P.47/8/9; 240-2: P.47/8 have Bs to agree with the bass line, but P.49 still has G.

Schubert IX, P.47/8/9; 248-9: Ds added to match the bass line, where Schubert was obliged to put rests.

Schumann I/1, P.53/4: There are some serious disagreements in pitch between the bass line and the timpani which Mahler removes by retuning. In b.63-6, Mahler changes the G-flat to D-flat. In b.68-9, Mahler changes the D-flat to C and adds the timpani to reinforce the basses.

Schumann I/1, P.53/4; 116-7: The preceding bars are left by Mahler, but marked piano. However, by employing the C drum, and continuing the rhythm of bar 115, Mahler enables the timpani to contribute vitally to the sound.

11.5 Addition of Timpani Parts

Having retouched those passages where the composer was obliged to make a compromise in order to include the timpani, Mahler, taking advantage
notes to timpani parts where the composer was unable to employ them:

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.4/5; 154, 158-9 & 163-4:
Crotchets added at the beginning of each bar, with pitches as the bass. Mahler, partly due to his own Retuschen in the preceding bars, clearly considered the recapitulation anticlimactic without the continued participation of the timpani.

Beethoven III/1, P.26; 276-9: Mahler adds crotchet As at the beginning of each bar and one at the end of b.279. Beethoven had employed the timpani in b.260-71 where they fit enharmonically, and Mahler does not see fit to exclude them from the climax of the first half of the development section. This entry also appears in P.25, but was later erased.

Beethoven III/2, P.25,26; 145-8: Ds added. In P.25 these are crotchets at the beginning of each bar, but in P.26 Mahler has a minim with trill and ffp in each bar.

Beethoven III/4, P.26; 416-20: See Ex.22.19. P.25 has only the additions in bars 419-20.

Considering the length of the work, Mahler’s additions to the timpani part in Beethoven III are not extensive; but they occur at key points.

Mahler added notes to the timpani parts in places where the composer could also have done so, since these additions do not require any retuning. Most commonly this occurs in Schumann’s works:

Schumann I/1, P.53/4; 300-1: Fs are added to match the bass line.

Schumann IV/1, P.6/57; 32: four semiquaver on A added to the second half of the bar. This leads nicely to the otherwise isolated D of b.33.

Both these cases are worthy additions to the texture and it is a pity that Schumann did not conceive of them. Mahler rarely adds such entries to Beethoven’s music:

Beethoven Leonore II, P.13; b.277 & 381: Mahler adds Gs at the beginning of each bar to reinforce the basses.
In the first movement of Beethoven IX, Mahler had a second player double the first in b.301-337.

11.7 Specification of Sticks

Just as in his own symphonies, Mahler often requested hard sticks. There is usually no need to specify soft sticks as many players will choose these anyway; partly because rolls are rendered easier, the harder sticks requiring a faster roll to be effective, and partly because intonation discrepancies are not so obvious. From the point of view of the sound at a distance, however, harder sticks give a more precise sound with a clearer pitch; and with the lower pitched drums this less boomy sound enables the drums to be played louder without obscuring other voices.

In his obituary notice, Krehbiehl noted that Mahler required wooden-headed sticks, not only in Beethoven's ninth symphony, but even in Weber's "Oberon" Overture. <13>. Mahler did not actually specify hard sticks in his scores or in the timpani parts, since his usual practice was to make such requests verbally in rehearsal. As noted elsewhere, players are inconsistent in what they write into their parts, it depending on whether they expect to remember the instruction, or actually have a pencil handy; but some of Mahler's timpani parts do have marks made by the players which call for hard sticks. Bar 105 of the third movement of Schubert IX, P.49, provides a good example of this and there are several notes made by players about hard sticks in the part of Beethoven V, P.31.
11.8 Removal of Timpani

Sometimes Mahler removes the timpani altogether. In Beethoven it is usually to prevent the bass line from being obscured:

- Beethoven, Leonore III, P.14: 77-82.
- Beethoven V/2, P.30/1: 114-8.
- Beethoven IX/1, P.40: 120-31.

One is hardly surprised that Mahler elects to remove many superfluous timpani entries in Schumann's works, reserving them for important statements:

- Schumann IV/1, P.56/7: 79-82 (1st note).
- Schumann IV/4, P.56/7: 21-4 <14> & 213-219 (1st three notes).
- Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.50/1/2: 91.

Other examples of the removal of timpani are given in Ch.10 in connection with the removal of brass instruments.
Chapter 12

Dynamics and Acoustics

When one hears a virtuoso orchestra conducted by a great conductor, one often has the impression that the dynamic range is wider than usual. The composer Max Steiner had such an impression of Mahler:

"...His pianissimos and his fortes were unbelievable. They were as good as Stokowski had many years ago when he had the Philadelphia Orchestra..." <1>

To be fair, much of the impression of extremes of loud and soft playing is generally due to great accuracy of intonation and ensemble, and the same observation can be made of a well tuned piano or organ played by a master; but in Mahler's case there were other reasons as well. His scores and orchestral parts show on every page the extreme care which he took with dynamic markings and these modifications on their own were responsible for a greatly increased clarity of texture. La Grange attributes to Ernst Decsey the statement that

"...one sometimes had the impression that Mahler had modified the instrumentation, even when he had not, solely because he had modified the balance of the different parts and groups of instruments..." <2>

A critic of Mahler's Beethoven V performance in Helsinki noticed this too:

...It was something really wonderful to hear each instrument, when it had its turn to say something essential, stand out crystal clear, dominating without it or them being covered by the other instruments. <3>

There were many grounds for the changes which Mahler made to dynamics
were an important factor in his success as a conductor.

12.1 Relativity of Scoring, Acoustics and Dynamics

Despite his own attempts to notate his music as accurately as possible, in the process inventing several new nuances and investing others with specific meanings which can only be experienced from his own recordings, Stravinsky acknowledged the relativity of dynamics:

Perhaps my experience as a performer has persuaded me that circumstances are so different as to require every score to be re-marked for every performance... There are no absolute dynamics. <4>

Herman Martonne (NYPO 1st violin player) tells us that Mahler was well aware of this:

I remember a clarinet player, a very wonderful player: he was very fine and Mahler always thought the world of him. And yet one day, Mahler said, "piano, piano". (The clarinet player replied): "But yesterday you said it was too piano"; so Mahler explained: "You know, it all depends on our mood, it's all mood. Yesterday I probably thought it was too much: today I think it's too little." In that respect he was human. <5>

Mahler was constantly changing his Retuschen, in terms of both instrumental and dynamic changes; and his varied approach reflected both his own changing viewpoint and the different orchestral and acoustical conditions under which he worked. He took into account the size of Carnegie Hall when he employed the so-called Bach Klavier, not only for performances of his own Bach Suite, but also for playing the continuo part in the other baroque works on his programme of 10 November 1909 <6>

Towards the end of his life, when he had been active with the New York...
I am convinced that a great many of my previous shortcomings in instrumentation are entirely due to the fact that I am accustomed to hearing under the entirely different acoustical conditions of the theatre... <7>

This comment, which presumably applies to Mahler's Retuschen as much as to his compositions, implies that Mahler may have had the impression, at least momentarily, that he had compensated too much for the rounded and rich acoustic of the concert hall in giving his instrumentation the sound appropriate to the opera house where, despite the drier acoustic, care is necessary to prevent the voices from being covered. Tovey puts this difference succinctly when he writes:

I have noticed that any truly symphonic orchestration sounds to me, for the moment, impenetrably thick after I have got my ears into focus for operatic or otherwise illustrative modern orchestration. <8>

I am inclined to think that Mahler's remark may reflect as much as anything the difference in sound quality between Carnegie Hall and the Musikvereinsaal, since the latter hall is not a hall in which brilliance is prominently featured; and I believe that many of his Retuschen, which were first conceived in Vienna and which have many woodwind octave raisings, reflect this characteristic of the European halls in which Mahler conducted.

12.2 Balance of Tutti

The different loudnesses of the instruments of the orchestra require an adjustment of the dynamic nuances written for music from the Classical period. Each instrument responds differently to the same written dynamic nuance, the nature of its response often depending on the pitch register. As in his own works, Mahler takes account of these different
need is the moderation of the brass, <9> but sometimes the strings also
need to play softer to allow the contributions of the woodwind to
receive their due weight. The woodwind are also asked to exert
themselves.

Mozart, K.551, P.45, 1st mvt, b.81-5: Mahler reduces the
power of Br and Pk with fp and sf, and puts diminuendi in
Vn2 and Va to enable Vnl and Ww to dominate the texture.
See Ex.28.2.

Schubert IX, P.49, 1st mvt b.406-16: Mahler marks all
instruments pp except Fg1/2 who have f. This allows the
bassoons to emerge from their extremely disadvantageous
position in the texture.

Beethoven, Leonore II, P.13, 108-11: Fg1/2 provide the bass
to the rest of the woodwind and Hr3/4. Mahler's general
dynamic in these few bars is ppp; but from b.109 he doubles
Fg1/2 and marks them forte.

Despite the disparity of the markings, in neither of these
last two cases will the bassoons dominate the texture:
instead they will balance with the rest of the ensemble.

Beethoven V/4, P.32; 86b: The whole orchestra is marked
ffp, except Vc, Cb and Cfg who continue ff with the
melody. As the melodic line rises in pitch, so it is able
to penetrate the texture more easily, and Mahler is able to
reflect this with crescendi in Ww in b.88 and in the rest
of the orchestra in b.89.

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, P.4/5, 118: Va and Vc pp, so
that they will balance with Vnl and Fg1/2.

Beethoven II/4, P.24; 275-7: Mahler removes sforzati from
Vnl to prevent them from dominating.

Mozart, K.551/4, P.45; 115-22: Vnl are marked fff and Hr,
Tr & Pk are marked p. Ww are subdued by fp marks on all
their long notes. In b.123, Vnl have mf and Vc & Cb have
fff from the second note. This an extreme example of
widely disparate markings to achieve Mahler's desired
effect.

Beethoven VI/5, P.32; 37-50: To prevent them overpowering
the strings, Mahler writes piano for the wind in b.37, with
crescendo in b.40. Thereafter the beginning of each even
numbered bar has fp with a crescendo leading through the
next two bars. <10>
12.3 Solo and Accompaniment

There are many instances of Mahler raising the relative volume of a solo instrument with respect to the accompaniment to enable it to dominate. Most of these cases involve woodwind solos and examples are given in Ch.8.1.1.

12.4 Supplementary Dynamics and Hairpins

Hairpins, that is crescendo and diminuendo signs taking place over a short time, are a means of making a melody more expressive; but, except in the music of Mahler and his contemporaries, they are not often notated fully in the original score. As a conductor, Mahler used hairpins as an expressive device; but whereas most conductors indicate them solely by their gestures, Mahler (and Weingartner) wrote them into the part. There are many examples of this, particularly in the slow movements of Beethoven II, IV, VI and IX. In many of these cases Mahler uses a notation which is not found in other composers, hairpins with an accent at their apex, which enables him to distinguish between a simple crescendo - diminuendo and one with an accented note at the climax. An excellent example of the latter is found in the theme which begins in the flute in b.30 of the slow movement of Beethoven VI. See Ex.24.2. Others may be seen in Ex.12.1, Ex.19.1, Ex.27.1 and Ex.27.2.

Representative examples of the use of plain hairpins are:

Mozart, K551/2, P.45; 5-10: The many dynamic nuances added by Mahler which can be seen in Ex.28.4, are typical of his treatment of this slow movement. They follow the expressive line of the melody. The harmony also influences Mahler's additions to the dynamic nuances: he takes into account the slower harmonic rhythm of b.7-8 in comparison with b.9 and the unexpected feint in the direction of D minor at the beginning of b.9.
harmonic tension. Examples are Ob1 in b.249-50 & b.254, and Cl1 in b.252.

Schumann I/2, P.53/4; 41-7: Vc has hairpins in b.41, b.43 & b.45, replacing Schumann's forte of b.43 & b.45, giving the melody a more subtle nuance and a better chance of drawing attention to itself.

Beethoven, Leonore II, P.13; 156-61 & 164-70: Mahler keeps the theme in Vc, Ob1 & Vn1 well to the fore by prescribing large expressive hairpins and, from b.158, reducing the dynamic of the triplet accompaniment to pp. See Ex.18.1.

Beethoven, Leonore II, P.13; 244-50: Hr3/4 and Va have an accent in b.245, and Va and Cl1/2 have crescendo on their Cs and diminuendo on their Fs. The accent announces the modulation, but also prepares the listener for the hairpins in Va and Cl1/2. These latter emphasise the connection between this overture and Leonore III where the rising fourth plays a more prominent role. See Ex.18.2.

Beethoven, Leonore III, P.14; 121-37 & 405-421: Although Beethoven's texture is more sophisticated here than in the equivalent passage in Leonore II, the problem of bringing the important voice to the fore is still present to a lesser degree; and the expressive style here employed by Mahler makes a much greater contrast with the surrounding sections of the work. See Ex.19.1

Beethoven, Leonore III, P.14; 468-77: Fl1, supported by doubling players, makes clear the connection between this transformation of the second subject and the original. See Ex.19.4.

12.5 Acoustical Problems

In a reverberant hall like Vienna's Großer Musikvereinsaal, and to a lesser extent Carnegie Hall in New York, there is an acoustic effect of loudness which is due to a build up of sound. This is due to the long reverberation time of the hall which causes a note still to be audible when succeeding notes are played. The effect is most noticeable in the case of wind instruments, especially horns and trombones. It means that crescendi have to be controlled so that they do not get too loud too early and it militates against a fast diminuendo. Under these
nuance to achieve, and some conductors, use a Luftpause to "clear the
air" before a subito piano. Conversely, it is no accident that
Toscanini preferred to make his recordings in a dry acoustic where a
true subito piano could make its mark.

Mahler’s solution to this problem is explained by Wellesz with
reference to the first movement of Mahler’s own Second Symphony:

Looking at the passionate melody which forms the bridge to
the second theme, b.43-7, one may ask why all the woodwind
start fortissimo, and instantly make a decrescendo to
piano. In fact this is the best way to get the effect of a
piano from the beginning, after the two bars in which the
brass hammers its rhythm fortissimo, the four trumpets even
forte-fortissimo. <11>

There are many places in the works of other composers where Mahler
changes dynamics to take account of the same phenomenon:

Beethoven II/4, P.24; 181: Vnl p, restored to pp two bars
later, so that their entry may be heard during the die-away
of the preceding tutti.

Mozart K.550/1, P.44; 20-1, 102-4 & 183-4: Instead of a
(subito) piano, Mahler writes diminuendo.

Schumann, Manfred Overture, P.50/2; 185: Vnl mf instead of
p which is reinstated two bars later.

Smetana, Bartered Bride Ov, P.58/9; 182-3: Vn2 have
diminuendo piano instead of subito piano.

Beethoven VII/1, P.34/5; 109-11: Wind and Pk have
diminuendo already in b.109, and Vnl have diminuendo in
b.111.

Schumann II/4; 191-2: Vn2 & Va have one bar diminuendo to
piano, while Cll continues ff, making diminuendo in b.192.

Schubert IX/4, P.48/9; 0-8: See Ch.29.4.9. The dynamics are
changed and Mahler waits after b.5 to allow the
reverberation to clear. This causes him to make a further
caesura after b.7 to preserve the musical logic.

Sometimes a change of dynamics is not enough and Mahler resorts to
instrumental alterations to counteract the reverberation in the hall:

Beethoven V/4, P.30/1; 43 (from 2nd note): Fl2, Ob2 & Fg2

12.5.0 - Dynamics and Acoustics
Beethoven V/4, P30/1; 317-9: Mahler doubles Fg1/2 and at different times added Vc and Ps.

Beethoven VII/4, P.34/5; 62-7: Ww doubled in 2nd half of b.62 until b.64. Chords on 2nd crochets of b.62 and b.66 are ff. St mf in b.63 and b.67. Fg2 joins Fg1. This follows a powerful tutti and Mahler makes a more gradual transition.

Beethoven VII/4, P.34/5; 274 & 278: This is treated similarly to b.62-7, though Hr1/2 are enough to replace Fgl-4 adequately. For some reason Mahler reinforces Fl1/2 by Cl1/2 this time.

Schubert IX/3, P.48/9; 65: Obl/2 & Cl1/2 doubled, and all other instruments except Fg1/2 have their first note shortened to a crotchet.

Schubert IX/3, P.48/9; 86-8: Mahler adds Fl3 and Cl1 to Fl1, with forte diminuendo instead of piano diminuendo.

Schubert IX/3, P.48/9; 193-5: Tr1/2, Ps1-3 & Pk removed from b.193. Obl-4 and Cl1-4 play in b.194-5.

Schumann I/1, P.53/4; 429-50: Cl1 8va to reinforce Obl.

Schumann II/4; 46: Fl1/2, Obl/2, Cl1/2, Hr1/2, Tr1/2, Pk & Vn1/2 removed. Fg1/2 & Va continue with Schumann's forte. Va & Vc/Cb have pizz.

12.6 Expansion of Dynamic Range

Klemperer reports that Mahler always wanted more clarity, more colour of sound (Klangfarbe), more dynamic contrast. <12> Mahler often achieves this by his changes of instrumentation, but in addition to these he expands the dynamic range of a work by writing ppp instead of pp, or fff instead of ff. He does this so often that it may be assumed that his reason is simply to underline the players' instructions, and to ensure that they do what the original marking required.

Bauer-Lechner reports that Mahler said after his experience with the Kaim Orchestra in Munich in 1897:

12.5.0 - Dynamics and Acoustics
Examples of Mahler making changes to counteract the tendencies of players are to be found in all the works discussed in individual chapters; but more interesting are those cases where there is a structural reason for Mahler's change of dynamics:

Mozart, K.551/1, P.45; 56-80: Mahler's additional dynamics have more than a local expressive intent here, since the passage culminates in a general pause; and the attenuation of the theme in Mahler's interpretation makes the greatest possible contrast with the succeeding tutti outburst in the minor mode. See Ex.28.1.

Mozart, K.551/4, P.45; 219-25: See Ex.28.7 where Mahler's supplementary dynamics underline the sudden modulation from E minor to the return to the first theme in C major.

Other examples may be found below.

12.7 Extension of Crescendo

After a long crescendo, Beethoven often arrives ff several bars before the entry of the theme to which it is leading: Mahler then continues this crescendo by requiring the brass, or the doubling instruments to enter softly and then make their own crescendo.

Beethoven, Leonore III, P.14, 374-7: Instead of a uniform ff in Trl/2, Ps1-3 & Pk, Mahler inserts p crescendo to continue the crescendo already underway and lead to the Recapitulation.
crescendo in St, and Mahler marks them p cresc.

Beethoven III/1, P.26, 79-80: Wind enter mf cresc.

Smetana, Bartered Bride, P.58/9, 2-5: Br & Pk fp cresc with sf in Br and ff in Pk in b.5. Similar means are employed whenever this passage re-appears.

12.8 Removal of Instruments to achieve a softer Pianissimo

Mahler often replaces or removes instruments to achieve a softer dynamic level, and many cases of this are given in Ch.7-11. He also removes instruments during the course of a diminuendo to give a more extended dynamic range.

Beethoven VII/3, P.34/5; 147b-8b & b.643-4: Ob1/2 & Fg1/2 removed to allow a more dramatic diminuendo.

Beethoven IX/2, P.40; 527-30: Fl3/4 replace Ob1/2. All wind ppp in b.530.

Beethoven IX/2, P.40; 944-50: 2nd half of Vn1, 1st half of Vn2, 1st half of Va and Cb tacet from b.948. Ob1/2 & Fg2 tacet in b.950. Cl1/2 tacet last two notes. All parts have ppp in b.950.

Beethoven VII/3, P.34/5; 277-84: Ww & Hr1/2 tacet, Ob1/2 & Fg1/2 also from previous bar. Tr1/2 play only in b.278 and b.280. This emphasises Beethoven’s soft statement of the reprise.

Schumann, Manfred, P.51/2; 4-6: Fl2 tacet last crotchet of b.4; Ob2 tacet b.4. Ob1/2, Cl1/2 & Hr1 tacet from 3rd crotchet of b.5 until 1st note of b.6. Vn2 tacet until 1st note of b.6, Va tacet until 1st note of b.7. VcI omits 1st three notes of b.4. In b.6, Vnl & Vc omit 1st note and Cb tacet on 2nd crotchet. Mahler thins out this passage to make a more effective diminuendo.

12.9 The Manipulation of larger Dynamic Schemes

By notating dynamics more carefully than the composer, and sometimes
crescendo. Mahler's changes in such cases often involve making the
crescendo in two or more waves, with one or more subito pianos at
intermediate steps. The reader is referred to the chapters on
individual works for numerous examples of this, among which the
following are noteworthy:

Beethoven VI/1, P.32: 151-75. <14>
Beethoven IX/1: 363-8.
Beethoven IX/4, P.40: 172-87.
Beethoven IX/4, P.40: 331-431.
Schubert IX/1, P.48: 280-303.
Schumann I/1, P.53/4: 381-96.

Sometimes the passage concerned involves both crescendo and diminuendo:


Occasionally, Mahler completely overhauls the dynamic scheme:


12.10 Dynamic Change for Contrast of Timbre

Sometimes Mahler's dynamic changes cause a sudden shift in balance
between the different instrumental groups:

Schubert IX/4, P.48, 94-7: Mahler's changes here emphasise
the woodwind, then, from the second half of b.96, the
strings. See Ch.29.4.9.

Beethoven, Leonore II, P.13; 348-63: Mahler's scheme allows
the important instrumental groups to emerge in turn: See
Ch.18.2.3.
There is one place where Mahler changes dynamics to prevent the listener's interest from flagging during a repetitive passage in Beethoven.

Leonore II, P.13; 294 et seq: Vc and Cb have accents on their *pizzicato* passage. By bringing the bass line to the fore, Mahler steers the music through a developmental passage which, due to the repetition of shorter one and two bar motifs, could become tedious. Woodwind are also accented from b.330. <15>
Chapter 13

Matters Temporal

Certain features of Mahler's interpretations are discussed here which do not strictly come under the heading of Retuschen. These are his cuts, the repeats which he made, timings and tempi, and his use of the Luftpause. This chapter gives an opportunity to review the important findings in respect of these features: for further details see the individual chapters on the works mentioned.

13.1 Cuts

Mahler made cuts in four of the scores which are catalogued in this study. The works concerned are Beethoven VII, Beethoven IX, Schubert IX and Schumann II, and the reasons for the cuts are various.

The omission, after the Trio, of the first eight bars of the Scherzo of Beethoven IX appears to have been due to Mahler viewing them as an introduction which could not be repeated. Perhaps he believed that Beethoven's notoriously hard to read manuscript had been misinterpreted. This is a cut which Mahler apparently made in his earlier years, restoring it in New York in 1910. <1>

In Schubert IX, the cuts in the second and fourth movements are cleverly worked out. Already in the Hamburg score there are three sections cut, and there are even more excisions from the later score,
comprising 20% of the second movement and 11% of the finale. They involve material which is repeated and, in the finale at least, Mahler actually tightens up Schubert's structure.

The cut in the Scherzo of Beethoven VII removes the second Trio and third appearance of the Scherzo, and destroys the structure of the movement completely. Made both in Prague in 1908 and in America, but probably not before, it is marked in the parts by players.

Equally reprehensible are certain cuts in the Finale of Schumann II: in fact, so strange and disfiguring to the periodic and harmonic structure of the movement are most of these that I beg leave to doubt that Mahler made them all. <2>

No score is available to confirm this statement, nor is a performance listed in Martner, but an article in The Musical Courier asserts that Mahler made substantial cuts in Tchaikovsky's Francesca da Rimini, to the extent of reducing its playing time from twenty-four to eleven minutes. <3> Although it is not difficult to find passages which are repeated almost verbatim in the work and which could easily be cut, one wonders why Mahler bothered to conduct the piece if he held it in such low esteem.

13.2 Repeats

In most scores it is clear that, like cuts, the removal of repeats was one of the latest decisions that Mahler made, since there are often Retuschen to be seen both in scores and parts in the Ima volta bars.

Whether this can be taken to indicate that Mahler decided this question during rehearsals, or whether the lack of repeats in certain movements
indicates only his last thoughts is not possible to discern, although
some of the timings written in the parts indicate that Mahler may have
been inconsistent in the repeats which he took. A table summarizing
what we do know from the available sets of orchestral parts forms
Appendix 2.

Critical reports are not of much help in this matter, though a review
in the Evening Post of Mahler's performance of Brahms I in New York in
November 1910 stated that:

...Unlike Mr Fiedler, he suppressed all the repeats, not
only the traditional one of the exposition of the first
movement, but a shorter one in the allegretto. For this he
deserves praise, as also for his splendid performance of
the final movement... But Mahler and Brahms could not be
anything but an anticlimax to Mahler, Hoffmann and
Saint-Saëns. <4>

It is not clear from this whether the suppression, or the first
movement repeat itself, were considered to be traditional in New York
at that time; but this review and the review of the same concert in The
New York Press (The concert closed with an interesting performance of
Brahms's First Symphony.) <5> show that Brahms was not considered very
highly there, at least not when conducted by Mahler.

From the information available, the only surprises are that Mahler made
the repeats in the first movements of the two Mozart symphonies and
that he omitted the short repeats in the Trios of Brahms I and Schumann
II. Otherwise his general attitude to repeats was the same as
conductors of the succeeding generation, including Walter and
Furtwängler, and which, excepting present day "authentic" performances,
remains the usual modern practice.
Mahler was naturally aware of the problems inherent in the fixing of tempi with a metronome, and expressed himself on them to Natalie Bauer-Lechner:

"...All the most important things - the tempo, the total conception and structuring of a work - are almost impossible to pin down. For here we are concerned with something living and flowing that can never be the same even twice in succession. That is why metronome markings are inadequate and almost worthless; for unless the work is vulgarly grouped out in barrel-organ style, the tempo will have changed by the end of the second bar. Therefore the right inter-relationships of all the sections of the piece are much more important than the initial tempo. Whether the overall tempo is a degree faster or slower often depends on the mood of the conductor; it may well vary slightly without detriment to the work. What matters is that the whole should be alive, and, within the bounds of this freedom, be built up with irrevocable inevitability."

Mahler was also not consistent in his tempi from one day to the next and justifies this to Natalie:

"What makes it even harder to play under me, and what the people complain about, is that I cannot bring myself to take the same tempo time after time. I would be bored to death if I constantly had to take a work down the same monotonous beaten track. But this has a good influence on singers and players; they simply cannot afford to be slack or lazy, but must always be on the qui vive."

For these reasons, Mahler did not make much use of the metronome, unlike his friend and colleague Mengelberg who wrote metronome markings in his scores every few bars. Even for the recording of tempi in his own works, Mahler used metronome marks only at the beginning of the first movement of his Second Symphony and in some of his early songs.

There are three sources of information about Mahler's tempi. Seven works were timed at his concerts with the New York Philharmonic and pencilled into the scores of Edwin Francis Hyde, a New York banker who was President of the Philharmonic Society from 1888 to 1901. These
Hyde gives timings for the following works conducted by Mahler:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Piece Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dvořák</td>
<td>Carnival Overture</td>
<td>22 Nov 1910</td>
<td>8 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liszt</td>
<td>Mazepa</td>
<td>4 Nov 1909</td>
<td>16 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>Symphony IX with cuts</td>
<td>1 Nov 1910</td>
<td>47 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Symphony II</td>
<td>22 Nov 1910</td>
<td>37 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Symphony III</td>
<td>31 Jan 1911</td>
<td>36 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchaikovsky</td>
<td>Symphony VI</td>
<td>20 Jan 1910</td>
<td>44 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Meistersinger Overture</td>
<td>10 Jan 1911</td>
<td>8½ mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is nothing very unusual about these timings. The list gives us confirmation of a Schubert IX timing written in the parts; but the only other timing which can be used is that for Die Meistersinger Overture.

At an average metronome mark of crotchet = 105, it is clear that Mahler did not linger any more on this overture in the concert hall than he would have done in the opera house.

The second source comprises many of Mahler’s orchestral parts which have timings written in by players, either at the beginning or at the end of the work, and sometimes for individual movements. There are problems in introducing these timings as evidence. Firstly, we do not know how accurately they have been recorded: at best they can be accurate to half a minute, and further than that one can only speculate. Secondly, many of the timings are for complete works, or for sections of works encompassing different tempi and there is no means of apportioning the timings for the different parts, or of estimating reliably the gaps between movements. Thirdly, we do not know when these timings were taken. These players' timings have been collated in Appendix 3.

Of particular significance are the timings for Bruckner IV and Schumann IV, since the orchestral parts from which they come were only used in New York, and Bruckner IV was performed only on 30 Mar 1910. From the entries in these two works it is reasonable to deduce that the many
New York. Of these, there are 12 first desk viola parts and four second
desk cello parts with timings; but, in view of the unfruitful nature of
any attempt to determine tempi from these, I have generally confined
any discussion in this study to those timings in orchestral parts which
can yield useful results, and have been content merely to record data
in other cases. The addition of information from other sources might
allow us to come to more interesting conclusions at a later date.

The third source about tempi is critical opinion. This is, of course,
relative and it is difficult to know with whom Mahler is being
compared.

Despite the difficulty in making use of the many tantalising timings,
an attempt has been made to evaluate tempi from them, and whatever
significant information can be gleaned from the available timings and
critical comments has been recorded in the chapters on individual
works.

The only trend which can be discerned is the frequently voiced opinion
that Mahler played the Scherzi of Beethoven Symphonies too slowly.
This was said at various times and in various places about his
interpretations of Beethoven III, V, VI, VII and IX.

13.4 Modification of Tempo

Of one agreed feature of Mahler's conducting there is no evidence other
than contemporary reports, and that is his freedom of tempo. Freedom
of tempo within a movement is one of the important considerations
discussed by Wagner in *Ueber das Dirigiren* and Mahler undoubtedly took
Mahler had flexibility. Take the second theme of the Eroica: the modification was tied into the phrasing. He practised what Wagner preached. He followed the tempo according to the understanding. After you take note of the initial marking, then you must do your part. Just a shade of modification, but it's the difference between freedom and slavery. <11>

The New York Times refers to this in Mahler's performance of Beethoven III of 4 November, 1909:

He sought for a dramatic expression highly colored, strongly emphasized, very free in tempo, into which he introduced many modifications... There was a splendid rhythmical quality in Mr. Mahler's reading everywhere that was never lost, and there were many beautiful and expressive details in all four of the movements, especially in the last, the series of variations in which there is much opportunity for plastic modeling, of which he took the fullest advantage. <12>

Without recordings it is impossible to get closer to a knowledge of what these contemporary reports signify.

13.5 Luftpausen

The "comma" is found in every one of Mahler's own symphonies which he conducted himself. The significance of such a comma can vary between the indication of a short gap between notes to show that a player must breathe, to an agogic distortion of the flow of the music which is commonly called a Luftpause.

Herman Martonne refers to the first possibility when he says:

I found one specific Mahlerish thing: his breathing in the melody of something, not always just one end to the other... Just like you sing... He'd say, 'breathe'. The sound stopped between phrases. That brought a clearness and an ensemble into the whole thing. Now that's almost insensible, but it's just enough to make it sound natural,
As far as the use of Luftpausen is concerned, I do not know where this practice originated, but in his book, *Ueber das Dirigiren*, Weingartner implies that as far as orchestral performance is concerned it can be traced back to Bülow in his later days, and that it was imitated by his followers, from whom Weingartner sought to disassociate himself.

In Mahler's own works the Luftpause is sometimes named as such in the score and employed to emphasise the beginning of a new period:

- Symphony I, 4th mvt: 374-5.
- Symphony IV, 3rd mvt: 314-5.
- Symphony VIII, 1st mvt: 261-2.

These are all *fortissimo* passages, though Mahler also uses the device in *piano*:


There are not many cases of *subito piano* in Mahler's own works, and this may be because he prefers to use the device described by Wellesz and mentioned in Ch.12.5. However, on occasions Mahler does prescribe a Luftpause for acoustic reasons. Examples are:

- Symphony IV, 1st mvt: 66-7 & 292-3.
- Symphony VI, 4th mvt: 609-10.

These Luftpausen are all examples of Mahler interpreting his own works, and a modern conductor might well decide to ignore some of them.

When it comes to Mahler's interpretations of the works of other
though in many cases we only have the witness of the orchestral parts as evidence, and it is, of course, difficult to know for certain exactly what was meant by the marks:

Beethoven III/1, P.26: 85-6, 93-4 & 361-2.
Beethoven IX/1, P.40; 4th mvt: 329-30.
Beethoven, Egmont Overture, P.11: 333-4 et seq.
Beethoven, Leonore III, P.14: 5 et seq.
Mozart, K.550/4, P.44: 16-17 et seq.
Schumann I/4, P.53/4: 6-7 etc.
Schumann IV/1, P.56/7: 28-9 & 143-4.
Schumann IV/4, P.57: 78-9 & 80-1.

In addition to this representative list, it should be noted that Mahler's scores of Beethoven VI, P.32, and Beethoven VII/1, P.34, are particularly rich in Luftpausen. See Ch.24 & Ch.25.

Some of Bülow's Luftpausen are described by Damrosch in Appendix 9 and, considering the high esteem in which Mahler held Bülow, it is not unreasonable to suggest that Mahler inherited the Luftpause from him. Bülow died in February 1894, and Mahler gave four performances of Beethoven VI in the 1894-5 season in Hamburg. The consequent assumption that P.32 was the score which Mahler used for these performances, and that the Luftpausen therein are a direct result of Bülow's influence on Mahler, would explain why there are so many of them indicated in that score. <15>
We learn from Ferdinand Pfohl that Mahler's Luftpausen were famous in their day. He reports of Mahler's performance of the C-major Fledermaus waltz in Hamburg in 1894 that:

He allowed the piquant rhythms of the woodwind, which dominate the sixth and eighth bars of the first period, to enter with Luftpausen, with a delay through which the graceful stream of the melody was prolonged in an unusual and bizarre manner. It was perhaps the first beginning of that caesura madness (Gäsurenwaëns), which the famous Court Opera Kapellmeister Hans Richter reported to me as a fundamental characteristic as much of the Court Opera Director as also of the conductor Mahler. <16>

Bruno Walter also heard Bülow conduct in Berlin and Hamburg and records in his autobiography his own deep impressions of this. <17> The Walter Luftpause, which can be heard in recordings made throughout the last 50 years of his career, probably derives from the Bülow-Mahler tradition. Walter's 1901 recording of Mozart's Idomeneo Overture, <18> and his 1959 recording of K.550, <19> both have noticeable Luftpausen. In b.210-1 of the first movement of the symphony this takes the form of a gap approximately equal to the length of a crotchet.
Chapter 14

Conclusions

14.1 Mahler's Retuschen Compared.

The sources discussed in this study give a good overview of Mahler's habits in three different periods of his life. The Hamburg scores of Schubert IX, P.47, and Coriolan, P.4, represent his adaptation of the works to an orchestra of the size demanded by Wagner in Lohengrin, with triple woodwind, four horns and three trumpets. The instruments which Beethoven and Schubert did not employ, E-flat clarinet, 3rd bassoon / contrabassoon and a second trumpet pair, were assigned an important role by Mahler in remedying defects of balance which he identified in the wind parts.

In Vienna, with the resources of the Philharmonic Orchestra which was selected from among the best players of the Imperial and Royal Court Opera, Mahler no longer needed such make-shift arrangements. He could call on players to double each woodwind part and play the extra horns and trumpets, many of whom participated in only a few bars of the work. At this time Mahler was able to afford to purchase his own sets of orchestral parts and to employ copyists to make the manuscript parts needed for the extra instruments. Although Mahler's aims and conception of the weaknesses of the original scores did not change fundamentally, he was obliged to start afresh in annotating scores to be used with the Viennese complement. Because of the necessity to
ideas, based on his Hamburg conducting, were now clearer, Mahler's scores from this period are much easier to read. The sharp lead pencil had given way to red ink or blue pencil. These were less easy to erase, and any later thoughts had to be added with a different implement. Sometimes this feature makes for an easy determination of the order in which Mahler made his changes, and it is certainly easier to decipher such a score than one in which pencil has been erased several times. Works in which Mahler's Viennese Retuschen can be identified with certainty include the overtures Coriolan, P.5, Leonore II & III, P.13/4, Beethoven IX, P.40, and Schubert IX, P.48. These sources of Coriolan and the two symphonies can be compared with Mahler's Hamburg scores.

Mahler's New York ensemble was a less accomplished one than the Vienna Philharmonic and we find evidence of Mahler changing his Retuschen to suit his changed circumstances. His string complement was now smaller than that in Vienna, although he could still call on doubled woodwind; and at the same time Mahler's own ideas were also changing. We have sources of several works which Mahler only performed in concert in New York and from which we can describe his New York Retuschen. These include Schumann I, P.54, Schumann IV, P.57, and Smetana's Bartered Bride Overture, P.58/9. By this time, Mahler's other performance materials had become rather confused with different changes in many places, though his employment of Boewig as his copyist enables us to distinguish with certainty many changes which were made in New York.
14.2 Did Mahler go too far?

Whether or not we accept that Mahler's manifesto setting forth his intentions in making Retuschen <3> represents a justified stance, we must ask ourselves whether he achieved his aims or whether, as has often been stated, he went beyond his assumed brief.

Even though not based on a study of the actual scores, many of the criticisms of Mahler’s Retuschen are based on an evaluation of the amount of red ink and blue pencil which they necessitated. But in terms of the overall audible impression which Mahler’s retouched scores give to the listener, the means by which he achieves his clarification are well disguised: the effect of much of the red ink and blue pencil is inaudible to all but the ears of a musician who knows the works by heart, and it is only when one compares the actual Retuschen with what Mahler could have done that it is possible to gauge his moderation.

In addition to piccolo, E-flat clarinet and double bassoon, had he wanted, Mahler undoubtedly could have used in Hamburg the cor anglais whose rich romantic timbre would be unsuitable for the classics. He did not. Indeed, Mahler generally decided which instrument was to reinforce another on the basis of which player could be spared from the task allocated by the composer, to help in something more important, and only used the supplementary woodwind instruments when he saw no alternative.

Unlike Frederick Stock, Mahler did not completely re-instrument Schumann III. Throughout his arrangement of the work, Stock employed triple woodwind, four chromatic trumpets, three trombones and tuba, and
We do not find Mahler performing Beethoven IX twice on one evening, as Bülow did in Berlin and Damrosch did in New York. Nor did he employ a semichorus, as Damrosch did as a substitute for the soloists in the same work.

In fact, Mahler's alterations were more far-reaching and radical than any made by his predecessors, contemporaries and successors; but this does not imply that they were arbitrary: on the contrary, his changes are based on a sound analysis of the works. His cuts in Schubert IX which might appear to be cavalier at first sight are useful suggestions for tightening up the structure. Mahler does not seek to expose detail which should more properly be hidden. When he employs two timpanists, as in the first movement of Beethoven IX, he does so for only a few bars to bring greater force to the recapitulation.

It can be said with justification of his employment of extra brass in Beethoven IX and other works that one is amazed at the amount of free time Mahler left these players.

Sometimes we see clearly that the problems posed by the composer have defeated Mahler. The redistribution of parts in bars 351-404 of the finale of Beethoven VII is a well-meaning but vain attempt to obtain more power and a better balance without reducing the woodwind dynamics or emasculating the important development of the bass line.

Even in his earlier Retuschen, Mahler was aware of the danger of makeshift arrangements which draw attention to themselves by their sporadic appearance, and he avoided it. As early as 1893, Bauer-Lechner reports him saying:

"...the idiosyncracies and inadequacies of the various
additional beauty and adornment when skillfully applied, while a bungler will simply stick them on wretchedly for the sake of expediency." <7>

Many of Mahler's changes only make sense in the context of others within the same work, and it is precisely because his Retuschen permeate a complete score that one is not aware of the original weaknesses of instrumentation, as one would be if the texture suddenly changed at their approach.

Going far beyond the recommendations of Weingartner, Mahler's acute aural imagination and sense of orchestral colour led him to seek possibilities for a realisation of those features of the score which were hidden either by the composer - Schumann III/1, 62-70 - or by the inadequacies of the available instruments, as in his rewriting of the horn parts in Beethoven VII/4, 24-8.

Sometimes Mahler's Retuschen involve the complete omission of a part of the rhythmic texture. These cases represent a statement by Mahler to the composer, to the effect that if he wants anything to be heard at all, he had better not try to say too many things simultaneously. Many such justified messages abound in Mahler's Schumann Retuschen, and even Beethoven is not safe from them, for instance in the first movement of the Ninth Symphony, bars 401-13, where the trumpets and timpani are removed by Mahler.

An attempt to catalogue Mahler's Retuschen in order of their acceptability would be doomed to failure, since they can only be judged against Mahler's own intentions and his own appreciation of the nature of the piece concerned. As Klemperer wrote,

the retouching of Beethoven, Schumann and others was an essential feature of Mahler's interpretation of their works. <8>
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anachronism can only be of value when considering the work of a composer demonstrably incompetent in instrumentation; and such an evaluation can legitimately be invoked when comparing Mahler and Stock in Schumann III. It is perhaps this fact which allows the acceptance of Mahler's Schumann Retuschen but not his Beethoven Retuschen; and it is in those cases where Mahler makes extensive changes and other conductors successfully employ the original text that the greatest difficulty arises in defending him. In such circumstances Mahler's main defence is the liberal interpretation of Busoni's statement that every notation is in itself the transcription of an abstract idea, <9> and the supporting evidence is Mahler's demeanour in discharging the responsibilities of divining that abstract idea. Once this is accepted, and there is no doubt that it accords with Mahler's own views, the concept of good or bad Retuschen ceases to exist and must be replaced by the distinction between those Retuschen which are by common consensus valuable from a practical point of view and those which enabled Mahler to realize the composer's abstract idea. The latter category will always be controversial and the many examples in Mahler's Retuschen are well represented by:

- Beethoven, Leonore II, 374-80: Remodelling of scoring.
- Beethoven III/4, 416-20: Extensive use of chromatic brass.
- Beethoven VII/1, 88-100: Remodelling of scoring.
- Beethoven IX/1, 301-38: Remodelling of scoring.
- Beethoven IX/4, 189-98: Remodelling of scoring.
- Mozart K551/4, 389-402: Rescoring of horns and trumpets.
- Schubert IX/4, 0-7: Rescoring and insertion of fermatas.
- Schumann I/1, 0-2: Restoration of Schumann's original.
- Schumann II/2, 267-70: Addition of Ur-motif.
Mahler had no formal pupils, though Bruno Walter had every opportunity of learning from him in Hamburg and Vienna. The influence of his Retuschen was nevertheless widespread. It is on record that he lent his conducting scores to his younger colleague Mengelberg, the Prague copies of Mahler's Beethoven VII and Coriolan Retuschen were much used by Talich, Both Schoenberg and Webern were involved in performances of Beethoven IX with Mahler's Retuschen, Klemperer is reputed to have had a copy of Mahler's Beethoven VI Retuschen, and Toscanini asked Alma Mahler to lend him Mahler's score of Schumann III.

Walter retained several of Mahler's Retuschen to the end of his life though his attitude to instrumental Retuschen in his book Of Music and Music-Making was ambiguous:

> The conductor ... often has to admit to himself that a mere modification of dynamic directions is insufficient for achieving clarity of melos. In those cases, there is nothing for it but to alter the instrumentation itself if obscurity is to be avoided.

This brings me to the complex question of orchestral 'retouches', the conductor's active interference with the original instrumentation. Whatever can be adduced on the grounds of literary fidelity, I must declare myself against the radical rejection of retouching. As long as it is done solely in the spirit of the work, and strictly for no other purpose, retouching may surely be counted among the legitimate means of interpretation. It goes without saying that the conductor has to refrain from interfering with the score as long as this is at all feasible; but if he cannot, by means of the given instrumentation, achieve clarity of dynamics or meaning, he may and should induce it by means of a (preferably small and unnoticeable) retouch (sic); after all faithfulness to the letter of the work should never obscure its spirit. But let us clearly distinguish between those alterations in the instrumentation that serve dynamic clarity or, in general, the clarification of the composer's intentions, and those arbitrary retouches that
performance of Wotan's farewell and Fire-Magic from Wagner's Die Walküre in which the conductor had the final chord played by divided strings. This was, apparently, more in accordance with his personal taste than the marvellous wind-combination of the original. He could not have doubted that an incomparable master of orchestration such as Wagner chose this wind-combination for the final chord of the 'Fire-Magic' out of a perfect inner realization of sound; still, to him, the conductor, the unmistakable intention of Wagner did not seem inviolable, and he arrogated for himself the right of substituting his own for it; in other words, he had no scruples in falsifying the sound of the Wagner orchestra.

Certainly, such crass cases of outrageous arbitrariness may be rare, but there is only a difference of degree, not of principle between them and those rather frequent, less drastic, alterations of the score by which many conductors seek to improve or modernize the orchestration, believing themselves entitled to make changes in persuasion of their personal sound-ideals. I have seen scores of classical masterpieces where the notation had in places almost disappeared under the written-in retouches which arbitrarily adapted the original orchestration to the sound ideals of another. But though his knowledge of the orchestra may be superior or his methods of orchestration more advanced, it can never be the conductor's affair to admix strange timbres to the proper colours of a score, to augment or change the character of its sonority; in short, to subject it to his own taste by any sort of interference. Even the smallest licence in retouching is to be deplored; yet, on the other hand, even incisive alterations, such as were recommended by Wagner in his suggestions about the performing of Beethoven's Ninth may bear witness to exemplary re-creative faithfulness and be able, in a legitimate manner, to aid musical interpretation. In all reverence for Wagner and the exemplary purity of his intentions, however, I should like to say that his retouches here seem to go too far. But although I have my doubts about these radical alterations of Wagner, I am whole-heartedly in favour of the principle evinced by them of lending to the sound of the orchestra the fullest dynamic clarity, even if it is a clarity which could not have been obtained by the original orchestration. <16>

Klemperer who did not hesitate to discuss Mahler's Retuschen, and whose views have been quoted earlier, summed up his own attitude with:

In this whole business of retouching, my motto is "Sehe jeder, wie er's triebe." ("Let each one see for himself how he does it.") <17>
Although the distinctions between Mahler's Retuschen in Vienna and New York are often blurred by our inability to determine their exact chronology, they demonstrate clearly Mahler's constant refusal to commit himself to a "final version". <18> Thus we cannot speak of a fixed Mahler edition of any given work. Unlike Weingartner, Mahler never wrote a book on his Retuschen and the question of whether or not he would have approved of their continued use is far from a definite answer.

Ernst Jokl relates how Mahler said on the occasion of a performance of Beethoven IX in New York:

> When we left the rehearsal together he said: 'I thought of writing down and publishing my "alterations" (he actually said these inverted commas). 'But - there is really no point, and it's no concern of anybody's.' <19>

We also find in Mahler's scores of Beethoven VII and Schumann I remarks which are difficult to explain as memoranda to Mahler himself or to his copyists, and which appear to be relevant only to other conductors.

Universal Edition, by acceding in a limited way to Alma Mahler's request that Mahler's Retuschen be published, not only encouraged the widespread, and still echoed belief that the Schumann Retuschen were the most significant, but also implied that they comprised finished edited versions.

The body of Mahler's Retuschen in Beethoven VII and IX, the overtures Coriolan, Leonore III, Die Weihe des Hauses and The Bartered Bride, Schubert IX, and Manfred Overture do seem to have stood the test of time during Mahler's career and it is arguable that, were he to have prepared his later scores for publication himself, most of the features
this we cannot ignore his attitude to the instrumentation of his own works. Natalie Bauer-Lechner reports that at a reading rehearsal of his fourth symphony in October 1901 in Vienna, Mahler made many changes to the instrumentation, saying:

"Instrumentation is not there for the sake of sound-effects, but to bring out clearly what one has to say." <20>

Egon Wellesz also describes Mahler rehearsing the Resurrection Symphony in the Großer Musikvereinsaal in November 1907 and making changes to the scoring:

When it came to the famous duet between solo soprano and solo alto: O Schmerz! Du Alldurchdringer! it was obvious that the chords in the trombones, though they were to be played pianissimo, were covering the voices of the singers. Mahler tried out everything to reduce the dynamics of this passage, but to no avail. The voices did not come through in the low middle register. Though there are no other sustained chords in the score, Mahler suddenly decided to strike out the trombones and said in a solemn way, very unusual for him: "Hail to the conductor who in the future will change my scores according to the acoustics of the concert hall." <21>

Otto Klemperer relates a similar event three years later:

At one point during the rehearsals for the Eighth Symphony he turned to some of us in the auditorium and said, "If after my death something doesn't sound right, then change it. You have not only the right, but the duty to do so." <22>

Yet today Mahler’s own Symphonies are played in fixed versions and despite his exhortations hardly any conductor would dream of changing a note. Though this accords with the current concept of Urtext it is evidently against the spirit in which Mahler wrote the works.

Some of Mahler’s retouched scores have received modern performances. The Schubert quartet has been published, performed and recorded. Schubert IX was performed in Munich in November 1978 and in London in 14.4.0 - Conclusions
Berlin Radio Symphony in December 1983 and broadcast over Sender Freies Berlin. <23> Leonard Slatkin performed Coriolan Overture with the Boston Symphony Orchestra in January 1986, and a later radio broadcast of his performance with the New York Philharmonic Orchestra impressed more by the essentially discreet nature of Mahler's Retuschen than by any feeling that one was hearing the re-creation of a Mahler interpretation. The Schumann symphonies have been recorded in an integral version by the Swedish record company Bis.

Despite this we are still far from a universal understanding of the significance of Mahler's Retuschen, and for the establishment of this nothing less than the actual publication of some of his retouched scores will suffice. This would be as valuable as the publication of Mozart's Messiah Retuschen or Wagner's Gluck Retuschen. It would involve a Critical Report giving full details of those passages where Mahler did not leave sufficiently clear instructions to establish his last thoughts. Such cases as the omission of trumpets and timpani at the beginning of the first movement Allegro of Schubert IX, the cymbal crash in Manfred and the employment of the trombone and tuba in Beethoven IX are problematical in this respect.

A further fruitful study might be made of Mahler's Retuschen in his own works, which up to now have rarely been discussed except as a means of establishing an Urtext or an Endgültige Fassung of his symphonies. It would be valuable to know more about the alternative versions, and a knowledge of these could form the basis for intelligent compliance with Mahler's own charge to conductors reported above. In addition to gaining an insight into those cases where Mahler reorchestrated sections of his works to gain more clarity, it should be possible to separate the essential elements of Mahler's scores from those which
scores of his posthumous works and a comparison of them with those
works which he was able to conduct himself demonstrates a clear
distinction between a pure text and a specifically realised practical
version. <24>

14.5 Towards an objective View

It is ironical that, although Mahler the composer is today held in
greater esteem than at any time, many things for which he stood in his
performance practice are rejected. The currently prevailing attitude
seeks and claims to present the works of the early nineteenth century
as they would have sounded to contemporary ears, with a particular
emphasis placed on reproducing the timbres of the instruments as they
are perceived to have sounded at the time of the first performance of
the works. If we could be certain that modern research has identified
the actual sounds, and if we could be equally convinced that the
composers longed for nothing else than the resources at their disposal,
then the process is justified; but as there is no guarantee of the
truth of these presumptions we are actually in a situation which
differs little from Mahler's.

Klemperer, arguably the foremost exponent of die Neue Sachlichkeit (the
new objectivity) in performing practice, already begged the question
when he wrote that Mahler

...retouched in the spirit of his age. I believe it was
unnecessary, and that one can bring out the full content of
such music without retouching. I believe, too, that if we
heard a Beethoven sonata played by Franz Liszt today we
should be shocked by his arbitrary treatment of it. And
yet both things, Mahler's retouching and Liszt's
interpretations, were entirely necessary - in their day.
Mozart's retouchings of Handel's Messiah should similarly
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Klemperer himself lived in a different age from Mahler, an age when the pendulum had already begun to swing to the other side. He himself had given it a hefty push; and his refusal to acknowledge that the essential musical greatness of the composers Mozart, Liszt and Mahler must have influenced their performing practice was a product of his own point of view. Similarly, the current preoccupation with factual accuracy in the performance of Beethoven, when pursued at the expense of creative responsibility, runs a serious risk in ignoring the history of performing practice in the works. An art which is fundamentally subjective cannot be objectified in this way after the passage of one hundred and fifty years, no matter how hard we may try.

Much hinges on whether we conclude that Mahler's Retuschen tell us more of Mahler or of the composers concerned: even Elgar was reluctant to commit himself in public to the practice of changing a single note in Mozart on the grounds of the development of the orchestra. At the conclusion of his Birmingham lecture of 8 November 1906 he points out that, in bar 124 of the first movement of Mozart's Symphony No.40, the second horn was not able to duplicate the reinforcement of the bassline that it had already afforded in bar 116, since

"...the A (sounding E) was not possible on the old horn, so it is perforce omitted. Can anyone say that Mozart would have omitted the upper note of the phrase if he had an instrument which could play it? No.

"The whole question of 'improving' the orchestration of the old masters might turn on this very simple point." <26>

We are in the realm of imponderables and the truth is that we do not know the answer to this question. Guido Adler, the father of musicology and close friend of Mahler, was able to see both sides of the argument about Mahler's Retuschen and deserves the last word. The intention is commendable, but the means are to be
universal validity to arise — for the alterations of Mahler
no more than for those of Wagner still employed by many
conductors of our time. Since the original of Beethoven
continues to be inviolably preserved, no lasting detriment
can result from this. Whether interpretation can and
should go so far is a question in itself. The
imperfections in the fulfillment of that ideal which hovers
before the composer, and which he wishes to realize in the
work of art, are lasting attendant manifestations of the
qualities of the work. Whether on the whole the latter
gains true completion through such alterations cannot be
verified. For the general public, which hardly notices
such additions, this question is of less moment. The
matter is one of conscience, which one can deny neither
Wagner nor Mahler. The historian will have to stand up for
the unalloyed preservation of the authentic text; yet he
can still recognize the good intention of the clarification
without granting it any universal validity. <27>
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Chapter 15

Listing and Description of Sources

This chapter comprises a listing and description of all the scores and orchestral materials of symphonic repertoire known to the author at the end of November 1988 which have marks in them by Mahler or his copyists. It does not include works by Mahler himself. The works are arranged in alphabetical order and numbered sequentially to aid unambiguous reference. In the main body of this study they are referred to as: P.1, P.35, etc.

15.1 List of Scores and Parts Edited by Mahler

1. Bach Cantata No.19 Part
2. Bach Cantata No.65 Part
3. Bach Cantata No.78 Part
4. Beethoven Coriolan Overture Score
5. Beethoven Coriolan Overture Score
6. Beethoven Coriolan Overture Parts
7. Beethoven Coriolan Overture Score
8. Beethoven Coriolan Overture Parts
9. Beethoven Egmont Overture Score
10. Beethoven Egmont Overture Score
11. Beethoven Egmont Overture Parts
12. Beethoven König Stephan Overture Score
13. Beethoven Leonore II Overture Parts
14. Beethoven Leonore III Overture Parts
15. Beethoven Weihe des Hauses Overture Score
16. Beethoven Weihe des Hauses Overture Score
17. Beethoven Weihe des Hauses Overture Score
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Piano Concerto No.5</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>String Quartet, Op.95</td>
<td>Parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>String Quartet, Op.95</td>
<td>Parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.1</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.2</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.3</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.3</td>
<td>Parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.3</td>
<td>Part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.4</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.5</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.5</td>
<td>Parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.5</td>
<td>Parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.6</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.7</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.7</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.7</td>
<td>Parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.7</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.7</td>
<td>Parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.8</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.9</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.9</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.9</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Bruckner</td>
<td>Symphony No.4</td>
<td>Parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Bruckner</td>
<td>Symphony No.5</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Symphony No.40</td>
<td>Parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Symphony No.41</td>
<td>Parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>String Quartet in D minor</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>Symphony No.9</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>Symphony No.9</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>Symphony No.9</td>
<td>Parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Manfred Overture</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Manfred Overture</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Manfred Overture</td>
<td>Parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Symphony No.1</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Symphony No.1</td>
<td>Parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Symphony No.2</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Symphony No.4</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>Symphony No.4</td>
<td>Parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Smetana</td>
<td>The Bartered Bride Overture</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Smetana</td>
<td>The Bartered Bride Overture</td>
<td>Parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Die Meistersinger Overture</td>
<td>Parts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15.2 Description of Sources

1. **BACH Cantata No.19**: Continuo Part

   **LOCATION:** Southampton University

   **ACCESSION NUMBER:** 73-032 489

   **EDITION:** Peters (5833)

   **STAMPS:** Kaiserl. u. Konigl. Hof-Musikalienhandlung / Albert J. Gutmann Wien, K. K. Hofopernhaus, surrounding a double eagle in a circle.

   **PERIOD OF USE:** From the stamp and appearance, sometime between 1897 and 1907.

   **COMMENTS:** This is a vocal score in which Mahler added marks in blue pencil for the organ part. These include directions as to which notes to play, dynamics and registration. Some sections were accompanied by piano. No performance of this work is listed in GMK. The arrangement is discussed in DMM2, p.377.

2. **BACH Cantata No.65**: Continuo Part

   **LOCATION:** Private Collection

   **EDITION:** Peters (5788)

   **STAMPS:** ?

   **PERIOD OF USE:** From the appearance, sometime between 1897 and 1907.
pencil for the organ part. These include directions as to which notes to play, dynamics and registration. Some sections were accompanied by piano. No performance of this work is listed in GMK. See DMM2, p.377.

3. **BACH Cantata No.78: Continuo Part**

**LOCATION:** Private Collection

**EDITION:** Peters (8904)

**STAMPS:** ?

**PERIOD OF USE:** From the appearance, sometime between 1897 and 1907.

**COMMENTS:** This is a vocal score in which Mahler added rehearsal letters and marks in blue pencil for the organ part. These include directions as to which notes to play, dynamics and registration. Some sections were accompanied by piano. No performance of this work is listed in GMK. See DMM2, p.377.

4. **BEETHOVEN Overture, Coriolan: Score**

**LOCATION:** Southampton University

**ACCESSION NUMBER:** 73-032 470

**EDITION:** Peters Edition

**COMMENTS:** This is a bound set of eleven Beethoven overtures, originally in three volumes. Only three out of the eleven works have any marks added to them. (See P.12 and P.15).

15.2.0 - Listing and Description of Sources
DATE OF REVISIONS: 1894.

COMMENTS: The marks are mainly in pencil and look very similar to those found in P.47 which was also performed in November 1894.

5. BEETHOVEN Overture, Coriolan: Score

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel (B.169)

STAMPS: Emil Berté & Cie, Wien

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1898

COMMENTS: There are many Retuschen which have been made in blue and lead pencil and red ink. Mahler conducted this work in November 1898 at his first Viennese concert. He conducted Beethoven III in the same programme, some of the parts for which are also stamped Emil Berté & Cie.

6. BEETHOVEN Overture, Coriolan: Parts

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel (Orch. B.156)

STAMPS: All parts have Gustav Mahler / Wien (facsimile). Many also have Leihmaterial / Unverkaufliches Eigentum / der Univ. Edit. 1010 Wien.
7. BEETHOVEN Overture, Coriolan: Score

LOCATION: Czech Philharmonic Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel (B.169)

DATE OF REVISIONS: Up to May 1908.

COMMENTS: This copy was made by "K.M", probably from P.5. Mahler's own hand is to be found in blue pencil. This and the parts, P.8, have been used subsequently by Talich and Klecki. <1>

8. BEETHOVEN Overture, Coriolan: Parts

LOCATION: Czech Philharmonic Archive
PERIOD OF USE: May 1908

STRINGS: 5,5,4,4,4 (Vn5 and Cb4 are manuscript)


COMMENTS: These parts basically agree with the score P.7, although they have been used since Mahler's concert in Prague. <2>

9. BEETHOVEN Overture, Egmont: Score

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel (B.12)

STAMPS: None

DATE OF REVISIONS: ?

COMMENTS: The blue pencil is not in Mahler's hand and the score is not annotated as richly as P.10 or P.11.

10. BEETHOVEN Overture, Egmont: Score

LOCATION: Haags Gemeentemuseum - Mengelberg Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel (Part B.170)

STAMPS: EIGENDOM der / Naam. Vennootschap / HET CONCERTGEBOUW

DATE OF REVISIONS: ?

COMMENTS: This score contains the inscription door Gustav Mahler

15.2.0 - Listing and Description of Sources
photostat, but enough to confirm that this score was written in by Mahler and that the rehearsal numbers correspond with those inserted in P.11.

11. **BEETHOVEN Overture, Egmont**: Parts

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel (Orch. B.160)

STAMPS: Gustav Mahler / Wien (facsimile) on Strings and Wind Set A.

PERIOD OF USE: From 1899 onwards.

STRINGS: 10,9,7,6,5

Vn1.8, Vn1.9, Vn2.9, and Va7 show no evidence of having been used. Vc5, has scarcely been used.

Vn1.10 has Wien changed to New York in pencil.

WIND A: A complete set of wind parts.

Trl: M Agamobr? or (Midadavch?) 1902 The House of Nobility, Saint Petersburg in Russian.

WIND B: A set of woodwind (including piccolo) for doubling players.

WIND C: Extra Hr1/2 and Trl/2 parts.

COMMENTS: In Vienna, Mahler first conducted this work in February 1899.

12. **BEETHOVEN Overture, König Stephan**: Score

LOCATION: Southampton University

15.2.0 - Listing and Description of Sources
EDITION: Peters Edition. This is a bound set of 11 Beethoven overtures, originally in three volumes. Only three out of the eleven works have any marks added to them. (See P.4 and P.15).

STAMPS: JOH. AUG. BÖHME / HAMBURG / Musikalienhandlung on title page.

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1891/7

COMMENTS: With such a small number of marks, in lead, brown and blue pencil, it seems unlikely that this score was used. Mahler programmed this work for a concert with the NYPSO on 13th and 16th December 1910. The critics of the NYT <3> and NYDT <4> mention the work, although Martner omits it from his listing.

13. BEETHOVEN Overture, Leonore II: Parts

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel

STAMPS:

String and Wind sets A and B have Gustav Mahler / Wien (facsimile), Mahler (facsimile) and PHILHARMONISCHE GESELLSCHAFT.

Wind set C has Philharmonic Society of New York with a lyre, and G. Schirmer successor to / J Schuberth & Co.

PERIOD OF USE: Strings and Wind sets A and B from 1900. Wind set C in 1909 only.

STRINGS: 9,8,6,6,4 bound in grey paper.

Vn1.2, Vn1.9, Vn2.1, Va5, Va6, Vc6 and all Cb parts are manuscript.
WIND B: Trompeten solo auf der Bühne (manuscript)

WIND C: A Breitkopf & Härtel set (B.20), printed by stone litho, of woodwind and horn parts used for doubling players.

COMMENTS: All except wind set C have rehearsal letters - in two different versions. Mahler did not use the Breitkopf letters. Mahler performed this work in Vienna in December 1900 and in New York in November 1909.

14. BEETHOVEN Overture, Leonore III: Parts

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel (Orch. B.158)

STAMPS: Gustav Mahler / Wien (facsimile)

PERIOD OF USE: From 1900 onwards.

STRINGS: 9,9,6,5,5.


Vn1.9 has no player’s marks.

Vn2.9 has only one player’s mark.

Cb parts not much used.

WIND A: A Complete set of wind:

F12 has segue Finale No.16 at end.

Hrl has at the beginning: O Gott gib meinen Worten Kraft -
WIND B: Set of woodwind for doubling players.

COMMENTS: The basic annotations of the parts were made by a copyist in black ink. Some of the Retuschen in the bassoon and viola parts were made by Boewig. There are clear indications that Mahler used this set for his performances of Fidelio in Vienna.

15. BEETHOVEN Overture, Weihe des Hauses: Score

LOCATION: Southampton University

ACCESSION NUMBER: 73-032 470

EDITION: Peters Edition. This is a bound set of 11 Beethoven overtures, originally in three volumes. Only three out of the eleven works have any marks added to them. (See P.4 and P.12).

STAMPS: JOH. AUG. BÖHME / HAMBURG / Musikalienhandlung on title page.

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1894?

COMMENTS: According to Martner, Mahler first performed this work in December 1899, although Andraschke <5> makes an unsubstantiated statement that he performed it in Hamburg in the 1894/5 season. I have been unable to find independent confirmation of this assertion, although the existence of this score may support it. There are only a few marks, in bars 63-66.
LOCATION: Vienna Philharmonic Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel

STAMPS: ?

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1899?

COMMENTS: Retuschen, dynamic changes and rehearsal letters inserted by Mahler in blue pencil. I have not seen this score. <6> Mahler first performed the work in Vienna in December 1899.

17. BEETHOVEN Overture, Weihe des Hauses: Score

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel (179)

STAMPS: GUSTAV MAHLER / WIEN (block capitals)

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1899?

This is a very clean score, which is bound in black cardboard. It has Retuschen entered by Mahler and also by a copyist, undoubtedly working from an earlier score, perhaps P.16. Mahler first performed this work in December 1899.

18. BEETHOVEN Overture, Weihe des Hauses: Parts

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel
PERIOD OF USE: From 1899 onwards.

STRINGS: 9, 9, 7, 6, 6

Vn1.9, Vn2.8 and Va6, seem not to have had much use.

Vn2.9, Va7, Vc6, Cb5 and Cb6 have no annotations.

WIND A: A complete set.

Hr4: manuscript, since inside the printed Hr4 part is actually a Hr3 part!

WIND B: Doubling set of woodwind.

COMMENTS: There are many additions made by a copyist, and pieces stuck into the parts. Players have added marks in rehearsal using pencil and blue pencil. Concerning the string parts, 8, 8, 6, 5, 4 represents the size of the string set which was definitely used by Mahler, while 8, 7, 5, 5, 4 represents the number of parts which was used much more than the others.

19. BEETHOVEN Overture, Weihe des Hauses: E-flat Clarinet part

LOCATION: Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek

ACCESSION NUMBER: MH 14429/c

EDITION: Mahler holograph.

STAMPS: GUSTAV MAHLER / WIEN (block capitals)

PERIOD OF USE: From 1899 onwards.
COMMENTS: Rehearsal letters, some comments and marks have been added in pencil. Mahler first performed this work with Busoni in March 1899.

21. **BEETHOVEN String Quartet, Op.95**: Score

LOCATION: Vienna Philharmonic Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel (B47)

STAMPS: ?

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1998/9

COMMENTS: Additions by Mahler in blue pencil and "copying-ink pencil" include rehearsal letters. <7> Mahler performed this work only once, in Vienna in January 1899.

22. **BEETHOVEN String Quartet, Op.95**: Parts

LOCATION: Vienna Philharmonic Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel (B47)
PERIOD OF USE: January 1899

STRINGS: 9, 9, 6, 5, 5. Cb parts m/s.

COMMENTS: Additions by Mahler in blue pencil and "copying-ink pencil" include rehearsal letters. <8> Mahler performed this work only once, in Vienna in January 1899, undoubtedly from this set of parts.

23. BEETHOVEN Symphony No.1: Score

LOCATION: Southampton University

ACCESSION NUMBER: 73-032 452

EDITION: Edition Peters (5442)

STAMPS: Rózsavölgyi és Társa / Budapest on the title page.

COMMENTS: Bound with P.24. There are no added marks.

24. BEETHOVEN Symphony No.2: Score

LOCATION: Southampton University

ACCESSION NUMBER: 73-032 452

EDITION: Peters (5443)

STAMPS: Rózsavölgyi és Társa / Budapest on the title page.

DATE OF REVISIONS: ?

COMMENTS: Bound with P.23. The markings are in red ink (two different
pencils. There are rehearsal letters written in which do not correspond with the Breitkopf letters. The thoroughness of the revisions and the many different types of writing implements used indicate that this may have been the only score Mahler used.

25. **BEETHOVEN Symphony No.3: Score**

**LOCATION:** Southampton University

**ACCESSION NUMBER:** 73-032 443

**EDITION:** Peters (5444)

**STAMPS:** Rózsavölgyi és Társa / Budapest on the title page.

**DATE OF REVISIONS:** 1891/2.

**COMMENTS:** Bound with P.28. The first recorded Mahler performance of this work was in March 1892, in Hamburg. The markings are mainly in lead pencil with some blue pencil and some ink. There are rehearsal letters only, in blue pencil. Before each rehearsal letter is noted the number of bars which have elapsed since the previous letter. The rehearsal letters are not always in the same places, and the revisions of this score are not as extensive as those of P.26.

26. **BEETHOVEN Symphony No.3: Parts**

**LOCATION:** Universal Edition Archive

**EDITION:** Breitkopf & Härtel (Orch B.7/8)
parts carry the raised pressed mark K u K Direktion des K u K Hofoperntheaters with a double headed eagle and some have Emil Berté & Cie, Musikhandlung, Wien I, Kärntnerring Nr.6.

PERIOD OF USE: From 1898 onwards.

STRINGS: 9,9,7,5,5 with printed bowings.

Vn1.9, Vn2.9, Va7, Vc5 and Cb5 have not been used much.

Vn1.1: On the cover in blue pencil are the names of Prill and Hellmesberger, concertmasters of the Vienna Philharmonic.

Vn2.2: 31/10/1898 779tn phil Probe - J Werner - Mahler 1 Mal.

WIND A: A complete set of Breitkopf & Härtel parts.

Fl1: Petersburg d 5te Marz 1902 A Niehoff. <9>

WIND B: A manuscript set with only the notes to be doubled.

All woodwind, plus extra brass parts: Corno 1 in Es, Corno II, Corno IV in Es, Corno VI in Es, Tromba 1 in C and Tromba 2 in C. All the parts in this set were made by the same copyist and only stamped Gustav Mahler / Wien (facsimile).

Fl1: Indications in English.

Fl1: M Kohon Feb 24 - 1911 New York <10>

Trl: M Agamobr? or (Miadamavch?) / 1902 6/3 / The House of Nobility, Saint Petersburg in Russian.

COMMENTS: The Breitkopf parts have their rehearsal numbers replaced by those corresponding to the Peters edition and these are supplemented by extra letters, and 56 numbers which follow consecutively throughout the work. The majority of the markings, in ink, were transferred from Mahler's score by a copyist. Mahler's marks are confined to the orientation figures with other occasional indications. However, even the copyist's markings are not always consistent from part to part, as
27. BEETHOVEN Symphony No.3: E-flat clarinet part

LOCATION: Viennese Private Collection

EDITION: in Mahler's hand.

STAMPS: GUSTAV MAHLER / WIEN (block capitals)

PERIOD OF USE: ?

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1900

COMMENTS: The part is reproduced as Ex.22.3.

28. BEETHOVEN Symphony No.4: Score

LOCATION: Southampton University

ACCESSION NUMBER: 73-032 443

EDITION: Peters (5445)

STAMPS: Rózsavölgyi és Társa / Budapest on the title page

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1900?

COMMENTS: Bound with P.25. No rehearsal letters added. Some writing by Mahler in lead and blue pencils. The first Mahler performance of this work was in December 1900.
LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Peters (5446)

STAMPS: Rózsavölgyi és Társa / Budapest on the title page.

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1889/90

COMMENTS: Bound with P.32. The markings are mainly in lead pencil with some blue pencil and some ink. There are rehearsal letters only. Mahler's first performance of this work was in Budapest in February 1890.

30. BEETHOVEN Symphony No.5: Score

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel

STAMPS: None

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1897

COMMENTS: There is no indication of when or where Mahler might have obtained this score. It contains extensive markings in Mahler's hand in red ink, lead pencil, blue pencil and red pencil. The red pencil was used for indications of the entry of the doubling wind instruments and the blue pencil for insertion of the rehearsal letters and numbers. A comparison of this score with P.29 indicates that it comes from a later period, probably from 1897.
LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf und Härtel

STAMPS: Most carry the stamp Gustav Mahler / Wien, though Vnl.1 has Wien crossed out and replaced by N.Y.

PERIOD OF USE: From 1897 onwards.

STRINGS: 9,9,6,6,5

Vnl.9, Vn2.9 and Cb5 have not been used much.


WIND A: A complete set.

Fll: Johtmans Helsingfors 1907

Psl: 31 März 97 in Budapest / A Neuhaußer.

Ps3: Paul Freburg (or Frebusch) / Philharmonie Budapest / am 31./III. 97. This part has at the end a tracing of a ten dollar coin (c.2cm dia.).

Pk: Helsingfors 1/11 07 Kallen Wånnånen.

WIND B: Doubling set of all woodwind, except Cfg.

WIND C: Copyists parts for Hr3/4 in F.

Hr4: Triest am 3/4/07 Konzert Mahler. F.Kökman /
Helsingfors 19 1/xi 07.

COMMENTS: The Retuschen have mainly been added by a copyist. The parts have been furnished with rehearsal letters and numbers (no numbers in Cb5) and these and most of the Retuschen and indications agree with the Breitkopf score listed above.

15.2.0 - Listing and Description of Sources
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33. **BEETHOVEN Symphony No.7**: Score

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Peters (5447)

STAMPS: Rózsavölgyi és Társa / Budapest on the title page.

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1894

COMMENTS: Bound with P.29. The marks are mainly in pencil. There are rehearsal letters only. Mahler first performed this work in 1894 in Hamburg.

34. **BEETHOVEN Symphony No.7**: Score

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Peters (5448)

STAMPS: Rózsavölgyi és Társa / Budapest on the title page.

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1893/4

COMMENTS: Bound with P.38. There are rehearsal letters in blue pencil, added in different places from those in P.34, but no extra numbers. Most of the Retuschen are in pencil and differ in detail from P.34. Mahler first performed this work in March 1894 in Hamburg.

COMMENTS: This score agrees closely with P.35. It is carefully marked with red and black inks, and blue and lead pencils. 146 extra rehearsal numbers have been added and the number of bars between rehearsal numbers has been noted.

35. BEETHOVEN Symphony No.7: Parts

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel

STAMPS: Gustav Mahler / Wien in facsimile.


STRINGS: 9,9,6,5,5.

The cello parts have special manuscript parts inserted for the finale. These were made by Boewig in 1909 to take account of the many additions to the parts.

Cb2: Ludolphe Slovatchevsky / S. Petersburg / 13 Nov 1907 / Kaiserl Oper.

WIND A: A complete set of wind parts.

Pk has an additional manuscript part for the finale.

Hr1: L Reisner Lvov 4/3 1903
Hr2: Rudolf Rezek 22/5 1908
Tr2: March 31st 1909

WIND B: A manuscript doubling set of wind and Hr3/4 all made by the same copyist.

15.2.0 - Listing and Description of Sources
COMMENTS: These parts, which were basically made by a copyist, agree closely with P.34 and have the same 146 additional rehearsal numbers.

36. BEETHOVEN Symphony No.7: Score

LOCATION: Prague Philharmonic Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel (Part. B.11)

DATE OF REVISIONS: Up to May 1908.

COMMENTS: This copy was made from Mahler's score by "K.M". Mahler's own hand is to be found in blue and lead pencils. <11>

37. BEETHOVEN Symphony No.7: Parts

LOCATION: Czech Philharmonic Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel

PERIOD OF USE: May 1908

STRINGS: 6,5,4,4,3

Cb3 is manuscript.

WIND: A complete printed set of wind, plus Hr3 and Hr4 in manuscript and two additional Pk parts in m/s for the finale.

Hr1: Reisner 1903

COMMENTS: These parts agree basically with the score P.36. <12>
38. BEETHOVEN Symphony No.8: Score

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Peters (5449)

STAMPS: Rózsa-völgyi és Társa / Budapest on the title page

DATE OF REVISIONS: ?

COMMENTS: Bound with P.33. There are no rehearsal letters or numbers. There are few marks, in pencil only. Mahler performed this work only once, in December 1898 in Vienna.

39. BEETHOVEN Symphony No.9: Score

LOCATION: Southampton University

ACCESSION NUMBER: 73-032 425

EDITION: Peters (5450)

STAMPS: None

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1895

40. BEETHOVEN Symphony No.9: Score

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Peters (5450)
DATE OF REVISIONS: From 1899 or 1900 onwards.

COMMENTS: Rehearsal numbers and letters have been added. Before recent rebinding the score was in poor condition with many loose pages.

41. BEETHOVEN Symphony No.9: Score

LOCATION: Southampton University

ACCESSION NUMBER: 73-032-434

EDITION: Peters (8814)

STAMPS: None

COMMENTS: In the main this is a copy of P.40. Rehearsal numbers and letters have been added. Several hands, including probably Mahler's own are in evidence. Some of the marks are doubtful.

42. BRUCKNER Symphony No.4: Parts

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Verlag der K & K Hof-Musikalienhandlung Albert J. Gutmann in' Wien (A.J.G.711)

STAMPS: New York / Philharmonic / Society with dragon's teeth. G. Schirmer / 35 Union Sq. N.Y.

PERIOD OF USE: March 1910

STRINGS: 8,7,5,5,4

15.2.0 - Listing and Description of Sources
WIND A: A full set, with cymbals.

Tb: Fred Geib March 30 - 1910 Carnegie Hall N.Y.
Philharmonic Orch. Gustav Mahler Conductor.

WIND B: A doubling set of woodwind.

COMMENTS: Mahler added rehearsal numbers throughout and many of the numerous markings. There are players marks in German, Italian and English.

43. BRUCKNER Symphony No. 5: Score

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Doblinger (D.2080)

STAMPS: None

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1900/01

COMMENTS: Mahler performed this work only once, in February 1901 in Vienna.

44. MOZART Symphony No. 40: Parts

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

STAMPS: The folder and all parts have Gustav Mahler / Wien (facsimile).

PERIOD OF USE: Probably from 1902 onwards.

STRINGS: 9, 9, 6, 5, 5. All Breitkopf & Härtel. (Orch.B.102)

WIND: A complete set with clarinets. Breitkopf & Härtel. (Orch.B.102)
COMMENTS: All the parts have pencilled in dynamics, and the first desks have these dynamics also in blue pencil with bowings indicated too. There are bowings printed in the parts and some of these Mahler accepted. These parts all show signs of much use, but they may not necessarily all have been in use in any given performance.

Mahler first performed this work in April 1886 in Prague, again in Dec 1890 in Budapest, and also in Hamburg in 1894. The first performance he gave in Vienna was in October 1898. According to Deutsch, the parts could not have been printed before 1890, and the extensive use which they have had makes it not impossible that Mahler acquired them in Budapest, though internal evidence only indicates with certainty that they were used by him from 1902 onwards.

45. MOZART Symphony No.41: Parts

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

STAMPS:

Strings: Gustav Mahler / Wien in facsimile (except for Vn2.6), and Philharmonische / Gesellschaft (except for Vn1.1, Vn1.2, Vn2.1, Vn2.2, Va1, Va2, Vcl and Cbl).

Wind Set A has Gustav Mahler / Wien and Philharmonische / Gesellschaft. Obl has this latter inside the rectangular box with chamfered corners, while the rest have the circular version.

Wind Set B has Philharmonic / New York / Society in red.

Wind Set C has New York / Philharmonic / Society in blue, with dragon’s teeth.

PERIOD OF USE: From 1899 onwards.

STRINGS: 9,8,6,5,4.

15.2.0 - Listing and Description of Sources -264-
least four different copyists involved. There are dates on
some from 1826 and 1860. The parts are numbered in red
pencil with the older parts indicated for the rear desks.
The bowings are inconsistent.

Cbl lacks the P.G. stamp.

Vn2.6 lacks the GM/W stamp.

WIND A: A set of ten handwritten wind parts (including timpani).

Fl: a 2 at the beginning, but details of doubling are not
generally given.

WIND B: A set of woodwind and horns.

This is an old Breitkopf & Härtel edition (Mozarts Sym:
No.6) which belonged to the New York Philharmonic Society.
Letters had originally been added in pencil. Others were
added in blue to correspond with Mahler's parts. The flute
part is marked II Pult. In the first Horn part it says: The
letters are changed: take blue for the new edition.
Doublings are indicated, but few dynamics. It would appear
that this set, if it was used at all in conjunction with
the handwritten set, was used for the doubling players.

WIND C: Flute Part in a later Breitkopf & Härtel edition with no marks
except blue pencil indications of repeats. This part seems unlikely to
have been used.

COMMENTS: Mahler first performed this work November 1899 in Vienna. The
Viennese stamps and the presence of some comments in English indicate
that this set was the one used then, and later in New York. From the
note at the end of Vn2.7: Josef Palm / Albert Backreif / Salzburg dem
15/7/91, and from its age, it is certain that other conductors had used
the set before Mahler. Why Mahler did not acquire a printed set is not
clear, but he took the trouble to bring the parts into line with the
Mozart Gesamtausgabe. The existence of so many wind parts supports the
belief that Mahler doubled certain passages in order to balance the
large tutti string section.

15.2.0 - Listing and Description of Sources
46. SCHUBERT String Quartet in D minor (D810): Score

LOCATION: In the collection of Dr Donald Mitchell

EDITION: Peters (5376)

STAMPS: JOH. AUG. BÖHME / HAMBURG / Musikalienhandlung

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1894

COMMENTS: Performed in Hamburg on 19 Nov 1894. Mahler added rehearsal letters I to 0 to the slow movement in blue pencil, probably to agree with the letters in printed parts, and pencil notes throughout for performance by string orchestra. An edition of this score with preface by Donald Mitchell and David Matthews was published in 1985 by Josef Wienberger Ltd.

47. SCHUBERT Symphony No.9 (D 944): Score

LOCATION: Southampton University

ACCESSION NUMBER: 73-032 564

EDITION: Peters

STAMPS: JOH. AUG. BÖHME / HAMBURG / Musikalienhandlung

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1894

COMMENTS: Rehearsal letters have been inserted throughout in blue pencil: some are additional, e.g. Mm in the finale. Bars numbered in pencil every five bars in the first movement. There are many
work in Nov 1894 in Hamburg.

48. SCHUBERT Symphony No.9 (D 944): Score

LOCATION: Bayerischer Staatsbibliothek, Munich

ACCESSION NUMBER: Mus Mss 7000

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel (B153)

STAMPS: Gustav Mahler / Wien (facsimile) in the front and on the title page.

DATE OF REVISIONS: From 1899/1900 onwards.

COMMENTS: Bound in green cloth, this score came in 1965 from the estate of Theodore Spiering, concertmaster of the NYPO during Mahler's tenure as Music Director. It agrees in all substantial detail with P.49, and is clearly the score that Mahler used for his performances from April 1900 onwards. In the second and fourth movements the number of bars between orientation signs has been written in. There is evidence of different rehearsal letters having been written in at an earlier date.

<14>

49. SCHUBERT Symphony No.9 (D 944): Parts

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf & Härtel

STAMPS: Gustav Mahler / Wien (facsimile) on all parts and cover of
PERIOD OF USE: From 1900 onwards.

STRINGS: 9,9,6,5,5.

Vn2.7: Dir. Mahler ohne Wiederholung 58 Min 1/4/1900

Va6 has no orientation marks added.

WIND A: A full set.

WIND B: A doubling set of woodwind.

WIND C: Manuscript Hr3/4 and Tr3/4. (Different copyists for horn and trumpet parts.)

COMMENTS: Most of the Retuschen have been put into the parts in black ink by a copyist. The extra rehearsal numbers in blue pencil and the cuts in russet pencil were added by Mahler. This set agrees substantially with P.48. There are entries by players which indicate use in New York.

50. SCHUMANN Overture, Manfred: Score

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf und Härtel (B.255)

STAMPS: Musikhaus Alexander Rosé / WIEN, I. Kärntner-Ring 11.

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1900

COMMENTS: The score has a grey binding. It contains doublings for woodwind, and has markings in black and red inks, and blue pencil.
51. SCHUMANN Overture, Manfred: Score

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf und Härtel

STAMPS: None

DATE OF REVISIONS: From 1908/9 onwards.

COMMENTS: The score has a red binding. There are no woodwind doublings indicated, but extra notes are indicated for a third flute. Mahler's Retuschen are based on P.50 but with significant differences, and are substantially as in P.52.

52. SCHUMANN Overture, Manfred: Parts

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf und Härtel

STAMPS: With the exception of Vn2.6, all the parts are stamped Gustav Mahler / Wien in facsimile. Va5, Va6, Vc5 and Cb5 are also stamped PHILHARMONISCHE / GESELLSCHAFT / WIEN.

PERIOD OF USE: From 1900 onwards.

STRINGS: 9,8,6,5,5

The first desks are an old Breitkopf Edition printed set, the rest handwritten.

WIND: A full set plus a handwritten part for cymbal.
The covers are very coarse paper, some having been used before for binding other works. The last desks of the string parts (Vn1.8, Vn1.9, Vn2.8, Va5, Va6, Vc5 and Cb5) were probably bound separately from the other string parts as they all are bound in paper which formerly bore the titles in German of selections from Berlioz' *Romeo & Juliet*. Several of the parts have players' remarks in English. Some of the Retuschen are in the handwriting of Boewig. The Retuschen are substantially as in P.51.

53. SCHUMANN Symphony No.1: Score

LOCATION: Osborn Collection, Yale University

ACCESSION NUMBER: Mus ms 529

EDITION: Peters (7084)

STAMPS: JOH. AUG. BÖHME / HAMBURG / Musikalienhandlung.

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1899 and 1908.

COMMENTS: Retuschen are in blue, russet and lead pencil, and red ink; and orientation numbers have been added in blue pencil. The orientation numbers run up to No.42, including Nos.10½ and 11½, but omitting No.37. No.43 has been erased. These orientation numbers match the parts, P.54.

This score undoubtedly served as the basis for P.54. Most of the Retuschen are in ink, which would indicate that they were done over a short period of time. Mahler performed this work first in Hamburg on 21 Jan 1895, but the use of red ink and many additional rehearsal numbers is more consistent with a later date of revision.
54. SCHUMANN Symphony No.1: Parts

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Breitkopf und Härtel

STAMPS: None

PERIOD OF USE: The number of string parts, the players' remarks and the lack of stamps indicate that this set was used only in New York, in 1908.

STRINGS: 9, 8, 7, 6, 5.

There are very few players' marks though, with the possible exception of Vn1.9, they have been used.

Vn2.7 and Vn2.8: Turn! at the end of the slow movement.

Va6: turn pppp at the end of the slow movement.

Vc1: no noise at the end of the slow movement.

WIND: A normal set with no doublings indicated.

Cl1: indications written in French: avec flûte, avec basson, en dehors.

Fg1: Muck written at the end.

COMMENTS: This set of parts matches P.53. Most of the marks were made by a copyist in ink; while others can be assigned to players. Players' marks in the parts are in English and German (Kurrent). In addition to the normal rehearsal letters there are extra orientation numbers.

55. SCHUMANN Symphony No.2: Score

LOCATION: Southampton University

15.2.0 - Listing and Description of Sources
ACCESSION NUMBER: 73-032 555

EDITION: Peters (7085)

STAMPS: JOH. AUG. BÖHME / HAMBURG / Musikalienhandlung.

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1891/7

COMMENTS: The small number Retuschen which Mahler wrote in in blue pencil relate to doublings and dynamics. There are no rehearsal letters in this score, so it is certainly not the one which served as a basis for Mahler's two performances in November 1910.

56. SCHUMANN Symphony No.4: Score

LOCATION: Osborne Collection, Yale University

ACCESSION NUMBER: Mus ms 530

EDITION: Peters (7087)

STAMPS: JOH. AUG. BÖHME / HAMBURG / Musikalienhandlung

DATE OF REVISIONS: 1900 and 1909

COMMENTS: Retuschen are mainly in blue pencil and orientation numbers have been added, running continuously up to No.37. This score matches the parts, P.57.

57. SCHUMANN Symphony No.4: Parts

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

15.2.0 - Listing and Description of Sources
STAMPS:

Strings and Wind Set A are stamped J. Schuberth & Co. / Music Dept / N-York 820 Broadway, or Scharfenberg / & Luis / New York (Va4), or both (Vn2.5), plus, in red, Philharmonic / of New York / Society.

Wind Set B are stamped New York / Philharmonic / Society in blue, with dragon's teeth.

PERIOD OF USE: From December 1909 onwards.

STRINGS: 8,7,6,5,4, printed by stone litho.

These parts have been re-numbered several times.

WIND A: Complete set matching the string set with some indications of doublings.

WIND B: A later Breitkopf printing with b written on them. These were used by doubling players.

COMMENTS: Most of the parts were marked up in blue by Mahler himself, from P.56, with additions by players in pencil. There are 37 continuously numbered orientation figures added by Mahler. Wind set B has only marks by Mahler and players, no copyist's marks.

58. SMETANA Overture, The Bartered Bride: Score

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Bote und Bock

STAMPS: Schirmer, New York.

DATE OF REVISIONS: Unknown. Mahler first performed the complete opera
nine times in the 1899/1900 season, and once in the 1900/1 season. 

<15> He also conducted a few performances of the work at the New York Metropolitan Opera in 1909. Mahler first gave the work as a concert overture in Prague in May 1908, but at that concert there were not enough wind instruments for the doubling of all parts. <16> Some of the Retuschen, which were written in by Boewig, date from 1910, but the basic revision could have been made either in Vienna, or in New York.

COMMENTS: This score was prepared by Boewig, using a blue pencil. The writing, which is very neat, suggests that he worked either from another score, perhaps one of the complete work which Mahler had used in the opera house, or from the set of parts, P.59. The original only has four rehearsal letters and in line with Mahler’s usual practice, 26 extra rehearsal numbers have been added.

59. SMETANA Overture, The Bartered Bride: Parts

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Bote und Bock

STAMPS: None

DATE OF REVISIONS: See P.58.

PERIOD OF USE: Possibly from 1908 onwards; certainly in Jan 1910.

STRINGS: Set of 8,7,5,5,4.

WIND A: A complete set.

On the back of C11 is written: A. Bellucci New York.
Piccolo, Trl/2, Hr3/4, Ps1-3 and Pk show no evidence of having been used.

Fl2: Not needed written in blue at the top. This part has no extra rehearsal numbers, but does contain the blue brackets which indicate doublings.

Ob2: An m/s part made by Boewig, and dated 1910.


COMMENTS: The materials agree closely with P.58. From the remark in Hrl of set B arises the possibility that Mahler played this work with six horns, with Hr5/6 doubling Hrl/2 in places, but there is no further evidence of this, and the modifications which Mahler made to the score do not seem to warrant it.

60. WAGNER Overture, Die Meistersinger Act I: Parts

LOCATION: Universal Edition Archive

EDITION: Schott

STAMPS: GUSTAV MAHLER / WIEN (block capitals) on all parts.

DATE OF REVISIONS: Unknown

PERIOD OF USE: Unknown

STRINGS: None

WIND A: Schott parts of Fl1/2 and Cl1/2 (one copy each), and Ob1/2 and Fg1/2 (two copies each). <17>

WIND B: Manuscript part for E-flat Clarinet in Mahler's own hand, using black ink and blue pencil.
is unconceivable that he did not have a complete set of parts, and the small number of players' marks in this set support the assumption that there was at one time, in addition to this set, a complete set of parts in use by Mahler. However, although most of the marks in this set indicate doublings, it is clear from other indications when there is no doubling taking place that, at least on occasion, the principal players also read from them at one time. Mahler has indicated in blue pencil the doublings required, and there are also pencil marks, probably made by players. Rehearsal letters, A - K, and numbers, 1 - 14, have been added. There is no copy of the piccolo part with this set.
Chapter 16

Beethoven, Coriolan Overture, Op. 62

As can be seen by the list of his performances, Coriolan Overture was one of the staples of Mahler's repertoire:

- Hamburg PO 19 Nov 1894
- Leipzig 14 Dec 1896
- Vienna PO 6 Nov 1898
- Vienna PO 16 Dec 1900
- Strassburg 22 May 1905
- Trieste 1 Dec 1905
- Frankfurt 18 Jan 1907
- Wiesbaden 9 Oct 1907
- Helsinki 1 Nov 1907
- St. Petersburg 9 Nov 1907
- Prague 23 May 1908
- Hamburg 9 Nov 1908
- New York SO 29 Nov 1908
- New York PO 16 Dec 1909
- 17 Dec 1909
- 31 Dec 1909
- 30 Jan 1910

In 1898, on the occasion of his first performance with the Vienna Philharmonic, Mahler remarked to Natalie Bauer-Lechner that

"...the Coriolan Overture is one of the richest and most concise of Beethoven's works, and one that is grossly underestimated..." <1>

adding that

"...the piece suited him as well as if he had tried to paint his own self-portrait in it." <2>

This self-identification with the work served Mahler well, as nearly all critics agreed that Mahler brought out everything the piece has to offer. La Grange quotes Kalbeck writing of the 1900 performance to the effect that Mahler
Dissent from this opinion was found in New York where, in a review of Mahler's 31 Dec 1909 concert, the Times wrote of Mahler's interpretation of Coriolan and Egmont Overtures that:

There is an overemphasis, a tendency to make everything part of an essentially dramatic scheme, to insist upon the highest lights and the deepest shadows, to exceed the bounds of euphony. <4>

16.1 Sources

16.1.1 Score, P.4

This score has the stamp of Böhme, Hamburg and was probably used in 1894. There are marks in blue and lead pencils and many erasures which render the score illegible in places. Many of the marks are identical to those found in P.5; but many are more audacious. Mahler has added parts for a second horn pair, a third trumpet, an E-flat clarinet, and a third bassoon / contrabassoon. There is also the unlikely mention of a trombone at one point.

16.1.2 Score, P.5

The stamp of Emil Berté Wien identifies this as the score which Mahler may have used as early as his 1898 performance. It is marked up by Mahler in red ink, and blue and lead pencils, and in many places is based on P.4. Mahler adds parts for Hr3/4.
16.1.3 Set of Orchestral Parts, P.6

The set of parts currently comprises only strings in the number 9,7,5,5,5. It appeared in the U.E. Archive (Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek) only in 1986 and has clearly been used by at least one other conductor, having been hired out for performances by the Boston Symphony Orchestra under Leonard Slatkin in January 1986. The original marks were made by a copyist in black ink and by Mahler in blue pencil. There is writing in English in several of the parts. Some of the marks have been changed, probably at the time of the Boston performance, and therefore little account has been taken of this source.

16.1.4 Prague Score and Orchestral Parts, P.7/8

Like the materials of Beethoven VII, P.36/7, this score and parts are found in Prague and were apparently copied in 1908 at the time of Mahler's concert there. They have been used subsequently and, as little time was available to the author for their detailed examination, they were not used as the basis of the present study.

16.1.5 Miniature Score with Interpretative Comments

Through the kindness of Dr. Donald Mitchell I have been able to examine a photostat of a miniature score of the Coriolan Overture which formerly belonged to Alma Mahler. Comments have been entered into this score with lead and blue pencils. The score was subsequently bound and the pages were trimmed, losing parts of some of the comments in the process. Most of the entries are in a hand unknown to me, which does not appear to be that of Alma Mahler. It is thought that Mahler himself
The comments are generally consonant with what has been discovered from P.4 and P.5, and they may have been written during one of Mahler's rehearsals. It is however very curious that none of Mahler's manifold instrumental Retuschen has been noted in this score. As the provenance of this source is not fully known, the comments have not been incorporated into this chapter; but its interest is great enough to warrant its transcription in Appendix Four.

The present author remains sceptical about the authenticity of the upbow in bar 1. While the comment appended is true in itself, it is hard to imagine that Mahler would obtain the power he demanded with any other bowing than down-up. A fortissimo attack can be obtained with an upbow, but the speed of movement required is so great that it cannot be sustained for two bars.

16.2 The Main Characteristics of Mahler's Interpretation

Except where stated the information cited in this section comes from P.5.

16.2.1 Timings

Timings are found in the parts:

Vn2 3 8 Min (German hand)
Val 6½ Min

These times give a metronome setting of minim = 78-96, and the matter is inconclusive.

16.1.5 - Beethoven: Coriolan
In 1898, Mahler told Natalie Bauer-Lechner that

...The five opening chords are already an overture to the overture; they contain the whole fate of Coriolanus. 'That is why they must not be, as is always done, merely rattled through (heruntergespielt) like five blows of equal force. On the contrary, they must sound like this: crescendo - diminuendo ascent, climax, and then the descent and complete downfall in the last two chords. In Heaven's name let the beginning of the following passage not be taken daintily and gracefully! Right after the opening chords, the semiquavers in the violins should not be played in bravura style; they must sound threatening, powerful. <5>

This description agrees well with the indications of the score, P.5.

The climax of the introduction comes in bar 11 which is marked fff by Mahler, with f in bar 13 and mf in bar 14.

Mahler's scheme for the ending of the work is: <6>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>MAHLER'S DYNAMIC NUANCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>fff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>fff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>mf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Wind &amp; Pk pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Wind &amp; Pk ppp, St pp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.2.3 Changes of Dynamics

The New York Times critic noted Mahler's expansion of the normal dynamic range in performing Beethoven, and this work gives good examples of Mahler's changes.

Apart from the example just discussed, the most obvious expansion of the dynamic range, at least to the eye, is in bars 240-2, where Vn1/2 end fff and Hr1/2 enter ppp; but this probably looks more impressive than it sounds.
for one to be made from \( pp \) to \( ff \):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>MAHLER'S DYNAMIC NUANCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>( pp )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>No crescendo in St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>St ( pp ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>St crescendo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Vn1/2 ( pp ), crescendo delayed one bar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>No crescendo in St until b.186.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Crescendo in Vn1/2 delayed until next bar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In three passages Mahler makes a section softer to prepare for a large crescendo:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>MAHLER'S DYNAMIC NUANCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Vn1/2, Va &amp; Vc ( ppp ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>( ppp ) from second note.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>St ( pp ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Crescendo delayed by two bars.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In one passage Mahler, by reducing the dynamic markings and removing the violas, engineers a drop in tone where Beethoven has prescribed a uniform piano:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>INSTR</th>
<th>CHANGED DYNAMIC</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Va/Vc</td>
<td>( pp )</td>
<td>Vnl comes into prominence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Va/Vc</td>
<td>( dim )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>( dim )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Vc</td>
<td>( ppp )</td>
<td>Va removed for four bars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Va/Vc</td>
<td>( cresc ) removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Vn2</td>
<td>( pp )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>( poco a poco cresc )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Vc</td>
<td>( pp )</td>
<td>Vn2 removed for four bars.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.2.4 Selected Passages

1-2: Bowing "down-up".

20: Vn1/2 penultimate note shortened to a dotted crotchet with a quaver

16.2.3 - Beethoven: Coriolan, P.5
34-9: Hrl-4, Trl/2, Pk *diminuendo* in b.34, arriving *mf* on the second crotchet of b.35, with *crescendo* in b.38-9.

41-5: Vn2 join Vnl for the first half of each bar, returning in the second half to their own part. Va adds original Vn2 part to its own on the first half of b.42-5. See Ex.16.1 for additions in Hrl-4 & Trl/2 and Pk in b.40-5.

44-50: Vc *8va* in the second half of each bar. Pk have crotchet B-flats at the beginning of each bar and on the *sforzandi* in b.46-9.

50-1: Hairpins in each bar.

51: Rit, with *a tempo* at the beginning of b.52.

60-3: Fl2 joins Fl1, Ob3 joins Ob1 and Cl2 joins Cl1. (Fgl/2 are already in unison.) All Ww doubled in b.62-3.

64: Vc *tacet* 1st quaver.

68-71: Ob3 joins Ob1, Cl2 joins Cl1. Hrl/2 reinforce Cl1 *8va bassa* and all Ww doubled in b.70-1.

84-91: Hr3/4 reinforce Fgl/2; Hrl/2 reinforce Va with same rhythm as Hr3/4. Tr *f* with *sf* on each dotted minim. Pk *ff dim* on the minims, with accents on the crotchets. This emphasises the two bar periodic structure. In many parts there is a comma before b.92 indicating a Luftpause.

92-5: Trl/2 play original Hrl/2; Cl1/2 reinforce Ob2; Hrl-4 reinforce Cl1/Fgl original. Vn2 joins Vnl. Ww doubled. Dynamic *fff*.

96-102: Vn2 join Vnl until the 1st crotchet of b.100, VaI plays Vn2...
original Cll/2 parts, and Hr3/4 reinforce Fgl/2. Ww doubled until the end of b.101.

103 & 105: Quaver Ds in Pk by analogy with b.231-3.

110° - 112 (1st note): Cll/2 8va; Hr3/4 plays original Cll/2.

113: Hrl/2 complete the bar, reinforcing Ob1/2 8va bassa; Tr2 takes lower D, and Pk have Ds with the same rhythm as Tr1/2.

113 - 114 (1st note): Vn2 join Vnl.

114-7: Va doubles Vn1 8va bassa, and Vn2 doubles Vn1/Va in octaves. To prepare the subito piano of b.118, Va has a quaver rest at the end of b.117. Pk have ff dim in b.114, with ff from the second note of b.116. Hr1-4 have the same rhythm as Fgl/2 and Hr3/4 reinforce Cll/2 8va bassa.

148-50: Vn2 joins Vnl.

151-4; Tr1/2 d'-flat & d''-flat in b.151, f & f' in b.152 and unison d''-flat in b.154.

154, 158-9 & 163-4: Pk has a crotchet at the beginning of each bar, with pitches as bass.

167-76: Fl2 joins Fl1; Ob2 joins Ob1; Cl2 joins Cl1; Fgl joins Fg2. Hr3/4 takes over original Cl2 and Fgl parts. Vnl changes to upbow during each C. Va/Vc double Vn2 for the second two crotchets of each bar.

176-7: Hairpins in each bar.

188-9 & 196-7: Fl2 doubles Fl1; Ww doubled. Until the 1st half of 16.2.4 - Beethoven: Coriolan, P.5
202: *Diminuendo* in Ww delayed until next bar to ensure that they stand out well from the strings.

212-9: All Ww doubled. See Ex.16.2 for changes in Cl1/2, Hr1-4, Vn1/2 and Va. In many parts a Luftpause is indicated before b.220.

220-3: All Ww doubled. F12 joins Fl1. Hr1/2 8va bassa until the 1st note of b.224; Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1. Tr1/2 play Hr1 original. Pk reinforces Fg2. Vn1/Vn2 8va.

By lowering the octave of Hr1/2 and adding Hr3/4, Mahler here concentrates the reinforcement of Va/Vc into the same octave, replacing the original Hr1 part by Tr1/2, and separating the Vn1/2 line by raising the octave.

224-9: Ww doubled. Vn1 still 8va until the 3rd crotchet of b.228. Vn2 takes original Vn1 part until the 3rd crotchet of b.228. Val plays Vn2 original. Hr3/4 reinforce Cl1/2 8va bassa until b.228 when they reinforce Fg1/2. Pk have Fs in b.224 and Cs in b.225, on the 1st and 3rd crotchets.

236-7: Vn1 plays 1st note as quaver, then part taken over by Vn2 to allow Vn1 to prepare for Mahler's high E-flat in b.238.

238-40: Vn1/2 8va. Fl1/2 reinforce Vn1/2.

256 & 258; Vn2 *mf* to bring out the only moving part

264-69: Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2 from the 2nd note. Cl1/2 doubled from the 2nd note.

270 - 274 (1st note): Vn2 join Vn1 and VaI play Vn2 original. In b.270, Hr3/4 resolve the voice leading with a crotchet, written

16.2.4 - Beethoven: Coriolan, P.5
286-9: All downbows. Pk has F on second crotchet of b.286. See Ex.16.3 for Hr1-4 and Trl/2 parts.

302-9: Vcl 3za corda in P.6. This promotes a portamento between the Ds and the A-flats, and the G and the E-flat.

310: Fgl tacet.

16.3 The Hamburg Score, P.4

The Hamburg score is one of the most difficult to read and often the actual changes are not legible. However it is clear that the E-flat clarinet and a third bassoon / contrabassoon were used. In addition to a second pair of horns, Mahler had access to a third trumpet, and indications for this are found scattered through the score. Despite the contrabassoon, in b.114 the indication Contraf u. Pos is found. It seems doubtful that Mahler would have employed a trombone just to play in four bars; but in order to determine what he actually did we should need to examine the orchestral parts.

16.3.1 Trumpet Parts

The alterations to the trumpet parts are quite radical in this earlier version of Coriolan, and the most interesting of them have been collected together:

34-50: Instead of Beethoven's two trumpets playing only C and G where they fit the harmony, Mahler employs three trumpets. See Ex.16.4.

70-1: Trl reinforces Vn2.

16.2.4 - Beethoven: Coriolan, P.5
84-7: Trl/2 reinforce Vn1, Tr3 reinforces Vn2.

88-91: Trumpet parts unclear, but one of them has Beethoven's Hrl part 8va with all the crotchets tied into one note. This gives the impression of a development of the semitone motif introduced in b.46-7.

114-7: An extra trumpet part is pencilled in to reinforce Vn1 8va bassa.

167-70: Trl/2 play original Cl1/2.

264-9: Tr3 (?) reinforces Vn2.

270-5: In addition to the original, the trumpet stave has: Ex.16.5.

Despite the ingenuity of these changes, Mahler's later Retuschen, where he had access to double woodwind, generally preserve more of the characteristic trumpet sounds of the natural scale and are more elegant.
16.3.2 The E-flat Clarinet Part

Mahler used the E-flat clarinet only in P.4. It is indicated by the circle with a horizontal line through it and the plus sign. Exceptionally, in b.88 Es-clar appears beside the circle. The marks are extensive, though there is often no indication where the reinforcement is to cease. Where not stated it is implied that the part reinforces Fl1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Last note only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-91</td>
<td>Reinforces Vn1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-5</td>
<td>Reinforces Obl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167-76?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212-?</td>
<td>Mark repeated in b.220.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288-9</td>
<td>Reinforces Obl.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.3.3 The Contrabassoon Part

The indications for the third bassoon contrabassoon are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>INDICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contraf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-83</td>
<td>Fg3 reinforces original Vc part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Illegible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Contraf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Contraf u Pos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Contraf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>nimmt Fag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206-11</td>
<td>Fg3 reinforces Hrl original.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220-7</td>
<td>See Ex.16.6 for Fgl-3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Contraf.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.3.4 Selected Passages

42-5: Vn2/Va essentially as P.5.

16.3.1 - Beethoven: Coriolan, P.4
50-1 & 176-7: Hairpins as in P.5

51: Lower strings and Hr1/2 pp.

60: St p (subito).

68: Vn1/2 pp (subito).

70-1: Hr1/2 as in P.5

78 (4th quaver) - 83: Beethoven's bassoon and cello parts are formed into three part harmonies and played by Fg1-3 Vc (3 fach getheilt).

92-5: Hr1-4 & Tr2 as in P.5; Tr1 takes over Ob2 part. Ob2, Cl1/2 and Es-cl join Ob1. The string parts are unchanged.

96-9: Hr1/2 as in P.5.

103 & 105: Pk added as in P.5. Tr2 8va bassa, reinforced by Hr1/2.

113: Hr1/2, Tr1/2 & Pk as in P.5.

114-7: Hr1-4 reinforce Vn2/Va, with rhythm as Fg1/2. Tr have same rhythm.

118: Va/Vc pp.

130: Va/Vc cresc removed.

132: Va/Vc p.

133: Va/Vc cresc.

151-4: Tr1/2 as P.5 in b.151. Tr2 has f' in b.152 and b'-flat in b.154.

16.3.4 - Beethoven: Coriolan, P.4
167-76: There are two different layers of changes here and all is not clear, but one can determine that by the substitution of \( T_{1/2} \) for \( C_{1/2} \), Mahler has been encouraged to re-cast this passage completely. \( C_{1/2} \) join \( F_{1/0} \); \( F_{2/02} \) join \( V_{n1} \). \( F_{1/2} \) & \( C_{fg} \) join \( F_{g2} \). \( H_{3/4} \) replace \( F_{g1} \). \( V_a/V_c \) join \( V_{n2} \) as in P.5; but \( V_c \) abandons the bass line completely.

182: St cresc removed.

185: \( V_{n1/2} \) cresc.

186: \( V_{n1/2} \) pp.

188-9 & 196-7: \( F_{11/2} \) play \( F_{11} \) 8va; \( C_{11} \) 8va; \( H_{3/4} \) reinforce \( V_{a1/2} \).

202-4: \( F_{11} \) reinforces \( O_{1/0} \) 8va. Although this completes the line in the flute, the top C does not sound good here.

206-11: \( H_{r1-3} \) and \( F_{g1-3} \) play chords as in b.78-83.

212-9: This passage is unclear in P.4, but Mahler is working towards his recasting of the voice leading in P.5.

220-9: This passage is also unclear; but \( H_{r1/2} \) and \( V_{n1/2} \) are as in P.5, \( O_{1/2} \) & \( C_{11/2} \) join \( F_{11/2} \), \( T_{3} \) replaces \( O_{1} \). Pk as P.5 except for B-flats in b.225. See Ex.16.6 for \( F_{g1-3} \). In b.224-8 \( V_{n1/2} \) & \( V_{a} \) are essentially as in P.5.

236-40: \( F_{11/2} \) & \( V_{n1/2} \) as in P.5. \( H_{r1/2} \) replace original \( V_{n2} \). \(<7>\) In b.240, \( O_{1/2} \) & \( C_{11/2} \) 8va bassa reinforce \( F_{11/2} \).

244: St only pp.

255-9: \( H_{r1} \) reinforces \( C_{11} \); \( H_{3/4} \) reinforce \( F_{g1/2} \), making complete

16.3.4 - Beethoven: Coriolan, P.4
264-7: Pk notes changed to F, F, G, G.

270-5: Vn2/Va as P.5. Hr3/4 as in P.5 for b.270, and join Cl1/2 from b.275, until the first crotchet of b.276. See Ex.16.5 for trumpet parts.

276-89: Hr1/2 join Vnl/Va in b.276-7, b.280-1 and b.284-5. In b.282 & b.286-9 there are many chromatic additions in the brass parts in pencil and blue pencil. The horn parts are essentially as in P.5, but the trumpet parts are not clear.

286-96: Dynamics as in P.5.

310: Fg tacet, as in P.5
Mahler's known concert performances of the Coriolan Overture were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laibach</td>
<td>24 Nov 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg PO</td>
<td>27 Oct 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna PO</td>
<td>26 Feb 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna PO, Paris</td>
<td>20 Jun 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Petersburg</td>
<td>23 Mar 1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York PO</td>
<td>6 Apr 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 Dec 1909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critics were divided in their views of Mahler's interpretation of this piece: in Russia he was commended for the slow tempo of the Coda because this lent to it an admirable power and solemnity, <3> although Rimsky-Korsakov is reputed to have declared that Mahler "mutilated" the work. <4>

17.1 Sources

17.1.1 Scores, P.9/10

There are two known scores with Mahler's annotations, the only one of significance being that in the Mengelberg Archive, P.10, of which I have seen only photostats of certain pages. Like P.11, it has extra rehearsal numbers, but no wind doublings are noted on the pages which I have seen. P.9 is a copyist's score in the U.E. Archive with details of woodwind doublings.
17.1.2 Set of Orchestral Parts, P.11

This is a set of Breitkopf parts with extra rehearsal numbers. There are doubling parts for woodwind, Hr1/2 and Trl/2; although in the score, P.9, there are no doublings indicated for Cll/2. The extra horn parts were used as Hr5/6, though no marks are found in the extra trumpet parts, implying that, if they were used at all, they were probably employed only at the end. A signature and date in Trl show that it was used for Mahler's St. Petersburg performance.

17.2 The Main Characteristics of Mahler's Interpretation

The following remarks are based on P.11, unless stated.

17.2.1 Timing

The first viola part gives Mahler's timing as $7\frac{1}{2}$ Min.

17.2.2 Selected Passages

2-3: Five downbows.

9-11: Cll/2 8va. Trl/2 play Cll/2 original.

15: Vn1 downbow on the D-flat and also on the A-flat. This avoids an ugly routine crescendo and keeps the bow in the upper half.

42 et seq: Crotchets tenuto.

58 (last note) - 73 (1st note): Vn2 join Vn1. Trl/2 & Pk have diminuendo in b.59, piano in b.60 and forte from the 2nd crotchet of

17.1.2 - Beethoven: Egmont
81: Two (!) fermatas; Vn1.8: lunga. Mahler must have delayed the entry of the second theme to obtain maximum force.

82-3: All notes except the quaver downbow.

96-116: Obl/2 doubled. Fgl/2 doubled until b.104.

153: Vn1 omit 1st note to prepare the pianissimo better.

192 (last note) - 200 (1st note): Vn2 join Vn1.

202-4: Fl2-4 double Fl1.

215 (2nd note) - 217 (1st note): Players marks indicate that Va abandon their part to double Vn1.

259-70: See Ex.17.1 for the six horn parts of P.11. P.10 only gives Hrl-4.

263-6 & 271-4: Hairpins in Vn1 in each bar.

287-92: Obl/2 tacent. Fl1/2 replace them in P.10, though not in P.11.

299-300 & 305-6: Fl1/2 continue to play with Pi.

317-22: Fl1/2 abandon their parts to join the piccolo, at the same pitch, omitting the first B-flat from b.321, and the E from b.322. This creates a much cleaner texture in b.317-20 and removes the flutes from obstructing the violins and piccolo in b.321-2. In b.317 Trl/2 & Pk have mf, with crescendo in b.319-20 and fff diminuendo in b.321-2.

323-8: As b.317-22.

329-42: Trl/2 play g'' or e, as appropriate, instead of unisons. There are indications that Mahler inserted Luftpausen before b.334, b.338.
341-2: Pk ffp crescendo.

343-7: Fl1/2 join Pi which is also doubled.
Chapter 18

Beethoven, Overture Leonore II, Op.72a

Mahler conducted the overture Leonore II only twice: in Vienna on 2nd December 1900 and, together with the other three Fidelio Overtures, in New York on 19th November 1909.

18.1 Set of Orchestral Parts, P.13

The basic set of parts was acquired by Mahler for his Vienna performance, and was marked up by a copyist. Most of this set consists of printed Breitkopf parts with an extra complement of rehearsal letters added to match the Peters Edition score which Mahler used. Rehearsal numbers were are also added. An extra set of woodwind and horns was added in New York. This set has no rehearsal letters and, unless Mahler had another set of parts for doubling players, it would appear that the woodwind were only doubled in New York. The hand of the librarian of the New York Philharmonic, H.G. Boewig, can be discerned in the preparation of both wind sets.
18.2 The Main Characteristics of Mahler's Interpretation

18.2.1 Timings

The following timings are found in the parts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>16 Minuten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>16 Minuten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl4</td>
<td>15 Minuten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val</td>
<td>13 Min 2 mal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Va3</td>
<td>15 Min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the exception of Val, there is nothing unusual about these timings which agree with Walter's recorded time of 15:16. <1>

18.2.2 String Doublings

In this work Beethoven often overbalances the strings by heavy wind tone, leaving the first violins quite exposed. Mahler obviates this by reallocating the string parts.

36-9: Vn2 joins Vn1, Vc joins Va. Br and Pk have ffp on both chords.
Ww not doubled.

118 - 126 (3rd crotchet): Vn2 joins Vn1, and Va adds Vn2 part. Tr and Ps have ffp.

135-7: Vn2 joins Vn1, and Val play Vn2 original.

443 - 462 (1st note): Vn2 joins Vn1 and Va plays the original Vn2 part.

501 (last note) - 509: Vn2 join Vn1.

518-9: Vn2 join Vn1, and Va join the upper part of Vn2.
18.2.3 Selected Passages

1 & 3: Ww doubled on the G only.

34-5: Ww doubled. Hrl/2 doubled on last five notes.

39: Psl a instead of c'.

40-2: Ww doubled.

45-6 & 49-50: Luftpause in Vc1 & Vc2.

57 et seq: Cello parts show that Mahler phrased the theme in two bar periods, by making a gap after the first two bars. In doing this he was probably wanting to make clear Beethoven's motivic use of the third and fourth bars of the theme.

91-3: In b.91, Obl has e''''; Cl1/2 8va. On the 1st note of b.93, Fll has c'''''', Obl has c''''', and Cl1 is 8va. Mahler ensures that the contour of the motif is heard.

97 & 101: Br, Pk have ffp.

103 - 106 (1st note): Cl1/2 replace Obl/2.

108-11: Mahler's general dynamic is ppp; but Fg3/4 double Fg1/2 forte from b.109.

118-27: Psl-3 have ffp on each long note. Tr1/2 have fp in b.123 & 125, and f in b.124 and b.126. Hrl/2 doubled. Ww doubled in b.126-7. See above for St.

138 (2nd half) - 142 (1st note): Fg1/2 doubled.

151: Cl1/2 reinforce Fl1/2.
& Vnl. Triplet accompaniment pp from b.158.

222-5: Vnl/2 four downbows, beginning with the E.

236-44: Ps2/3 tacent.

244-252: Vnl.3 & Vnl.8 have sul G, espr. See Ex.18.2 for dynamic nuances in Va and Cl1/2.

292 & 304: Fgl/2 doubled.

294 et seq: Vc and Cb have accents on their pizzicato passage. Ww also accented from b.330.

348-63: Mahler's scheme allows the important instrumental groups to emerge in turn:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>348-51</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>Br fp. Ww doubled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352-5</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Ww &amp; Hr1/2 fp single; Ps &amp; Pk f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hr3/4 &amp; Tr1/2 sfp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356-9</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>Ww ff doubled; Br &amp; Pk fp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360-3</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Ww p single.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wind cresc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

360: Wind p single.

362: Wind crescendo.

350-1: Mahler writes e'''-flats and c''' for Obl and Cl1, raising Cl1 an octave for the first note of each bar to give strength to the woodwind unison. He declines to do this eight bars later.

374-80: See Ex.18.3 for Mahler's changed parts in this passage. His purpose in this is to strengthen the off-beats and it must be admitted that in the original the entry of the woodwind does take the edge off the violin parts: but both this change and the addition of the timpani
to take advantage of it.

384 (second quaver) - 390 (first quaver): Obl/2 join Fl2. Cl1/2 8ve below Fl1/2.

428: Last note in Ww doubled.

429: Fl1 has Ab to match Obl/Fg1.

443 - 446 (3rd crotchet): Fl1-4 reinforce Vn1, and Obl-4 & Cl1-4 reinforce the original Vn2 part now played by Va. Although it looks like overkill, all the wind united in this way without any reduction in the brass dynamics, together with the string changes mentioned above, allow Mahler to give full value to Beethoven's theme.

461-77: Cl1-4 play a crotchet G as the last note of b.461 and then reinforce Fl1/2.

18.2.3 - Beethoven: Leonore II, P.13
Mahler performed the overture Leonore III nineteen times in the concert hall, on fifteen occasions with ensembles which he conducted regularly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budapest Opera</td>
<td>3 Jan 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg Opera</td>
<td>27 May 1891, 27 Nov 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg PO</td>
<td>26 Feb 1894, 21 Jan 1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna PO</td>
<td>1 Apr 1900, 18 Jun 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Met Orch</td>
<td>24 Mar 1908, 10 Jan 1909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and on the remaining four occasions as a guest conductor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lemberg (Lvov)</td>
<td>2 Apr 1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiesbaden</td>
<td>8 May 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>27 Oct 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>1 May 1910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was a piece which the opera orchestras knew well, since it was performed regularly between the two acts of Fidelio. Mahler conducted Fidelio in Prague, Budapest, Hamburg, Vienna <1> and New York; it was indeed a corner-stone of his repertoire, and Leonore III was always a part of his performances.

In Hamburg, Mahler placed the Overture at the scene change in the second act, and he followed the same practice in his Vienna revival of 1904. <2>
19.1 Set of Orchestral Parts, P.14

There is a complete set of Breitkopf parts, with a doubling set for woodwind. All have additions made by copyists, including thirty-six extra rehearsal numbers.

Mahler did not perform Fidelio in Vienna until his revival of 1904, and players marks indicate that this set of parts was used in the opera house. The earliest date in the parts is 1907, and it cannot be known for certain when Mahler began to use this set; but 1900, the date of his Vienna Philharmonic performances, would represent a reasonable suggestion.

19.2 The Main Characteristics of Mahler's Interpretation

19.2.1 Timings

The parts contain the following timings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Val</td>
<td>13 Mins at beginning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Va4</td>
<td>13 Minuets (sic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vc2</td>
<td>13 Min at beginning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr1</td>
<td>9.18 (sic) at beginning; 14 min 9.30 at end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr2</td>
<td>9.16 at beginning; 9.30 14 Min at end</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this information we can deduce that Mahler took between thirteen and fourteen minutes to perform the work. There is nothing remarkable about this. <3>
19.2.2 Reduced Strings

The size of the set of parts gives a maximum string complement of 18, 18, 12, 10, 10, and Mahler indicated in detail where the strings were to be reduced:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>Vn1</th>
<th>Vn2</th>
<th>Va</th>
<th>Vc</th>
<th>Cb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tutti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tutti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(from 2nd note)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Presto of b.514, Mahler followed Bülow's practice in increasing the number of first violins gradually, though the actual details of the places where they entered were different. <4>

| 503 | 8   |    |    |    |   |
| 518 | 10  | (from the F) |    |    |   |
| 519 | 12  | (from the F) |    |    |   |
| 520 | 14  | (from the F) |    |    |   |
| 521 | 16  | (from the F) |    |    |   |
| 522 | Tutti | (from the G) |    |    |   |

19.2.3 Horn Parts

Reflecting the two tonal centres, in the first half of Leonore III, Beethoven writes for a pair of horns in C and a pair in E and much of the time only one of the pairs is employed. Mahler remedies this by adding extra notes in the part which is unemployed by Beethoven, either
19.2.4 Selected Passages

1-5: Mahler doubled the first bar in the woodwind and arrived ppp in b.5. This made a deep impression on Max Steinitzer in Leipzig:

One can well imagine the joy we youngsters felt at Mahler's unrestrained crescendos and ritenutos. It was a great event in our lives when, for example, he took the first four bars of the Third Leonore Overture in a continuous ritenuto; in the simplest manner, each of the descending octaves acquired tragic import until finally the low F sharp sounded in majestic, rigid stillness, like the waters over which God's spirit moved at the creation. <5>

5-7: The hairpins in the strings have been repositioned towards the beginning of the bars, indicating that Mahler made this swell in the first third of the bar. There are Luftpausen between bars 5-6, 6-7 & 7-8.

26: Ww3/4 & Hr3/4, reinforcing Fgl/2, enter on 2nd note, p cresc with fff at the end of the bar.

27: Wind and Pk ffff. Doubling ceases at end of bar. Unlike the equivalent passage in Leonore II, the violins do not need reinforcement here, as the writing is more brilliant.

30 - 31 (1st note): Ww doubled. Luftpause at the end of b.31.

37-68: At the beginning of the Allegro, Vnl and Vc are marked pppp ohne Ausdruck. The actual numbers allocated to each part is carefully calculated. <6> The crescendo poco a poco does not begin until b.53, by which time all the strings are playing. Ww3/4 begin piano in b.65 and make a four bar crescendo to ff. Trl/2 & Psl-3 have p cresc in b.65-8. There is a Luftpause between b.68 and b.69.

The overwhelming effect of Mahler's crescendo in the opening of this
appears from other criticisms of that period and later that Mahler also
began the Allegro moderately, adding an accelerando to the increase in
volume. <8> The Daily Telegraph, reviewing Mahler's London performance
with the Hamburg Opera in July 1892, was indignant about this:

What authority has the Hambourg conductor for the slow
opening of the Allegro and the accellerando (sic) which
immediately followed? Or for similar interference with the
tempo at the beginning of the presto coda? <9>

69: All parts indicate a break before b.69.

71: From this bar the woodwind are single.

73-6: Fl2 joins Fl1, both taking the top C. Fl3/4 double in b.75-6.

77-8 & 81-2: Mahler initially inserted a forte-piano in all parts
except Vc and Cb to enable the continuation of the Vnl and Ww theme to
be heard. In New York he also added Fg1-4 and Va to the bass line.
<10> Pk removed from b.77-82.

82 (last two notes) - 91: Vn2 joins Vnl.

94-5 & 98-9: Hr2 plays an octave below Hr1 and Hr3/4 double. Psl-3
have fp to keep them out of the way of the horns and the basses.

102: Vnl downbow to avoid a crescendo.

116-8: Vn2 joins Vnl, VaI plays Vn2 original.

121-37: See Ex.19.1. Bar 121 is marked rall, with a tempo in b.122.
This implies that Mahler considered the second theme to begin at b.122,
rather than four bars earlier, and this rallentando was sufficiently
noticeable to have been criticised adversely by Sittard in Hamburg in
January 1895. <11> Although Beethoven's texture is more sophisticated
here than in the equivalent passage in Leonore II, the problem of
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expressive style here employed by Mahler makes a much greater contrast with the surrounding sections of the work.

192-5: Fl1/2 & Cl1/2 doubled. In b.193, Fl1/2, Cl1/2 & Hr1/2 piano, Tr & Ps mp. Fg3/4 double Fg1 in b.193-5. Va doubles Vn2, V11 divide, the second half playing the original Va part. <12> This treatment is also prescribed for similar passages.

270: Vn2.1 a tempo, implying that Mahler rushed headlong into the trumpet call.

272-7 & 294-9: Theodore Spiering reports that Mahler had the trumpeter play non espressivo, saying:

"In the barracks one makes no nuances." The second call was to be no louder than the first because: "Both times the trumpeter is standing on the same spot, on the tower, consequently they must both times be heard equally loud." <13>

278: See Ex.19.2 for bowing in Vnl.3.

327: Va3, Cb3 have accell.


330: Fl1 ppp ohne Ausdruck.

333: Fgl ppp ohne Ausdruck.

364-77: See Ex.19.3 for bowings.

374-7: Instead of a uniform ff, Tr1/2 have mf cresc and Ps1-3 & Pk have p cresc.

378-83: Vn2 joins Vnl.

400-2: Vn2 joins Vnl, Va1 plays Vn2 original.
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468-77: See Ex.19.4. The connection between this transformation of the second subject and the original is made clear. In b.475, F12-4 double F11, Ob2-4 double Ob1, and Fg3/4 double Fg1/2.

479 et seq: The last note of this bar in the Ww is turned into a quaver with a quaver rest, and this is done at every subsequent appearance in Ob & Fg in this section of the movement. By contrast, at each entry, F11 has pp cresc.

499-509: Apart from the shortening of the upbeat crotchet to a quaver in Vn1, many parts show hesitations in the middle of b.504 and at the end of b.505. Additionally, there are fermatas on the bar lines of b.506/7 and b.508/9. Mahler treated this transition very freely, not notating his intentions in the parts but leaving the players to do this as necessary.

510-3: Two bars crescendo, one bar diminuendo and then pp.

534-7: Vn2 joins Vn1. Fl1/2 reinforce Vn1 in solid notes. Ob1/2 & Cl1/2 ditto an octave lower. Ww doubled.

554-61: Hr1/2 double Hr3/4 and Fl1/2 doubled. Ww and Hr fff. The usual effect of this today would be to ensure that the horns blare out above everything; but in Mahler’s time, with a less powerful and rounder horn tone, this may not have been the case.

562: All Ww doubled until b.569; Hr1/2 single. Ps & St mf.

590: Ps enter mf.

594: All instruments piano crescendo.
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606: All instruments have crescendo and Wv3/4 enter piano molto crescendo. It seems that Mahler's crescendo only reaches forte by b.606, with the increase to fff coming in the last four bars.
Chapter 20


Mahler performed Beethoven's Overture *Zur Weihe des Hauses* three times with the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra and also included it as the first item in his first pair of subscription concerts with the newly reformed New York Philharmonic Orchestra in 1909:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vienna PO</th>
<th>3 Dec 1899</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 Feb 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 Feb 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York PO</td>
<td>4 Nov 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Nov 1909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The New York critics made no musical comment on the performance of the overture.

20.1 Sources

20.1.1 Score, P.15

One of the set of Beethoven overtures which are stamped with the mark of Böhme's music shop in Hamburg, this score has few marks in it. Mahler's Retuschen are confined to b.63-6 where Vn1/2 are 8va and Hr1 has two notes changed, and a glance at the many Retuschen which he incorporated into the work at a later date will show that Mahler cannot have spent much time working on this score.
20.1.2 Score, P.16

I have not seen this score, which is in the Vienna Philharmonic Archive, but from the description provided by Dr. Herta Blaukopf it appears to be the score which served as the basis for P.17.

20.1.3 Score, P.17

This score is very clean. It has entries in Mahler’s hand and also that of a copyist, probably taken from P.16. <1>

20.1.4 Set of Orchestral Parts, P.18

The orchestral material comprises a set of Breitkopf parts with strings 9,9,7,6,6 and two sets of woodwind parts. There are many additions made by a copyist and pieces stuck into the parts. Players have added marks during rehearsals using lead and blue pencils.
20.1.5 E-flat Clarinet Part, P.19

Like the two other extant examples, Mahler's E-flat clarinet part is in his own handwriting. It is reproduced as Ex.20.1. The score, P.17, states where the E-flat clarinet plays without giving details of the notes; but since the instrument is used here exclusively to reinforce F11, it would have been unnecessary for Mahler to write the actual notes in the score. The places where the instrument reinforces F11 are:

1 - 4 (1st note)  
29-52  
64 (last note) - 68 (3rd crotchet)  
109 - 124 (3rd crotchet)  
174, 189-90  
218 (2nd half) - 223  
224 (last note) - 228  
243 (2nd half) - 257  
259, 263, 278  
280 & 282-6

As in other works, Mahler's reinforcement of F11 has been carefully thought out. Only in one passage is it surprising that he does not use it. This is the second half of bar 167 and bars 169-70 where he has chosen instead to reinforce the flutes by Vn1. <2>

20.2 The Main Characteristics of Mahler's Interpretation

The remarks here are based on the score, P.17, supplemented by a comparison with the orchestral parts, P.18/9. Despite the small number of performances which he gave of it, Mahler's revisions to this work are thorough and have given rise to many examples in other sections of this study. Many of these involve octave raisings of the violins and woodwind, with a result that the tone of the work is made very strident.
20.2.1 Timings

There are timings in the parts as follows:

| Vn2.7  | 11 Min |
| Va1   | 10\(\frac{1}{2}\) Min |
| Hr3   | 10 Min |

There is nothing unusual about these timings.

20.2.2 Selected Passages

22-7: Va reinforces Fg in b.22 and Vc reinforces Fg in b.25-7.

Normally the bassoon voice is lost completely and the participation of the violas seems sensible, losing nothing by the suppression of the repeated Gs. However, although it promotes the forward motion of the harmonic progression, the reinforcement of the bassoon line by the cellos, leaving the double basses unsupported, would appear to confuse the bass line, since the timpani are actually below the double basses in the first note of b.25.

29-31: Hr1/2 reinforce Cl1/2.

32 (last 2 notes) - 34 (1st note): Cl1/2 8va. Hr1/2 play Cl1/2 original, Hr2 playing written c'' in b.34. Fll/2, Obl/2 also 8va from the 2nd half of b.33. Vnl has three times down-up on the minims.

E-flat clarinet plays Fll original. <3> The general elevation of the upper woodwind by an octave and the energetic bowings make an emphatic climax to the first section of the work.

37: Trl omits 1st note.

41-52: Fgl-4 reinforced by Vc make Tovey's "hurrying footsteps"
but this change is earlier, and in various places, in P.18.

63 (2nd half) - 68 (9th semiquaver): Vnl 8va until the 1st note of b.65. Vn2 8va until the 12th semiquaver of b.64, joining Vn1 from the 4th crotchet of b.64.

71-2: In P.18, Vn1/2 & Va have hairpins in both bars, thus effecting a smoother transition between the preceding turbulent semiquavers and the ethereal calm of b.75-8.

79: Crotchets in St tenuto.

88: Cl1/2 join Ob 1/2. Ww doubled.

89-91: Vn2 has five downbows.

94-6: Va five downbows.

99-101: Vn2 doubles Va from the 2nd semiquaver of b.99 to the 3rd crotchet of b.100. Vnl bowing as Vn2 in b.89-91.

104-6: See Ex.20.2 for the completely recast wind parts.

109 (2nd note) - 113: Vnl 8va until the 1st note of b.113. Vn2 is also 8va from the 2nd note of b.109 until the 9th note of b.110, and doubles Vnl from the 2nd note of b.111. VaI plays Vn2 original in b.110-3. In his desire to make the Vn1 part audible, Mahler here runs the risk of it becoming entangled with the flute part, of which it is a variant.

117-23: Ob1 & Cl1 are 8va until the 2nd note of b.119, and again from the 2nd crotchet of b.120. Ob1 returns to Beethoven's original at the 2nd note of b.122, while Cl2 joins Fl1 from b.122 until the 9th note of b.123. Es-cl is also playing here.
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fugue subject in the bass.

152-4: C1l/2 8va. Hr1/2 replace C12 until the 1st half of b.154 and C1l/2 in the 2nd half of b.154. Vn2 doubles Vn1 and VaI plays Vn2 original.

166 & 168: Ob1 doubled in the 2nd half of these two bars. Originally this was played by 2 oboes, later by 4.

167-70: Vn1 abandons the Bs to reinforce F1l in the second half of b.167 & b.169, and in b.170.

174: Ww doubled for this bar only, F1 quadrupled.

185-6: Vn2 doubles Va/Vc from the 2nd half of b.185.

189-202: Ww doubled and marked fff. Es-cl plays in b.189-90. C1l-4 are 8va in b.189-91.

191-9: Vn2 rests from the 9th note of b.191 which is a quaver, joining Vn1 from the beginning of b.192. VaI plays Vn2 original.

200-2: In b.200-1, the notes under the fermatas are bowed down-up. The parts indicate a break after the fermatas. In the Adagio bar both crotchets are bowed down. The trill is in all string parts (bowed down-up) and fff, with half the cellos doubling the violas.

203: ruhiger.

217 - 221 (1st note): C1l/2 8va. From b.218 (2nd half) to b.200, Va and Vc reinforce Fg1/2 respectively.

221-3: Vn2 joins Vn1. Va adds Vn2.

224-7: Vn2 plays Vn1 original; Vn1 8va from the last note of b.226,
237 - 238 (1st half): Vc joins Fg. This is a more secure foundation for
the texture and prevents the violas being the lowest voice in the
strings.

238-245: Vn2 plays original Vnl part from the last crotchet of b.238
until the 1st note of b.243. Vnl plays semiquavers on the C tied from
b.238 to b.239. VaI takes over Vn2 in b.240-2 - lower octave only in
b.241. Vnl/2 both 8va from the 2nd half of b.243 until the 9th note of
b.245.

253-4: First note omitted in all Ww. ObI and Cll 8va except last three
notes. Legato slur over first eight notes of b.253 and from second
note of b.254 to the first note of b.255. To balance the interplay
between strings and woodwind, St have fp at the beginning of each bar
and ff for the scales.

259: Ww doubled and Es-cl plays.

263: Ww doubled in this bar. Es-cl originally silent; but added later
in pencil. The crescendo of b.262-3 must have been very strong, or
there would have been no need of doubled wind.

264: All parts have pp. The change in texture in the strings almost
implies this sudden drop in dynamic level, as in b.435 of the finale of
Beethoven VII.

277, 279 & 281 (1st half): VaI adds Vn2 part; VcI adds Va part.

278-286: Cll/2 8va. Ww3/4 & Es-cl play in b.278, b.280 and from b.282.
Chapter 21

Beethoven, Symphony No.2, Op.36

Mahler conducted Beethoven II on only two occasions: once in Vienna on 19 Nov 1899 and together with Fidelio and the three Leonore Overtures in New York on 19 Nov 1909.

21.1 Score, P.24

The only known score of Beethoven II which has Mahler's handwriting bears the stamp of Rózsavölgyi és Társa on the title page. It is catalogued here as P.24 and has copious markings in red ink of two subtly different shades which may readily be distinguished only in good sunlight. Examples of these two shades of red ink are found on p.52/3 (4th mvt, b.144 et seq.) where Red Ink No.1 (rich red) was used for the expansion of the clarinet parts and Red Ink No.2 (pinkish and thinner colour) was used for doubling woodwind, adding rests and dynamics. Other implements used by Mahler in this score are red, brown, blue, thin black, medium black and thick black pencils.

There is no significance in any of the actual colours employed, no plan involved in the order of their use, nor any discernably deliberate association of specific writing implements with different functions. It is clear, however, that Mahler did not work straight through the score, but concentrated on various aspects of it in turn. The
occasions; and the thoroughness of the revisions indicates that in all likelihood this was the only score he used. No extra doubling parts are indicated.

Rehearsal letters have been added in red pencil. The positions of these are different from the letters in Breitkopf scores, but their presence suggests that Mahler used the score as the basis for a set of orchestral parts. This set has not been found.

A miniature score containing an accurate copy of the marks in P.24 is in the U.E. Archive.

21.2 The Main Characteristics of Mahler’s Interpretation

21.2.1 Repeats

As there are Retuschen in the Ima volta bars, it would appear that Mahler repeated the exposition of the first movement. This is not of itself conclusive, as there are scores in which the excision of repeats followed the establishment of Retuschen in Ima volta bars. There are no marks at all in the third movement, and no reason to doubt that Mahler made the usual repeats there.

21.2.2 Expansion of the Clarinet Parts

The largest problem in Beethoven’s woodwind writing in the second symphony is the embarrassingly small contribution of the clarinets. It cannot be that Beethoven did not trust the players of his day, since they are called upon to make significant contributions in several places. However, the addition of the clarinet to the woodwind
crisis in that both Haydn, in five of his London symphonies, and
Beethoven in his first two symphonies were so used to the three octave
deployment of flute, oboe and bassoon that they seemed not to know how
to employ the clarinets in tutti and unison passages.

Examples of this in the first movement of Beethoven II are b.158-69 and
b.197-212, where Beethoven has written entries which are scored in
three or four octaves. The distribution of the parts is well balanced
when the flutes, oboes and bassoons are employed, and no room is left
for the clarinets.

However, these are fortissimo passages, and with a powerful string
section the woodwind do not make their full impact. So, as well as
marking the parts a due where Beethoven envisaged solo players, Mahler
reinforces the oboes with the clarinets.

Mahler's complete additions to the clarinet parts are:

First movement

18: C1l/2 reinforce Ob1/2.

147-69: Cl1 reinforces Ob1, except for the second half of b.153 where
it reinforces Fl1 for five notes, having paused during the first half
of the bar. C12 reinforces Ob2, except in b.148 (Fgl) and b.153 (Ob1).

197-212: C1l/2 reinforce Ob1/2, Except C11 joins Fl1 from b.198 (2nd
note) until b.206 (1st note) and b.210 (last note) until b.212.

215-6: C1l/2 reinforce Ob1/2.

350 - 354 (1st crotchet): C1l/2 reinforce Ob1/2.
128 - 133 (1st note): Cll/2 reinforce Obl/2. Strangely, the reinforcement appears to stop after the A-flat, perhaps a mistake caused by b.134 being on the next page.

Fourth movement

12-8: Cll/2 reinforce Fl1 and Obl who are already marked a due.

90-3: Cll/2 reinforce Obl/2.

140-2, 146-8, 155-7 & 165-181: Cll/2 reinforce Obl and Fg1, who are already a due and marked ff.

196-202: As b.12-8.

279-82: Cll/2 reinforce Obl/2.

303-9: Cll/2 reinforce Obl. All fff from the last note of b.304.

310-1: Cl2 and Ob2 play Obl original, while Obl & Cll reinforce Fl1. The last note of the entry is left hanging. Again, this may be because it is at the beginning of the next page.

321-2: Cll/2 reinforce Fl1 and Obl.

409-13: Cll/2 reinforce Obl/2.

414 (1st crotchet): Cll/2 reinforce Fl1/2.

21.2.3 Selected Passages - 1st movement

63-5: Fl2 doubles Fl1.

107-10: Fl2 doubles Fl1.

21.2.2 - Beethoven II
Fgl from b.152. See above for Cl1/2.


180 (2nd note) - 181: Fgl/2 tacent.

201, 202 & 204: There are plus signs in blue pencil on the Ww staves in b.201, and above the score in the other bars. I am unable to explain these.

206-12: Vn2 doubled by Va (b.206-9) and Vnl (b.210-1). First note of b.212 omitted in Vnl. This is an awkward passage for Vn2 which is given more power by Mahler. By omitting the last note in Vnl he makes the part easier.

266 (2nd note) - 268: Vn2 join Vnl.


314-6: Cl1/2 and Ob2 join Ob1. This puts a great emphasis on the new figure which foreshadows the violin interjections in bar 55 of the finale, at the expense of the more important development in the bass.

327-40: In b.327-331, the dynamics of Vnl/2 & Va are reduced to f, while accents in the bass demonstrate where the melody is. A crescendo in b.332-5 leads to fff in the strings, and in b.336-40 Mahler lets the brass and timpani thunder out fff, an interpretative feature which is clearly audible in Bruno Walter's recordings, and which may represent an even longer tradition. Vn2 join Vnl from b.336.

340-354 (1st note): Vn2 join Vnl.
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55-9, 63-6, 139-44, 220-3, & 227-9: Mahler took great care with the grading of a crescendo which comes several times during the slow movement, bringing out the moving parts. See Ex.21.1. Such a procedure needs to be done with care if it is not to become tedious.

75: Vnl tacet 1st three notes. Mahler writes mf in all parts, to emphasise the meno forte intended by Beethoven.

157: Unusually in the scores studied here, Mahler notes a ritardando in this bar and a tempo in the following bar.

At the end of the second movement, and uniquely in all Mahler's conducting scores considered here, we find the indication Warten!!. I do not know to what this refers. <1>

21.2.5 Selected Passages - 4th movement

12-8 etc: Fl1, Ob1 & Fg1 all a 2.

77-8: Ob1/Fg1 have crescendo in b.77 and piano (subito) in b.78.

119 (2nd quaver) - 130: Vn2 join Vn1. Va1 play Vn2 original.

131: Vn2 omit first note, which is played by Va1.

171-6: Cl1/2 reinforce Ob1 and Fg1 and Fl2, Ob2 & Fg2 join the first players, in addition to playing their own part. Undoubtedly this Retusche was considered necessary by Mahler to preserve the required balance with a large string section in a reverberant hall.

181: Vnl p, restored to pp two bars later, so that their entry may be heard during the die-away of the preceding tutti.
252: C11 has hairpins.

254: Ob1 has hairpins.

261-2: As 77-8.

275 & 277: Vn1 sf removed.

276-7: Hr1/2 reinforce C11/2 and Fg1.

278-82: C11/2 reinforce Ob1/2. This the only way the canonic answer can be made audible.


374-80: Vn2 join Vn1.

381: Va 8va.

392-3: Vn2 join Vn1, Va playing lower voice of Vn2 original.
Mahler conducted Beethoven III eleven times during his career:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>14 Mar 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg PO</td>
<td>26 Feb 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>24 Apr 1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna PO</td>
<td>6 Nov 1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna PO (Paris)</td>
<td>21 Jun 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>20 Oct 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Petersburg</td>
<td>17 Mar 1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>25 Mar 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York PO</td>
<td>4 Nov 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Nov 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Nov 1909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22.1 Sources

22.1.1 Score, P.25

This score bears the stamp of Rózsavölgyi és Társa. It is not the immediate basis of the orchestral parts mentioned below; but clearly dates from an earlier period in Mahler's career and will be discussed separately.

22.1.2 Set of Orchestral Parts, P.26

The set of orchestral parts, which has been much used, dates originally from Mahler's period in Vienna. There are Breitkopf & Härtel string parts with printed bowings in the number of 9,9,7,5,5, the last desk of each having been used but rarely. For the wind there exist a printed
containing only the notes which were to be doubled. These handwritten parts were all made by the same copyist and have a curious mixture of Italian and German in the titles. Occasionally, when Mahler later decided to double extra passages, the doubling players had to lean over and play from the printed set with their colleagues.

The manuscript brass parts are labelled:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tromba 1 in C</th>
<th>Corno 1 in Es</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tromba 2 in C</td>
<td>Corno II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corno IV in Es</td>
<td>Corno VI in Es</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tromba 1 in C and Corno IV in Es are reproduced as Ex.22.1 and Ex.22.2 respectively. An examination of them will show the surprisingly small number of notes written for these additional instruments.

The majority of the markings in the parts were transferred in ink from Mahler's score by a copyist, Mahler's hand being largely confined to the orientation figures, comprising the usual letters and 56 additional numbers running consecutively throughout the work. There are also many marks made by players. From the evidence of the rehearsal letters, the score which corresponds to these parts is probably in the Peters edition; but its whereabouts is unknown.

On the basis of dates inserted by players, we know with confidence that these parts were used by Mahler with the Vienna Philharmonic in the 1890s, on tour in Russia in 1902 and also in his New York performances.

22.1.3 E-flat Clarinet Part, P.27

The E-flat clarinet part, P.27, although now separated from the other parts, was clearly used with them. Written in Mahler's hand, it has
The same treatment as illustrated and discussed in Chapter 9. Except where stated below, the instrument reinforces Fll, in the following places:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st mvt:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 - 40 (1st note)</td>
<td>dynamic \textit{forte}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 (2nd note) - 117</td>
<td>last note quaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245-6</td>
<td>dynamic \textit{forte}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276-9</td>
<td>dynamic \textit{ff} with \textit{sf} on each note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>dynamic \textit{forte}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>dynamic \textit{ff}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396-8</td>
<td>dynamic \textit{ff} on first two notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516-9</td>
<td>first note concert b'''-flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526 (2nd note) - 534</td>
<td>last note quaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561-3</td>
<td>\textit{f} instead of \textit{ff}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655-62</td>
<td>begins on concert e'''-flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671-3</td>
<td>follows contours of ObI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2nd mvt: |       |
| 60-1 | dynamic \textit{ff} |
| 96 (2nd note) - 101 | enters \textit{p cresc, f} from b.97 |
| 130 - 133 (1st quaver) | with Fll until b.145 (1st note) |
| 141-150 | with Fll2 from b.145 (2nd note) |
| 167 (2nd half) - 168 | with Fll from b.149 (3rd quaver) |
| 197-8 | ends with quaver concert a'''-flat |
| 204 - 205 (1st quaver) | dynamics \textit{pp cresc ff} |
| 208-9 | dynamics \textit{p cresc ff} |

| 4th mvt: |       |
| 167-74 | last note of each entry is quaver |
| 213-21, 241-2 |       |
| 245 - 246 (1st quaver) | concert e'''-flat |
| 251 (2nd note) - 255 | as Fll, 8va above ObI |
| 315 | last note quaver |
| 316-328 | last note is crotchet |
| 332-7 | last note quaver |
| 392-3 | dynamics \textit{p molto cresc ff} |

22.1.3 - Beethoven III -325-
22.2 The Main Characteristics of Mahler's Interpretation

Unless otherwise stated, the following observations on Mahler's interpretation of Beethoven III are derived from the orchestral parts, P.26/7.

22.2.1 Repeats

The orchestral parts indicate clearly that Mahler made the usual repeats in the third and fourth movements. In the first movement there are signs that Mahler initially decided to make the repeat of the exposition. In the cello parts $m^1o$ is written in pencil where the first theme returns in the $l^1m^1a\ volta$ bars, and there are marks round the repeat sign between bars 4 and 5 of the movement to indicate to the players where the repeat begins. The subsequent crossing out of the $l^1m^1a\ volta$ bars in all parts, mainly done by players, makes one doubt that Mahler ever took the repeat in concert. The E-flat clarinet part has simply a double barline at the end of the exposition and no indications that it was ever used with the repeat, and this can probably be taken to indicate Mahler's practice after 1900.

22.2.2 Timings and Tempi

Several of the orchestral parts give timings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART</th>
<th>1st mvt</th>
<th>2nd mvt</th>
<th>3rd mvt</th>
<th>4th mvt</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vn2.3</td>
<td>18 Min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vn2.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48½ Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the timings for individual movements given in Vn2.7 and
and second, and second and third movements. The parts indicate that he did not wait before attacking the finale. These timings are thus consistent with each other.

The possible tempi for the first movement corresponding to these and other timings are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMING mins</th>
<th>MM (crotchet) with repeat</th>
<th>MM (crotchet) without repeat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>130 (Vn2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>115 (Vn2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual tempi for other conductors are:

- Furtwängler: 152 VPO concert Dec 1944
- Furtwängler: 144 VPO session Nov 1952
- Walter: 152 NYPO session Mar 1949
- Walter: 132 CSO session 1958 <3>

It seems unlikely that Mahler completely changed his conception of the basic pulse of the movement; and therefore one explanation for the two different timings could be that they refer to performances with and without the repeat. In this case, unless Mahler deliberately took the performance with the repeat faster, the tempo would have been somewhere between crotchet 130 and 140. Another explanation would be that the timings of both players are inaccurate by up to a minute and that they both refer to the same performance, or the same basic tempo in different performances. If the actual duration of the first movement were 17 minutes, we should have a tempo of either M.M.149 or M.M.122 for the crotchet; and the matter is unfortunately inconclusive since the evidence may be interpreted to fit almost any known tempo.

For the second movement we obtain a tempo of quaver = M.M.76, which is on the fast side of average. <4>
parts indicate that Mahler did not cut the repeats; and, taking 639 bars lasting 7 minutes, we obtain a tempo of 92 bars to the minute which is very slow.

In Hamburg, in March 1892, Sittard reproached Mahler for his slow tempo for this movement, even slower for the Trio, yet faster in the Coda; and incorporating these comments we can obtain more detail:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>BARS</th>
<th>METRONOME</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scherzo I &amp; II with repeat:</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>4:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trio with repeat:</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To make further impact on the timings requires the acceptance of even slower tempi than these; but there is ample documentation to support the view that Mahler's tempi in this Scherzo were exceptionally slow:

- 26 Feb 1894, in Hamburg: Arnold Berliner noted the moderate tempo of the Scherzo, and how this allowed the quavers of b.9 to be played distinctly. <6>

- 4 Nov 1900, in Vienna: Theodore Helm criticised the slowness of the third movement which was also deemed unpardonable by Hans Geissler. <7>

- 21 June 1900, in Paris: Gustave Robert stated that the first and third movements appeared to be definitely slower than usual. <8>

The tempi of the finale are impossible to judge from a single timing for the whole movement.

22.2.3 Extra Horn Parts

The extra horns are employed sparingly in the first movement in bars 276-9 and 359-61 to reinforce Hr3 and Fg1/2.

During the second movement, the extra horns appear in the fugue. Hr3
and Cr4 take over the original clarinet part in bars 135-40 (middle half); and, in bars 135-40, Hr1-3 and Cr1/2 are assigned the original Hr3 part, Hr1/2 and Cr1/2 taking this line up to the written a’, while Hr3 plays the original. Cr4/6 enter at the beginning of b.140, reinforcing the cellos until the first quaver of b.144, subsequently reinforcing the pedal point of the doublebasses and joining the cello and bass line from the second note of b.149 until the first note of b.150. Together with the added timpani this makes a fearsome noise at the climax of the fugue. Cr1/2/4 also double Hr1-3 in bars 159-68.

The extra horns are not employed at all in the Scherzo.

In the Finale, the appearance of the extra horns is reserved for the Poco Andante. Five horns are employed in the theme which begins in b.381, with Hr2 replaced by Cr2. See Ex.22.2.

22.2.4 Extra Trumpet Parts

The extra trumpet parts contain entries in only two places. They double Tr1/2 in bars 160-8 of the second movement where, from the dynamics (fff) and the players remarks (Trompet aufheben hoch. hoch), it is clear that Mahler wanted the trumpets to dominate the texture. In bars 419-20 of the finale there are only three notes for Tr3/4, doubling Tr1/2 with maximum effort. See Ex.22.1.

22.2.5 Selected Passages - 1st movement

5: Vc dim.

7: Vn1 pp.

9: Vn1 (subito) p.

22.2.3 - Beethoven III, P.26/7
79-80: Wind enter \textit{mf cresc.}

83-94: See Ex.22.4. Mahler changes Beethoven's phrasing and is thereby obliged to insert a Luftpause at the end of b.85 and b.93.

Gustave Robert stated that in his Paris performance on 21 June 1900 Mahler held back excessively in the \textit{B-flat motif of the first movement}. <9>

98: Hairpins removed from Fll/2, Cll/2 & Fg1/2 to ensure the prominence of Obl.

113 (2nd note) - 116: Obl/2 reinforce Cll and Hr3 reinforces Fg1. Ww doubled until b.118. St have \textit{mf} in b.113, with \textit{crescendo} in b.116, and \textit{ff} restored in b.117.

123-7: See Ex.22.5 for Mahler's revised horn parts. Trl/2 unchanged.

132: Va/Vc \textit{mf} instead of \textit{p}, to take account of reverberation.

144-6: On the second two notes of each bar Vn1 double Vn2 and Vc double Va.

186-93: Vn2 \textit{mf} on 2nd note, \textit{ff} on 2nd note of b.188; Vn1 \textit{mf} on 2nd note of b.188, \textit{ff} on 2nd note of b.190, etc. Hr1/2 & Trl/2 \textit{mf}. Va doubles Vn2 from the 2nd quaver of b.188 until the first quaver of b.190, returning to the original part on the second crotchet of b.190. The same in b.192-3.

198-205: St & Br as 186-93. Pk has crotchets at the beginning of each bar, four Gs and four As. Hr1/2 reinforce Cl2 and Fg2 in b.202-5.

219: \textit{Sforzando} in all parts.

243 - 248 (1st crotchet): Obl/2 & Cl1/2 reinforce each other and Hr1-3
254-9: By analogy with the bars which precede and follow them, Hr1/2 have f''-sharp / c''-sharp and Trl/2 have c''-sharp.

256-9: See Ex.22.6 for bowing.

260-271: Vn2 joins Vn1, Va adding the original Vn2 part.

272-9: Vn1/2 add each other's parts until b.275. See Ex.22.7 for the re-writing of the wind and timpani which assists in building up an impressive climax. All parts fff in b.276-9.

316-8: Fl1/2 reinforce Cl1 8va.

330-1: Fl mf cresc - dim to replace sfp.

332-3: Vn2 espr; sfp removed.

342-3, 346-7, 350-1: Obl/2 originally ppp then removed.

358-61: Fl2 joins Fl1 in b. 361. Obl joins Ob2 in b.358-60 and reinforces Cl2 in b.361. Cl1/2 join Obl/2 in b.360. Ww doubled. Cr6 reinforces Fg2. All this considerably strengthens the minor third motif, which is often inclined to be lost in heavy string tone.

Indications in nearly all parts show that Mahler made a considerable gap before attacking b.362 very strongly.

362-5: Fg1-4 reinforce Vc.
366-95: Mahler grades the dynamics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>ff</td>
<td>Ww doubled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>mf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>mf</td>
<td>Ww single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>ppp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

442-5: Trl 8va from 2nd note until first crotchet of b.444. See Ex.22.8 for Hr1-3.

482-4: Fll 8va until the A-flat.

486-97: Similar to b.83-94.

516-9: See Ex.22.9 for Ww and Hr parts. Woodwind doubled. Mahler creates a powerful wind "unison" and allows the strings to play at full strength.

531-4: Hr3 plays Hr1 part and Hr1/2 tacent to prepare for their entry in b.535.


560-2: Ww doubled, Obl/2 & Fgl/2 only until the end of b.561.

564: Vn2 enter mf.

615: Cresc removed from St.

651: Ww doubled until b.672. (Obl/2 from b.652.)

655-64: See Ex.22.10 for Br. Fll reinforces Obl 8va b.657 until the 1st two quavers of b.663.

681-4: See Ex.22.11 for bowing.
22.2.6 Selected Passages - 2nd movement

8: Triplets all in one downbow. *Saltando* in Va5.

12-5: Dynamic nuances removed from St to draw more attention to Ww.

17-8: *Diminuendo* until the demisemiquavers.

23: Vc *mf*.

60-1: Hr2 reinforces Fg2 until the 3rd quaver of b.61. It is strange that the problem of the weak bass line was not solved by Mahler by doubling Fg2, as Weingartner advised. <10>

74-5: *cresc* in b.74 replaced by *poco cresc* in b.75 to allow Ob1 and Fg1 to dominate.

76-9: See Ex.22.12 for the re-cast Fl & Tr parts. Ww doubled.

90-5: St *ppp*; *cresc* of b.92 deferred to b.95. *Cresc* in Trl/2 and Pk deferred to 96. Ob2 doubles Ob1 from b.92. All these changes allow the woodwind to dominate.

103: Vn1 has last two notes downbow, *portato*.

114: See Ex.22.13 for Vn2 bowing.

130-4: Cll/2 8va. Ob1 has *Lift the bell*. Ww doubled until b.150. Hr3 & Cr4 play Cl1 original (f) until the 1st half of b.133. Hr1/2 and Trl/2 *mf*.

135-140: Hr1/2 & Cr1/2 double Hr3, Hr3 playing the original in b.139-40, and the others continuing to reinforce Cl1 until the 1st quaver of b.140.
have the entry in b.139-140 8va bassa and play tremolo in b.144 instead of a trill. Tr ffp.

145-50: See Ex.22.14 for Mahler's extensive Retuschen in the horns. The culmination of this passage and the subsequent entry of the trumpets is probably what cause Krehbiehl to describe features of phrasing calculated to provoke discussion, especially in the funeral march, in one climax of which there were suggestions of the crack of doom and an agonized hymning of the Day of Wrath. <11>

150-2: See Ex.22.15 for bowing.

154: Vn1: Griffbrett.

159 - 168 (1st note): All wind doubled. St take four bows in b.159.

173-9: Ob1 doubled. All other instruments except Cl1 pp.

194: Fl2 doubles Fl1.

197: Fl1 doubled.

198: First two notes of Ww doubled.

204-5: Ww doubled until 3rd quaver of b.204 Hr2 as in b.60-1.

230-47: The Vn1.1 part is richly annotated with bowings and fingerings to give a highly expressive ending to the movement. See Ex.22.16.

22.2.7 Selected Passages - 3rd movement

166 etc: Basic dynamic of horns piano.

It should be recorded here that Elliott Galkin states that the first statement of the theme of the Trio was played by three horns located to his extreme left, behind the
But when I spoke to Dr Galkin about this he was unable to quote a verifiable source of his information.

423: Pk mf.

22.2.8 Selected Passages - 4th movement

1-3: Vn2 doubles Vn1; Va 8va until b.2; Vc plays Va original until the 1st crotchet of b.2.

12 et seq: According to Natalie Bauer-Lechner, Mahler spoke to her in 1897 about the beginning of the last movement in the following terms:

"...They (bad conductors) mistake this for the theme (after the preceding stormy opening!) and consequently take it far too quickly, instead of realizing its true meaning. Beethoven is trying it out meditatively - then playfully - he is learning to walk - he gets into his stride gradually. That's why the latter part of it - like an answer - should follow rather more quickly..." <13>

See Ex.22.17 for the indications of this playful spirit which are found in the orchestral parts. The theme is split into two bar phrases with differenciation in the dyanamics. The vertical lines probably indicate that Mahler made a short pause. This would give the improvisatory quality referred to above.

51-9: Vc has cresc in b.52, p in b.53. Vn2 & Vc have cresc in b.57, pp in b.58.

60: Five consecutive downbows in Vn1, consistently applied at subsequent appearances of the theme.

103: See Ex.22.18 for dynamics and bowing in Vn1/2.

171: St have p, and CL fp to allow F11/2 & Obl/2 to dominate.
246: Hr2/3 mp dim to prevent the reverberation from covering them.

303-7: Hr1 doubles Hr3 and the notes of Hr2 are changed in b.305-6 to be an octave below Hr1.

315-6: Fl1 reinforces Ob1 8va. Trl 8va in b.316.

320 (last note) - 321: Fl1/2 reinforce Ob1/2 8va.

327-8: Fl1 reinforces Ob1 8va from 3rd note of b.327.

344 (2nd note) - 348: Vn2 joins Vn1; Va adds Vn2 original.

356-63: Vn1 has diminuendo in the 2nd half of b.357 & b.379, while Vc & Cb have crescendo with diminuendo in the following bars; thus drawing the attention to the Vn1 and Vc/Cb lines in turn.

380-96: Hr2/3 & Cr1/4/6 double Hr1. Cr2 plays Hr2 original.

392: Crescendo in all parts.

416-20: See Ex.22.19 for the extra Br and Pk parts and St dynamics.

457-8: Wind p cresc.

22.3 The Budapest Score, P.25

Most of the characteristics of Mahler's interpretation as gleaned from the orchestral parts are also included in this score, though their realization is in many cases less fully worked out. This score probably served as the basis for the later one from which the orchestral parts were made.
22.3.1 Horn Doublings

In this score there are horn doublings indicated before each movement and underlinings in the wind parts which appear to denote doublings. These marks and the inclusion of rehearsal letters show that the score was probably used by Mahler for his Hamburg performances.


Additionally, Hr4/5 are indicated to reinforce Fg1/2 in the first movement in bars 274-7, and in bars 98-101 and 145-50 of the second movement.

22.3.2 Other Wind Doublings

Underlinings are found in the wind staves. This notation has not been found in any other of Mahler's scores and it appears to denote themes which he wants to emerge strongly, giving the impression that these are therefore to be doubled.

BEGIN   END   COMMENT

1st mvt:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Hr1/2 until 2nd crotchet of b.40, then Fg until 1st note of b.42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>F12, Cl2, Fg1/2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Fg1/2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>Ww.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>All Ww until 2nd crotchet of b.365.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>Ob1/2, Cl1/2, Fg1/2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>Fl1/2, Ob1/2, Fg1/2 &amp; Hr1/2 from 2nd crotchet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ww and Hr1/2. (Hr end in b.658.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22.3.1 - Beethoven III, P.25
### 22.3.3 Reduction of Strings

In a few places in the first and last movements Mahler indicates reduced strings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>END</th>
<th>INSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>1/2 (Vnl/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>4 Pulte, 3 Pulte, 2 Pulte, 3 Celli, 3 Bässe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>nur die Hälfte (beginning of new page)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 22.3.4 E-flat Clarinet

The E-flat clarinet is marked to be used only once: in the second movement where it doubles Fl1 from the second half of b.167 to the first note of b.168; but it cannot be assumed from this that this was all the instrument played.
22.3.5 Agogic Markings

In this score Mahler indicates Luftpausen by vertical lines. In all but three cases these same Luftpausen can be found in the Vienna material.

1st mvt, b.357 & b.361: Vertical pencil strokes at the end of each bar in the flute stave, the first of which is not noted in P.26.

2nd mvt, b.149: Vnl have tenuto marks over the last five notes, implying a ritardando.

2nd mvt, b.246: A vertical line in the flute stave at the end of the bar.

4th mvt, b.17 & b.25: Vertical strokes in Vnl and Fl.

4th mvt, b.103: Vertical lines in Vnl/2 before the last note.

4th mvt, b.392 & b.403: The ends of these bars have two tenuto marks in Vnl and a vertical line in Fl. This is not noted in the Vienna material.

22.3.6 Selected Passages - 1st movement

83-99: The phrasing of the second subject is as in the Vienna material, although the dynamic shadings are not so finely developed. The deletion of the Ww hairpins of b.98 is already a part of Mahler's interpretation.


123-127: The rewriting of the brass entries is more radical than in the Vienna material. See Ex.22.20.
186-205: Mahler moderates the wind by *ffp* only when Vn2 have semiquavers, i.e. in b.188-9 etc.

219: Mahler puts an accent (') on this bar.

243-7: The wind additions are essentially as in P.26.

254-9: Hr1/2 and Tr1/2 as P.26.

266-71: Mahler adds, in pencil, two extra horn parts playing concert c'-sharp and e'.

276-9: Pk as in P.26 and additions in horn staves.


442-5: Br essentially as in P.26.

482-4: F11 as in the Vienna material.

531-534: Hr1 *tacet* as in P.26.

655-64: F11, Tr1/2 and Hr1-3 as in P.26.

22.3.7 *Selected Passages - 2nd movement*

16: Vn1 G-Saite.

60-1: Hr2 as in P.26.

76-8: As in P.26.

98-101: Hr1/2 doubled and Hr4/5 reinforce Fg1/2.

109: Vn1 cresc, with *dim* in b.110. In P.26 Mahler retains the *sotto*
130-39: The doublings here are similar to P.26, expect that the horns do not join Cl1 at b.130, and the ending of b.139 is left to Cl1/2 and Va.

145-8: Pk have a roll on D. This was later replaced by a crotchet D at the beginning of each bar.

173-9: Obl doubled molto espressivo.

204-5: Originally Hr2 doubled Fg2, but Mahler later abandoned this.

22.3.8 Selected Passages - 3rd movement

97: Hr2/3 reinforce Vc.

256a-8a: Peters Edition score has ties here for the horns, and Mahler leaves them as printed.

22.3.9 Selected Passages - 4th movement


99: Va, Vc & Cb Forte and accent (ˈ) on the B-flat, instead of the beginning of the bar.

103: Dynamics as in P.26.

327-8: As in P.26.

416-20: Hr1-3 and Tr1/2 as in P.26. Pk enter in b.419. Vn1 has staccato dots in b.419, except for the last two notes which are tenuto.

457-9: Originally, wind had *dim* in b.457 and *cresc* in b.458.

Presumably this did not include Fg1/2 and was designed to allow the...
b.459.
Mahler conducted Beethoven V nineteen times. It was the first Beethoven symphony which he had the opportunity of conducting and he had no hesitation in offering it when engaged as a guest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>24 Feb 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg PO</td>
<td>12 Dec 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>15 Dec 1892&lt;1&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>15 Mar 1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>24 Mar 1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>31 Mar 1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna PO</td>
<td>5 Nov 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Nov 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris (VPO)</td>
<td>18 Jun 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiesbaden</td>
<td>9 Oct 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>1 Nov 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York SO</td>
<td>13 Dec 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York PO</td>
<td>3 Dec 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Dec 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Dec 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 Dec 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 Dec 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Jan 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia (NYPO)</td>
<td>17 Jan 1910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23.1 Sources

23.1.1 Score, P.29

This Peters Edition score, bears the stamp of Rózsavölgyi és Társa. The markings are mainly in lead pencil with some blue pencil and some ink. Rehearsal letters have been added; but no extra numbers. Retuschen appear to have been sketched in rather than written
indications were adequate for Mahler to do his own copying. The score is discussed below.

23.1.2 Score, P.30

There is no indication of when or where Mahler might have obtained this score which is in the Breitkopf and Härtel edition. It contains extensive markings in Mahler's hand in red ink, lead, blue and red pencils. The red pencil was used for indications of the entry of the doubling wind instruments and the blue pencil for insertion of the rehearsal letters and numbers. A comparison of this score with the Budapest score indicates that it comes from a later period in Mahler's life, most probably from 1897 onwards. Four pages of the Finale, comprising b.105-33, are reproduced as Ex.23.1.

23.1.3 Orchestral Parts, P.31

Several of these parts contain dates written in by players and indicating that they were used extensively by Mahler from March 1897 onwards.

The set contains printed string parts in the proportion 9,9,6,6,5, although Vn1.9, Vn2.9 and Cb5 have not been used much. There are two wind sets, P.31B containing the indications for doubling players and P.31C being copyist's m/s parts for Hr3/4 in F. These extra horn parts were not made by the same copyist who prepared the extra brass parts of Beethoven III & VII, although he may have made the change in b.317-9 of the Finale. A page of Hr3, comprising b.178-385 of the Finale, is reproduced as Ex.23.2. The parts have been furnished with rehearsal letters and numbers - there are no numbers in Cb5 - and these and most
orchestral parts, including the m/s horn parts were prepared originally for Mahler's three guest engagements in March 1897.

23.2 The Main Characteristics of Mahler's Interpretation

Unless otherwise stated, the score and set of parts, P.30/1 are the basis for the comments below.

23.2.1 Repeats

The parts show that Mahler made all repeats except for the exposition of the Finale.

23.2.2 Timings and Tempi

Timings are found in the orchestral parts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Val</th>
<th>Vc2</th>
<th>Hrl</th>
<th>Psl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 Min</td>
<td>35 min</td>
<td>37 min</td>
<td>m.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following timings, taken from records may be used as a comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nikisch</th>
<th>Furtwängler</th>
<th>Furtwängler</th>
<th>Walter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BPO</td>
<td>BPO</td>
<td>VPO</td>
<td>CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DG session</td>
<td>concert</td>
<td>HMV session</td>
<td>CBS session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>8.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>10.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>10.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>33.30</td>
<td>35.10</td>
<td>36.15</td>
<td>34.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These timings are not sufficiently divergent from those ascribed to

23.1.3 - Beethoven V
individual movements prevents us from going further on this basis. However, from contemporary writings we obtain the information that Mahler took the Scherzo slower than was customary:

- According to La Grange, Viktor von Herzfeld, on the occasion of Mahler's first performance of the work in Budapest on 24 February 1890, commented on the slow tempo for the Scherzo which allowed many details to receive their value. <4>

- Again according to La Grange, Sittard, described the Scherzo as a minuet in the old style, with powder and hoop-petticoats. <5>

- In St Petersburg, a review in Nowosti Dnja said of Mahler's 15 March 1897 performance of Beethoven V: ...I have never heard it interpreted in such a slow tempo... <6>

- When Mahler conducted Beethoven V with the Kaim Orchestra nine days later, the critic of the Munich Allgemeine Zeitung wrote The Scherzo... was considerably too slow. It appeared to us as though the conductor had absolutely no feeling for it; we have never heard it played so lamely, so completely ineffectively. Indeed, every listener felt as though he should "give it a push", and especially the double bass passage in C major which was absolutely tedious. <7>

- In December 1908 the critic of the New York Times noted that ...His tempo in the Scherzo was distinctly slower than that to which we are accustomed; and not to the advantage of the effect. <8>

- In a review of a performance with the New York Philharmonic Orchestra, the critic of the New York Daily Tribune pointed out that ...the general reading was free from eccentricity of tempo or nuance (except in the third division, which moved with leaden feet). <9>

- The New York Times repeated this assertion in 1910: The allegro that stands in the place of a scherzo was taken very deliberately, as before - it seemed even more deliberately. <10>

All these reviews agree that Mahler's tempo was slower than normal in the Scherzo, and it is a pity that we have no definite timing to substantiate this.
23.2.3 Doubling of Woodwind

Mahler selectively reinforced all the woodwind instruments except the contrabassoon. Most of these indications are uncontroversial. An exception is the doubling of the first movement oboe cadenza in b.266-8. Originally Mahler had only the C of b.267 and the following G doubled, but in the parts the doubling has been extended in pencil to all four players from the Eb of b.266 to the first D. It continued with two players and the breathing was staggered.

Already in Budapest, in 1890, Viktor von Herzfeld had disapproved of this doubling, <11> and it was still a feature of Mahler's performances in New York:

The first example of erraticism occurred in the famous cadenza, in the first movement. This Mr. Mahler phlebotomized by giving it to two oboes and beating time for each note - not in the expressive adagio called for by Beethoven, but in a rigid andante. Thus the rhapsodic utterance contemplated by the composer was turned into a mere connecting link between two parts of the movement. <12>

Mahler's actions in this are inexplicable.

23.2.4 Doubling of Piccolo

Mahler has most of the piccolo part played by two players and, in bars 73-6, 329-32 and 346-9 of the finale, where the piccolo normally has great difficulty in making its undoubled part heard, he adds all four flutes to the piccolo line. The second piccolo doubles the first 8va in bars 48-9, 73-82, 134-43, 257-9 and 269 (2nd note) - 272; and in b.244-50 both piccolos play 8va. The transposition of the piccolo part was noticed in New York; <13> and these features are probably what the critic of the Munich Allgemeine Zeitung meant when he complained that
a stronger effect. We must protest against such
tastelessness and crudity - in the name of Beethoven, who
would surely be furious about it. Leave the works of the
master as they are. Only Wagner can retouch, since he has
done it with discernment. <14>

23.2.5 E-flat Clarinet

The Budapest score has several passages marked for reinforcement by the
E-flat clarinet and these are discussed below. The indications are not
so numerous in P.30, but in P.31B Cl4 is directed to reinforce Fl1 on
the E-flat instrument in b.181-96 of the third movement. The New York
critics do not mention this, and the use of Cl4 might also indicate
that Mahler, at least in New York, had refined his reading to the
extent that an additional player was not required exclusively for the
E-flat clarinet.

23.2.6 Second Horn Pair

Mahler introduced a second pair of horns in all four movements. The
second pair of horns is used in several ways:

- to reinforce the motivic structure of the melos: 1st mvt,
b.110-8, 249-50 & 363-9.

- to reinforce the bassoons: 1st mvt, b.368-9 & 440-55; 4th
mvt, b.132-6, 269-70, 289-94, 308-17 & 395-end.

- to reinforce the clarinets: 3rd mvt, b.38-41; 4th mvt,

- to reinforce the oboes: 3rd mvt, b.91-3.

In these cases where Mahler adds new parts in Hr3/4 he retains the
original Hr1/2 parts.

23.2.4 - Beethoven V, P30/1
1-5: There are no indications in the scores or parts as to Mahler’s interpretation of the first five bars; but Krehbiehl’s criticisms are a help here:

The opening phrase ... he took in tempo; only at its return later in the movement did he broaden and emphasize it insistently. <15>

Mr. Mahler did not think it necessary to broaden the tempo of the opening measures of the symphony so as to make the fundamental theme of the work sound like an introduction; nor did he exaggerate the fermate, as many conductors have done. <16>

Mahler’s approach when he performed the work in Hamburg was to hold the fermatas long and this may have been influenced by hearing Bülow and by Wagner’s comments in Ueber das Dirigieren. However, it seems that Mahler changed his views in this as a result of criticism; for, according to Natalie Bauer-Lechner, Mahler said in late 1899 that:

"Because of the fermatas at the beginning, I’d rather not perform it. I have lost my confidence ever since they thought, in Hamburg, that I held the pauses too long. Every pause, I am convinced, has to be calculated in direct relation to the basic beat; either twice or four times the latter." <17>

44: Second quaver downbow. Mahler reverses the normal bowing to place a downbow and accent on the first note of the Ur-motif.

44 & 48: Ww fp.

75-82: Mahler changes dynamics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75-6</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>hairpins in Vnl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-80</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>hairpins in Vnl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>ppp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td>delayed from b.84.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23.2.6 - Beethoven V, P30/1 - 1st mvt
though it looks a little overdone in the score, and because it mirrors Beethoven's changed orchestral setting in the recapitulation.

110: Ww doubled from 2nd note until b.122. Ob3 has *Lift the bell*: fff
ddd

112 (last quaver) - 113 (1st quaver) & 116 (last quaver) - 117 (1st quaver): Hr3/4 double Hrl/2.

177 - 179 (1st note) & 185-7: Vn2 double Vn1 and Va takes over Vn2 part.

182-95: Ww doubled fff. Fgl/2 reinforced by Hrl/2 in b.183-4, and by Cl1/2 in b.190-1. Vn1/2 have sfp and Va, Vc & Cb have *sf dim p* in b.182-3 & b.190-1. Vn1/2 are *ff* in b.179-81 and b.187-9. See Ex.23.3 for Vn1/2 bowing from P.31.

196-9: Ww and St play detached. Strings have all downbows printed in the parts.

228 & 240: Mahler changes the dynamic of the first note in the strings to *pp* to bring out the *Ur-motif*. Weingartner discusses this same feature, which had been printed thus in earlier editions of the parts, using the term castrated chords. <18>

245 et seq: Downbow on second note of bar.

248-52: Commas after the first quaver of b.248 and before b.249 and b.251, and rit in b.248 with *a Tempo* in b.253, show that Mahler played the *Ur-motif* much more deliberately here. Hr3/4 double Hrl/2 in b.248-9 and reinforce Cl12 in b.250-2.

256 (2nd half) - 258 & 260 (1st half) - 262: Fgl/2 doubled.

23.2.7 - Beethoven V, P30/1 - 1st mvt
363 (2nd quaver) - 369: Hrl/2 abandon their original part to reinforce Fgl in b.363-5 and b.367-9, in b.369 having a minim. Hr3/4 join in the last four notes of each entry.

369-74: Hrl/2 omit original in b.369-12. Tr and Pk are mf in bars 369-72 and are removed from b.373 - 374 (1st note). St have sfp in b.374 and ff in the following bar, etc. In doing this, Mahler emphasises the structure of the passage which begins in b.373. Left as Beethoven instrumented it, a misleading impression can easily be given that the passage begins with the second wind quaver of bar 374, whereas in truth the strings lead.

374 (2nd note) - 386: Ww doubled and Cl1/2 8va.


440-66: Hr3/4 reinforce Fgl/2 until b.445, and Cl1/2 8va bassa from b.448 until b.455, doubling Hrl/2 in b.458, b.464 & b.466. Fl2 joins Fl1 in b.444-5; Ob1/2 join Fl1/2 in b.448-53; Cl3/4 double Cl1/2 8va in b.448-55. Ww doubled in b.440-58 & 464-6. Mahler keeps the dynamic level and intensity up. <19>

474 - 475 (first note) Strings removed. Mahler considers that the trumpets and drums are adequate here and wishes to reserve the entry of the strings for the next phrase.


488: Poco rit.
23.2.8 Selected Passages - 2nd movement

0-1: Mahler ties the upbeat into the first note of the first bar with a downbow, unifying this with its later appearance in b.157-8.

12-15: F12 sometimes replaced Obl.

12-19: Commas after b.12 & b.13, and in Vnl/2 after the 3rd notes of b.16 and b.17. Here and elsewhere in the movement, Mahler breaks up the melodic line into short phrases with echo effects. According to La Grange, this was commented upon by Sittard in Hamburg in 1893. <20> The markings in the score and parts do not necessarily imply more than a slight separation for articulation purposes; but clearly, at least in 1893, Mahler made a lot of them.

48: Fg doubled.

62-4: F12 sometimes replaced Obl.

80 (3rd quaver) - 86: C13/4 double C11/2.

114-123: Hr1/2 Trl/2 & Pk originally had \( f \) dim \( p \) in b.114: Pk later removed altogether from b.114-5 and Trl/2 & Pk later removed from b.117-8. Vnl/2 have \( mf \) and Fg1-4 & Va (8va where necessary) reinforce Vc. Hr3/4 replace Fg1/2.

Wagner refers to the "spasmodically splendid accompaniment" of the trumpets; <21> and recommends moderation of their dynamics. The reinforcements represent a radical departure from the original in an attempt to solve the problem of overbalance of the melody in the bass line while preserving the harmonies. By his deletion of Trl/2, Mahler avoids their entering only where coincidentally convenient and
end of the passage.

122-3: Ww doubled.

123: Springender Bogen in P.31.

132: St mf.

146: Ww doubled until the 1st quaver of b.156.

156: Trl/2 tacent from 2nd quaver.

157: Vn1 & Va mf dim p instead of p to make them audible through the wind chord.

163-4: Vn1, Va & Vc have one bow per bar to assist the pianissimo.


185-94: Cll and Ob1 join Fl1, and Ob2 reinforces Cl2 until b.192. In b.193-4, Ob1/2 & Cl2 join Cl1. Vn2 joins Vn1 until the 1st note of b.192. See Ex.23.4 for Hrl-4 & Trl/2.

The strengthening of the woodwind line is an improvement, though the shadowing of Vn1/2 by Trl/2 is a most un-Beethovenian procedure, as is the addition of Hrl-4 to the basses in b.190-3. Though gratuitous on stylistic grounds, this addition to the horns can be defended in terms of bringing the main line to the fore.

223-6: Mahler's breaking up of the line into its motivic constituents reaches its extreme here. The tempo must be severely held back in order for hairpins under the last semiquaver of b.226 to make any impact.

225-6: Cl3/4 double Cl1/2 8va.

23.2.8 - Beethoven V, P30/1 - 2nd mvt -353-
235: Crescendo delayed until b.237.

240-1: Br p cresc ff.

242 (3rd quaver) - 244 (1st note) & 245 (3rd quaver) - 247: Cl3/4 double Cl1/2 8va and Ww doubled.

23.2.9 Selected Passages - 3rd movement

38 (3rd crotchet) - 39 & 40 (3rd crotchet) - 41: Hr3/4 (gestopft) reinforce Cl1/2. This passage and b.90-3 caused more than raised eyebrows in New York:

Mahler has the horns play 'stopped' instead of open in a passage of the scherzo, giving the peculiarly veiled quality of tone that is the familiar outgiving of the stopped horn. It is effective, certainly, in this passage; but it was not Beethoven's intention.

Indeed it would be difficult to recall a passage in all his orchestral works where he has used this peculiar tonal effect dear to modern instrumental composers. The propriety of thus retouching even so small a stroke of the brush in the colors of Beethoven's canvas comes obviously into question...

...Into the cadence of the second subject of the third movement Mr. Mahler injected a bit of un-Beethovenian color by changing the horn parts so that listeners familiar with their Wagner were startled by hearing something very like Hagen's call from Götterdämmerung from the instruments which in the score simply sustain a harmony voice in octaves...

90 (3rd crotchet) - 91 (1st crotchet) & 92 (3rd crotchet) - 93 (1st crotchet): Hr3/4 gestopft reinforce Ob1/2.

114, 118 & 122: Mahler places accents (') on the last note of each of these bars. This is also a feature of the parallel bars 298, 302 & 306 and may have been occasioned by the slow tempo which Mahler adopted.

181 (3rd crotchet) - 196: Es-cl reinforces F11. Ob1 8va until b.183.

St mf with crescendo beginning in b.191.

23.2.8 - Beethoven V, P30/1 - 2nd mvt
213 - 217 (first note):obl/2 tac-tacent.

324: Pk part has mit 2 Schlägeln zur jedem (sic) Zeit in blue pencil. (With two sticks always.) This is presumably to prevent the timpanist playing lazily with one hand.

368: Pk part has allmählich in Wirbel übergehen. (Gradually changing into a roll.) Although contradicting Beethoven’s intentions, this makes an exciting crescendo into the finale.

23.2.10 Selected Passages - 4th movement

1-12: See Ex.23.5 for Mahler’s and Strauss’ dynamic changes in the brass. <24> Mahler also has crescendi in St in b.7, b.9 and b.10-11, arriving fff at the end of b.11.

4-22 (1st note): Vn2 join Vn1. <25>

25: obl/2 & Cl/2 join Fll/2 from the 2nd note.

26: Obl has Schalltrichter Auf! and a drawing of an up-turned bell.

26-33. Fgl/2 abandon Beethoven’s original, playing a crotchet c and then joining Cfg. Hr3/4 double Hr1/2 until b.28 (1st crotchet) and form b.30 until b.32 (3rd crotchet). Hr4 has hoch Schalltrichter but this has been pencilled out.

28-9 & 32-3: To help the basses, Mahler inserts mf cresc for two bars in Vn1/2 & Va, mf in Ps, and fp in Hr, Tr and Pk.

34-40: Vn2 play in unison with Vn1.

43 (from 2nd note): Fll, Obl and Fgl doubled by second players and Cl1/2 reinforce Obl/2. All Ww doubled. Coming after a powerful tutti,
reverberant acoustic.

48-9: Cll/2 reinforce Obl/2. All Ww doubled.

58-60: Ww, Br, Pk, Vc/Cb originally p on 6th quaver of b.58. Fl1/2,
Obl/2, Cll/2 & Pk subsequently removed from 6th quaver of b.58 to 1st
crotchet of b.60.

Although a drastic measure, this may be the only way to ensure that
Vnl/2 and Va can be heard well.


72 - 79 (1st note): Fl1/2 abandon their parts and play in unison with
Pi.

86b-91: The whole orchestra is marked ffp, except Vc, Cb and Cfg who
continue ff with the melody. As the melodic line rises in pitch, so it
is able to penetrate the texture more easily, and Mahler is able to
reflect this with crescendi in Vnl/2 & Va in b.87, in Ww in b.88 and in
the all the accompaniment in b.89. Va double Vn2 in b.88. Ww doubled
from b.89.

106 (last note) - 110: Four downbows in Vc/Cb. Ww, except Cfg p in
b.106. Ww, except Cfg f on the 2nd note of b.109 and p at the
beginning of b.110. Vnl, Vn2 & Va interjections in b.108-9 et seq.
fff. See Ex.23.1. for photocopy of P.30 in b.105-33.

118 (last note) - 121: Four downbows in Vnl/2.

120 (last crotchet) - 121: Obl/2 reinforce Flg1/2 and Cll/2 reinforce
the resultant Obl/2 part. All Ww doubled. Four downbows in Va/Vc.

122 et seq: Mahler has placed sf under all the detached crotchets in

23.2.10 - Beethoven V, P30/1 - 4th mvt
132-53: Cll-4 play 8va from the last note of b.132 to b.144, and Fg1-4 8va from the last note of b.134 to the first note of b.136. Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2 from the last note of b.132, taking over the original Cll/2 part from the last note of b.136 until b.153 (Hr4 has concert d' from b.146.) In b.132 Obl: Schalltrichter auf! with a drawing of an up-turned bell. All Ww are doubled. Ps ffp in 142, cresc in 143 and ff in 144. Vn2 joins Vn1 in b.142-3, aided by Va from the 2nd half of b.142. This major overhaul gives a much better balance of the parts.

210-228 (1st note) & 240 (last note) - 243: Vn2 joins Vn1.

245, 247 & 248 (second half of each bar only): Cll/2 reinforce Fl1/2. Cll/2 reinforce Obl/2 in b.249, so as to lead back to their original part.

257-9: Fl1/2, Cll/2, Fg1/2 8va. Ww doubled.

267-9: Essentially as b.58-60, with the addition of notes in Vn2/Va to reinforce the moving semiquavers of Vn1 in b.267-8.

289-94: Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2. Ww doubled from b.292. All instruments have sf in b.292.

302 (last crotchet) - b.308 (1st note): Vn2 joins Vn1. Hr3/4 reinforce Cll/2 until b.305.

306-17 Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2.

317-9: Flg1/2 doubled and reinforced by Vc. Hr3/4 have indications for reinforcing Fl1/2 also, but this has been deleted. See Ex.23.2. Ludwig Karpath reports that horns reinforced Flg1/2 at Mahler's Viennese performance of 5 Nov 1899. The public had been alerted to this by the
being able to detect the difference. \textless 26\textgreater Psl/3 have marks in the parts indicating that they also reinforced Fgl/2 at one time.

329 - 333 (3rd crotchet): Fl1/2 join Pi from the 2nd semiquaver until the 3rd crotchet of b.332. P1 doubled.

346-9: As 329-333.

350-1: All downbows, probably to prevent rushing.

390: Ww doubled to the end. Hr3/4 double Hr1/2 until the 1st note of b.395 and then reinforce Fgl/2, returning to doubling Hr1/2 from b.416.

23.3 The Budapest Score, P.29

The Budapest score is not clearly marked, several passages giving the appearance of being very sketchy. The repeat in the finale has been struck out.

23.3.1 E-flat Clarinet

Mahler's use of the E-flat clarinet in Beethoven's Fifth Symphony was noted by Viktor von Herzfeld in writing about the Budapest performance of 24 Feb 1890 \textless 27\textgreater and the Budapest score (P.29) has several passages marked for reinforcement by the instrument. These are marked by Es-clar with or without x, or merely by x:

1st mvt: b.110 (2nd note) - b.108, b.228-32, b.362 (2nd note) - b.369 (1st note).

23.2.10 - Beethoven V, P30/1 - 4th mvt
3rd mvt: b.27-?, b.79-?.

4th mvt: b.73-?  Es-cl mit Picc

The indications are rather sketchy and in the absence of the actual part the full story cannot be known. However, the places cited above do make sense as likely places where Mahler would have used the E-flat clarinet to reinforce the flute. In the main, the part can be expected to reinforce Fl1, except for b.228-32 and b.249-52 of the first movement where the Fl2 part would be more valuable, and in the finale where it may be that Mahler had large sections of the piccolo part reinforced.

23.3.2 Selected Passages - 1st movement

245: As P.30/1.

94-110: Pk in Eb, Bb by analogy with b.346-74. For some reason, Mahler elects to leave b.101 empty.

113-22: See Ex.23.6 for Trl/2 and Pk.

177 - 179 (1st note) & 185-7: Vnl/2 as P.30/1.

440 et seq: Hrl/2 rewritten as in P.30/1.

474-5: Strings removed, as in P.30/1.

23.3.3 Selected Passages - 2nd movement

114 et seq: Fg/Va reinforce Vc/Cb. Hr3/4 replace Fg1/2.

185 et seq: O1/2b not rewritten, but fp under first four notes, and this
take on the form of the later version.
Chapter 24

Beethoven, Symphony No.6, Op.68

Mahler's sixteen performances of Beethoven VI fall into three groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg PO</td>
<td>3 Dec 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>1 Mar 1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Mar 1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 Mar 1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna PO</td>
<td>17 Dec 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York PO</td>
<td>14 Jan 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>5 Dec 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>6 Dec 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>7 Dec 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester, NY</td>
<td>8 Dec 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, NY</td>
<td>9 Dec 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica, NY</td>
<td>10 Dec 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>13 Dec 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>16 Dec 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td>15 Feb 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford, CT</td>
<td>16 Feb 1911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The series of eight performances in December 1910 were on tour with the New York Philharmonic Orchestra. During this brief tour the critics were highly impressed by Mahler's performance of the work and by the time of the two performances in Carnegie Hall the orchestra must have been very familiar with Mahler's interpretation. At the first of these performances, the New York Times noted that the playing of the band throughout was very brilliant;<2> while other papers contented themselves with reporting that

A somewhat unexpected occurrence during the performance made many persons in the audience start up in their seats. One of the kettle drums, manipulated by the second tympanist, tumbled over suddenly just before the famous tempest, in which it was to have furnished a share of thunder, and the fall thereof created an unexpected racket. Mahler, however, showed no signs of unusual excitement, and the
Natalie Bauer-Lechner reports many conversations with Mahler on the subject of Beethoven VI, most of them in terms of a feeling for nature and the melodic content of the work; but in one passage, from January 1896 in Hamburg, Mahler refers to his editing of the score:

"It is true that Beethoven's works need a certain amount of editing. For look here", he said - explaining with the aid of the score of the Pastoral which he had before him - "Beethoven counted on artists (Künstler), not artisans (Handwerker), for the conducting as well as the playing. He didn't write everything in such minute detail as Richard Wagner was later to do, nor was he so experienced in orchestral technique as never to make a mistake in notating the sound he wanted, particularly later on when he lost control over this because of his deafness. So in order that the music should be played as it was meant to sound, one has to add all sorts of dynamic indications in the parts, so that the principal voice stands out and the accompaniment retires into the background. One must take care, too, that the bowing and expression produce the effect that the composer wanted."  <4>

24.1 Score, P.32

This score, has the stamp of "Rozsavölgyi es Tarsa / Budapest". There are rehearsal letters but no additional numbers. The inclusion of parts for E-flat clarinet and Hr3/4 and occasional woodwind reinforcements by Hr1/2 and Tr1/2 imply that Mahler did not have access to other woodwind doubling players at the time when this score was in use. It is probably the score referred to above by Natalie Bauer-Lechner; but there is much room for doubt that this is the only score which Mahler had of the work.

Most of the marks in P.32 are in lead and blue pencil, and many of them are not clear. In particular the changes to the brass parts in the 4th movement are illegible in places. In his Klemperer biography, Peter
in Cologne he (Klemperer) had a score of the work that contained all Mahler's retouchings, mainly in the brass. <5>

This implies that a cleaner copy of Mahler's original existed and indeed, unless Mahler prepared the orchestral parts himself, he would have needed this for a copyist to work from, since special parts were required for Hr3/4, Trl/2, Pk and Es-cl, at least.

Although the existence of a later score is by no means definitely established by the above arguments, the loss of such a score may easily have happened after Mahler's death if other conductors had access to it for copying. The disappearance of the orchestral parts may most easily be explained by supposing that, since the work was performed in the last month of his activities in New York, the materials were overlooked or missing when Mahler's library was retuned to Alma, maybe after his death. <6>

24.2 The Main Characteristics of Mahler's Interpretation

24.2.1 Tempi

In conversation with Natalie Bauer-Lechner, Mahler made comments on the second movement:

"...nobody gets this right. Either they take it too quickly and beat four (dotted) crotchets, or they count out the twelve quavers and then the tempo becomes far too slow. The former mistake is more usual; this is the fault of the joke with which Beethoven closes the movement. Rain begins to fall, and the merrymakers run for home, naturally at a hurried tempo which Beethoven accelerates here. This mistakes the muddle-headed into taking the whole movement more quickly." <7>

In the second half of this extract, Mahler appears to confuse the
interpolated passage gives a probable key to Mahler's tempo for the third movement; since, after the word 'usual', there is no doubt that Mahler is referring to the third movement. <8> Bauer-Lechner quotes Mahler again later, and this clarifies Mahler's ideas on the tempo of the slow movement:

His slow tempo in the second movement caused general astonishment... "It must flow on comfortably like a little brook," said Mahler, "not agitated (sehr bewegt)" <9>

Confirmation of Mahler's slow tempo for the third movement, which can be inferred from Bauer-Lechner's confused rendering of the passage cited above is given by reviews; for according to La Grange, Sittard criticized Mahler for the slow tempo of the third movement in Dec 1894; <10> while the critic of the Pittsburgh Gazette Times in 1910 reported that the third movement began slowly but gradually accelerated to produce an irresistible effect. <11>

24.2.2 Repeats

There are no indications in the score as to Mahler's practice in respect of repeats in this work.

24.2.3 E-flat Clarinet

The E-flat clarinet is notated by the circle with a horizontal line to play in the Trio of the third movement from b.173, reinforcing F11. There is no indication where this is to cease, though it probably goes only as far as b.180 to enable the triplets to ring out.

In the fourth movement, the E-flat clarinet is marked to reinforce F11 from the second half of b.39. A further circle / line occurs in b.43. There is no indication of where the reinforcement is to cease, but this
lines through them are found in b.75 & 77, and in b.82 zu 2 mit Es-clar shows that the E-flat clarinet joins the piccolo part.

24.2.4 Doubling of Piccolo

The piccolo part was doubled throughout its entry and reinforced by the E-flat clarinet (zu 2 mit Es-clar in b.82). This can be valuable as, although the piccolo has some notes which are extremely piercing, it is not always as loud as necessary, though it probably also accounted for the critic of the New York Times writing that

...the most realistic thunder rent the air, the drums rolled, the shrill instruments shrieked, "and there was a horrible din"... <12>

24.2.5 Extra Horn Pair

Mahler introduces a second pair of horns in the last two movements. These are indicated by "3.4" in the bassoon stave or by extra notes written into the horn stave. Lead and blue pencils have both been used for these markings, and the different indications are sometimes in conflict with each other.

In the fourth movement, at b.78, Hr3/4 are introduced with no indication of where the reinforcement ceases. At different times Mahler marked b.112 & 114 for reinforcement; and there are also four-part chords written into the horn stave in most of the loud passages of this movement.

In the finale, Hr3/4 are introduced in b.100; and Hr3 reinforces Fgl from b.213 with Hr4 also joining in from b.216. In these passages there is no indication of where the reinforcement is to cease. Four-part chords in the horn stave are a feature of b.227-30.

24.2.3 - Beethoven VI
The vagueness of these marks and the pencil in which they have been written and changed several times, makes it in many places impossible to discern with conviction what Hr3/4 played, and is a strong argument for belief in the existence of a later and clearer score.

24.2.6 Luftpausen

The Budapest score of Beethoven VI contains a large number of Luftpausen, and these are listed below. They are marked in the form of commas in all parts and occur at the ends of the bars indicated. Most of the Luftpausen are to emphasise harmonic structure, while others are to indicate correct phrasing.

1st movement:

138 & 417: Mahler underscores the surprise of the following bar each time.

140, 419 & 421: The first two of these are found only in the accompaniment and are probably only indications to the wind players to articulate the beginning of the next chord; but the last one occurs in the Ob, Cl and Vn1 staves and surely indicates a dramatic pause before the forte.

274: For dramatic emphasis, to produce a heavy accent on the next note.

281: To underline the half close.

467: The pulsation changes here and Mahler is unwilling to rush headlong into the new section, in which it is otherwise difficult to delineate the importance of the viola.

511: This is a normal separation in the final chords.

2nd movement:

35, 41, 104, 105, 106 & 113: Only in b.104 & 106 is this in all parts, and it may therefore not indicate any more than the fact that the players should not play through into the next bar, but start a new phrase.

39, 46, 65, 76 & 118: To emphasise the cadence on the dominant.
3rd mvt:

202: To give a stronger attack and accent on the first fermata bar.

5th mvt:

63: To emphasise the subito piano.

195: For a more dramatic entry of the pianissimo.

238 & 240: This is the normal phrasing of this passage. Gaps are also marked in the accompaniment in b.242 and 243, and also before the last note of b.246.

258 & 259: To underline that these are the last three tonic chords of the work, a fact which is sometimes obscured by the horn and strings from b.260 on.

It is, of course, impossible to know how large any of these gaps were.

24.2.7 Selected Passages - 1st movement

37: Hr1/2 have a'' / f'' as their last note.

43: Hr1/2 have b' / d' instead of a quaver rest.

67 et seq: Mahler emphasises the importance of the cello part by adding hairpins, and continues this in subsequent entries of the theme. See Ex.24.1.

115-22: At the beginning of the bars 115, 117 & 119, Ww, Va, Vc & Cb have Forte with fp in the middle of the bar. Hr1/2 have diminuendo on the long notes and return to f at each quaver. Obl 8va in b.117-8 & b.121-2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vn2/Va/Vc</td>
<td>p cresc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Vn2/Va/Vc</td>
<td>mf</td>
<td>Ww breathe at end of bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
<td>mf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vn2/Va/Vc</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>ppp cresc poco a poco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Ob</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fl/St</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cl/Fg/Hr</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Vc/Cb</td>
<td>ff</td>
<td>Cb 8va.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although these dynamic changes are sketchy, the overall intent is to allow the main motif to dominate at all times and to follow its progression from instrument to instrument. Like Weingartner and others, Mahler breaks the twenty four bar crescendo of Beethoven's original into two stretches of twelve bars, emphasising the sudden change of chord from B-flat to D.

275-8: Vn2 f dim, Va mf dim and Vn1/2 dim pp.

279-81: pp in 279. Vn1 cresc in 280 and dim in 281. Vn2/Va have hairpins in 281 leading to and away from the fourth quaver. The additional detail written by Beethoven and underlined by Mahler's dynamics causes him to put rit in b.281 and to pull back with a Luftpause before the trill which takes the place of the fermata of the fourth bar of the movement.

289-92: Hairpins in Vn2 and Cl1/Fg1. These enable the thematic material to stand out.
297-9: Crescendo in b.297-8 and diminuendo in b.299.

312 & 317: Hr1/2 as b.37 & b.43.

427 - 428 (1st note): Vnl tacent and notes added to Vn2. This enables Vnl to enter with more poise in b.428.

440-7: Wind have p under each of the bars with minims in them to enable the strings to take over from the woodwind motifs in the alternate bars. This reflects the different disposition of this bar in comparison with b.115-22 in the exposition.

448-59: Mahler grades the dynamics in all parts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>448-9</td>
<td>crescendo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450-1</td>
<td>forte diminuendo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452-3</td>
<td>crescendo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454-5</td>
<td>fortissimo diminuendo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456-7</td>
<td>crescendo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458-9</td>
<td>fff with diminuendo in wind.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

470: All instruments have fp. This may be for acoustic reasons, to prevent reverberation covering the entry of Va pp to be in b.472.

479-492: Cl1 doubled in b.479 - b.480 (1st note), b.483 and b.485. In b.489 and b.491, Cl2 is substituted for Cl1.

24.2.8 Selected Passages - 2nd movement

Krehbiehl complained that Mr. Mahler’s changes of accents in the accompaniment figures of the "Scene by the Brook" made the flow of the water strangely jerky. <13> It is a pity that we have no documentation which would give a clue as to the nature of this.

1: Consistently in the semiquavers of the theme Mahler inserted
note received its due weight.


30: See Ex.24.2 for Fl phrasing.

31-2: As 29-30. In b.101-4 Mahler intensifies this with Luftpausen.

39: ff at the beginning of the bar with rit from halfway through. Mahler thus emphasises the change from lyrical to rhetorical expression.

40: The trill has hairpins under the first half and diminuendo under the second half of the bar to keep the line alive.

46: poco rit and crescendo with (subito) piano on the last two notes. This is again to emphasise the rhetorical style with which Beethoven punctuates the basically lyrical movement.

57-8: Mahler delays the crescendo in b.57 until the second half of the bar, and interprets Beethoven's piano in b.58 as subito piano.

64: Strings have poco crescendo lest they overpower Fl and Ob soloists.

66-8: See Ex.24.3 for Mahler's changed dynamics which allow the thematic substance to emerge.

69-75: Hr2 lower F.

79 (last crotchet): Vnl D-saite.

136-7: Vnl, Fgl & Cll all have hairpins on their entries. Fl1 enters f.

24.2.8 - Beethoven VI, P.32 - 2nd mvt
24.2.9 Selected Passages - 3rd movement

87: *Forte* in Vn1/2 to prevent them beginning the *diminuendo* too soon.

91: *1/2* in Vn1/2 without any indication as to where this ends.

95: Fg2 *forte* instead of *piano* to emphasise the rustic nature of its contribution.

122: C12 substitutes for C11, to recognise the different function of this bar from the solo which follows in the next, and allow C11 to prepare.

213-5: *rit*; St *diminuendo*.

216: St *cresc*.

217: *accel*.

223-234: *poco riten*.

These changes of tempo underline the unexpected modulation of b.216-9 and prepare a more dramatic contrast with the ensuing *Presto*.

24.2.10 Selected Passages - 4th movement

What Mahler did as regards the timpani is unclear. In 1910, the *New York Times* reported of Mahler ...employing two pairs of kettledrums instead of one; <14> and this is substantiated by Krehbiehl writing the same day that

Mr. Mahler is not satisfied with the thunder of Beethoven's kettledrum, so he has added another pair, with a part of their own. <15>
kettledrum in the Pastoral. <16>

In the absence of the actual orchestral parts we have no information, since the present score contains no changes of notes in the timpani stave.

21-56: See Ex.24.4 for Hrl-4 and Trl/2.

23-4: Vn2 doubles original Vnl part, Vnl loses lower octave, Va adds f". By this means the strings are made much more powerful.

27-8: St as 23-4.

31-2: St as 23-4.

39-41: Fl2, Obl/2 & Es-cl join Fl1. Cl1/2 play Obl original.

68: Fl2 doubles Fl1.

73 & 75: Cl reinforces Ob2.

91-2: Tr2 8va for greater brightness.

114: Breiter werden! indicates that Mahler relaxed the tempo, perhaps to the end of the movement, or at least until b.136.

119 (2nd crotchet) - 122: Hrl/2 reinforce Fl1/2. At one time Mahler also had Trl/2 reinforce Cl1/2 in the following bars.

122 - 126 (1st crotchet): Trl/2 at one time reinforced Cl1/2.

126 (2nd crotchet) - b.128 (1st crotchet): Cl1 joins Obl, and Ob2 joins Cl2.
24.2.11 Selected Passages - 5th movement

3-4: Cl1 has cresc with (subito) piano in b.5. This matches the following horn entry.

28-31: Hr2 doubles Hrl 8va bassa. Hr1/2 reinforce Cl1/2 & Va/Vc in b.31.

37-50: To prevent the wind overpowering the strings, Mahler writes piano for them in b.37, with crescendo in b.40. Thereafter the beginning of each even numbered bar has fp with a crescendo leading through the next two bars.

54-5: Ps1/2 tacent and Tr1/2 reinforce Vnl.

77 (last note) - 80: Ww p in b.77 with cresc from the 2nd half of b.78, and f in b.80. Va joins Vnl until the third note of b.78.

100-8: Hr3/4 reinforce Fgl/2. Notes changed in Tr1/2, but not added to so that they reinforce Obl/Fgl.

133: All except Va/Vc have dim mf.

136-9: Hr2 doubles Hrl 8va bassa.

161; Tr1/2 tacent.

162-3: Tr1/2 reinforce Obl 8va bassa.

172-4: Vc doubles Va.

190-1: Wind ffp in b.190 and cresc ff in b.191. Vnl/2, Va ff with dim p in 2nd half of bar.

192-3: As 190-1.
219-20: Wind as 190-1. Vnl/2, Va ff dim mf.

221-2: Wind as 190-1. Vnl/2, Va f dim p.


225-6: Wind and St cresc.

227: Tutti ff.

225-7: Trl/2 have $g''/g'$ and reinforce Vnl at the lower octave.

229-30: Tutti diminuendo.
Mahler conducted Beethoven VII thirteen times in his career:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>1 Mar 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg PO</td>
<td>22 Oct 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna PO</td>
<td>19 Mar 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemberg (Lvov)</td>
<td>4 Apr 1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>1 Apr 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Petersburg</td>
<td>27 Oct 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>23 May 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg PO</td>
<td>9 Nov 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York PO</td>
<td>31 Mar 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Mar 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Feb 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Feb 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 Feb 1911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These performances fall into four groups: concerts in Hamburg (1894), and with the Vienna Philharmonic (1899), European guest engagements (1903-8), and concerts with the New York Philharmonic Orchestra (1909-11).

Mahler's reading of Beethoven VII was generally well received by the critics, the following from *Musical America* which reviews the performance of 7 February 1911 being typical:

...Mr. Mahler gave a reading... that was marked by virility, dramatic expressiveness and remarkable phrasing of the separate themes. Mr. Mahler's Beethoven is always interesting, for he makes it individual in its force and fire. Not satisfied with the scoring he again added more wood-wind with excellent effect, vivifying the climaxes and clothing Beethoven's ideas in garments that are in fashion at the present day. No conductor in recent years has gotten more out of the second movement than he has; it was a song of tender sadness as Mr. Mahler read it, the body of string tone being exceedingly rich, and the blend of the entire orchestra superb... <1>
25.1 Sources

25.1.1 Score, P.33

This score bears the stamp of Rózsavölgyi és Társa / Budapest. It has no indications of a doubled woodwind complement; but contains information about the use of E-flat clarinet, contrabassoon, trombone and tuba. There are rehearsal letters which agree with Breitkopf parts. Most of the marks are in pencil, and are similar in nature to those found in P.34, for which it obviously served as a basis. P.33 probably gives information about Mahler's practice in Hamburg in his two performances of 1894.

25.1.2 Score, P.34

This score, in the Breitkopf und Härtel edition but without a stamp, agrees basically with the Retuschen of the orchestral materials, P.35. It is carefully marked in red and black inks, and blue and lead pencils. Except for G in the first movement and A in the second movement, there are no rehearsal letters; but Mahler added instead 146 numbers, running consecutively through the entire work. To enable a copyist to add the rehearsal numbers quickly to the parts, the number of bars between numbers has been added at the top of the pages.

25.1.3 Set of Orchestral Parts, P.35

The orchestral material comprises a complete printed set of parts, P.35A, plus handwritten doubling woodwind and Hr3/4. These parts have been marked up with Mahler's Retuschen and rehearsal numbers which
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of notes for the timpani in the finale were so numerous that the printed parts became unreadable, and P.35 contains a manuscript part which was probably made before 1907.

By 1909, Mahler's changes in the cello part had also become so extensive in the finale that the librarian of the New York Philharmonic, H. G. Boewig, wrote out new parts for P.35. The extra five pages were inserted in the printed parts and their immaculate handwriting are a tribute to Boewig's penmanship and patience. This cello part is reproduced here as Ex.25.1.

From dates and other evidence found in the orchestral material, we know that this set was in use from 1903 until Mahler's death, and from the number of string parts it is likely that it was also used in 1899 by the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra.

25.1.4 Score and Parts, P.36/7

In the Archive of the Czech Philharmonic Orchestra in Prague there is a score and a set of parts for Beethoven VII. These are discussed in Appendix Seven. <2>

25.2 The Main Characteristics of Mahler's Interpretation

The most important sources of information about Mahler's performance practice in this work are the score, P.34, and the set of parts, P.35, and unless otherwise stated these are the source of descriptions in this study.
In Vn2.4 the first movement is timed at 15 minutes, and the second at 9 minutes. Val gives the total timing as 35 minutes.

The average tempo for the second movement works out at crotchet = M.M.61.

25.2.2 *Repeats*

Mahler did not make the first movement repeat, nor that of the exposition of the finale. In the Scherzo he did not repeat the section which begins in bar 24, nor the second half of the Trio. In later years he suppressed completely the second appearance of the Trio, cutting directly from b.400 to b.637. <3>

25.2.3 *Reduction of Strings*

In P.34 we find sections with reduced strings and, though the occasions are less numerous than in P.33, described below, the amount of the reduction is specified more closely.

In the first movement, Mahler specifies desks in the number 5,4,3,2,2 from b.222 until the first note of b.236, and also in b.301-22. Less specific is his indication *die Hälfte* for Va, Vc & Cb in b.401-4.

In the second movement, he asks for 5,4,3,2,2 at the beginning of b.199, returning to *Tutti* in b.202 (Vn1), b.203 (Va), b.204 (Vn2), and b.206 (Vc/Cb).

25.2.4 *Extra Horn Pair*

The extra pair of horns played only in the outer two movements. Mostly
changed his mind about the actual notes to be played. We have conflicting information about this from P.34/5 and P36/7 and this is discussed in Appendix 7.

In the first movement, from bar 405 to 423 (first note), Mahler at different times had Hr3/4 either reinforce the bass line, or replace the bassoons who then were free to reinforce the bass.

In the finale, Mahler did not hesitate to use Hr3/4 to complete the harmony in the horns in bars 104-22 and 333-41. In bars 368-405 (first note), Mahler at one time intended Hr3/4 to reinforce the bass line, but this reinforcement was later assigned to Fg1/2 and Hr3/4 took over the original parts of Fg1/2 from b.366.

25.2.5 Selected Passages - 1st movement

9-10: Luftpause before b.9. See Ex.25.2 for the thinned out wind parts.

15, 17, 19 & 21: All wind fp.

17 et seq: Two bows per minim.

22: Luftpause at the end of the bar.

28: Vn1/2 have accent and diminuendo on each entry.

34-40: See Ex.25.3 for Tr1/2 which are rewritten to avoid conflict with the rest of the orchestra. Minims in Vn2 8va.

46 (last crotchet) - 47 (1st crochet): Vn1/2: 8va. Mahler continues the line of the melody as in its first appearance.

54 - 57 (first note): F12 replaces Ob1.
57-62: Diminuendo to ppp.

66: Hr1/2 doubled. Luftpause at end of bar.

88: Fl1-4 and Ob1-4 reinforce Vnl and Cl1-4 & Vc reinforce Va.

89-100: See Ex.25.4 for Mahler's extensive Retuschen. This is one of those rare passages in which Mahler has made so many changes that one is justified in using the term rescoring. He has selectively doubled the woodwind, and exchanged the trumpet and horn parts. Lest there should be any doubt about this, Mahler writes: N.B. Trompeten u. Hörner vertauscht (N.B. Trumpets and horns interchanged). The unison of the violins and their reinforcement by trumpets makes the main line more brilliant; although Mahler does not succeed in making Beethoven's imitative writing any clearer in b.97-9.

109-11: Until b.110, Vn2 joins Vnl and Va1 plays Vn2 original. Wind and Pk have diminuendo already in b.109, and Vnl continue forte in the 2nd half of b.110, making a diminuendo in b.111.

122-3: Tr1/2 tacent.

124-7: Cl1/2 8va. Hr2 8va bassa. Tr1/2 reinforce Ob1/2 8va bassa.

129: Fl1 reinforces Ob1; Ob1, Cl1, Fgl doubled. Hairpins in Ww; diminuendo in St.

142-5 On the As, Vnl alternate between pp with hairpins and ppp without expression.

153, 155, 159 & 161 (2nd half of bars only): Ww doubled and Hr3/4 reinforce Fgl/2.

164 - 165 (1st note): Fl1/2 in top octave. Ww doubled until 178.
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168 (2nd note) - 169 (1st note): F12 joins Fll.

169 (last two notes) - 170: Fll/2 as b.168-9.

165 (last two notes) - 170: Fg1-4 reinforce Vc.

177-8: F12 joins Fll.

185: Vc2 Saltando. A Luftpause before this bar.

201-4: Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2.

205-10: Hr3/2 reinforce Fg1/2, Hr4 has written d'.

207: Vn1 and Va 8va to prevent a change of octave, the first note of the bar omitted from Vn1 to give time for them to prepare the high F.

211 - 217 (1st crotchet): Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2.

221-2 (first note) F13 doubles Fll in order to balance Ob1.

236-49 Mahler builds this crescendo in the strings by returning to a lower dynamic level at the beginning of each long note and making a crescendo through the note. The woodwind dynamics are also finely adjusted to take account of the entry of Fll/2 and Hr3/4. See Ex.25.5.

255-6 Beethoven’s orchestral layout of this short canon is ignored in order to make it more audible. The entries are: Vn1/2, Vn2/Va, Va/Vc.

278-99: Vn2 joins Vn1 and VaI plays Vn2 original.

307: Ob1 has crescendo and other woodwind have ppp to allow the oboe to be heard.

323 - 326 (1st note): Vn2 joins Vn1 and VaI plays Vn2 original.
a contribution here.

344: F11/Fg1 have A, F12/Fg2 have E, thus playing an octave above and below C11/2. Why Beethoven did not do this is not clear, but Mahler's change clarifies a passage which is most unconvincing in the original.

363-7 & 370-3: C11/2 8va.

368: F11 had b'''-flat at one time.

377 (last two notes) - 383 (first quaver): Fg1/2 as in b.165-170.

399: Tr1/2 replace Hr1/2 in P.35.

400: F12 replaces Obl.

401-421 It is in respect of this passage that La Grange quotes Arnold Berliner: One hears here Fafner spread out in his cave, while the forest bird sings above him, <4> and Mahler's Retuschen are well described by Berliner. As with the corresponding passage in the finale, Mahler changed his mind many times about the details of his Retuschen here in P.34/5. <5> The following appear to represent Mahler's last thoughts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>WIND</th>
<th>STRINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Hr3/4 and Fg1/2 join Va/Vc.</td>
<td>Va/Vc/Cb die Hälfte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>Fg3/4 join Va/Vc pp cresc.</td>
<td>Va/Cb Tutti.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

423-6: Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2.

427 (2nd note) - 432: Vn2 joins Vn1.

432 (2nd note) - 446 (1st note): C11/2 8va.

441 (last two notes) - 446 (first note): Tr1/2 reinforce Hr1/2.
54, 56 etc: Mahler shortens the 2nd note to a semiquaver, with a rest for clear articulation.

67-74: Vn2 have basically two bows to a bar, even in b.67/8 & b.71, to ensure their domination.

79 - 83 (1st half): Vnl 8va to match Vn2 in b.55-9.

83-6: Ww doubled.

83-4: Fl1/2 8va.


91-2: Fl1/2 reinforce Cl1/2 8va.

117, 119 & 121: Hairpins added to emphasise the entries of Cl1 and Hr2.

123-36: Ww soloists have crescendo on the long notes and diminuendo on the quavers, thus making definite two-bar phrases.

141-4: Benjamin Kohon, 1st bassoon in the New York Philharmonic, relates that

In the 2nd movement he wanted the woodwind to come out very strongly, in fact some parts were doubled. In one section the bassoon has a little phrase which is always more or less covered by the strings and he always shouted over: Fagott, Ton! Ton! Ton! Finally he doubled it. <6>

This statement is borne out by Fg3, in which a player has added the notes in question.

147: Some desks of Vnl have three notes, continuing the line and helping to make a seamless transition between the violins and the lower strings.
150-183: Mahler fully notated his ideas of shading in the wind parts.
See Ex.25.6.

210: Fl1 mf and doubled.

213 (last three notes) - 221: Cl1 8va.

247-52: Cl1/2 reinforce Fl1/2.

25.2.7 Selected Passages - 3rd movement

25 & 137: The grace note removed from Vc/Cb.

147a-8a & 643-4: Ob1/2 & Flg1/2 removed after first crotchet. Ob1/2
tacet in b.149.

TRIO

According to La Grange, Sittard complained in Hamburg of Mahler's
Bayreuth tempo for the Trio, which he had never heard played so slowly,
and that Mahler got even slower in the transition back to the Scherzo.
<7>

181-206 & 223-4: A pencilled addition on the cover of Hr4 indicates
that at some stage Mahler had Hr2 doubled by Hr4.

201-6: Mahler had the wind and strings articulate their chords clearly,
putting quaver rests between them all.

205-6: In P.35, Trl reinforces Hrl 8va.

207 et seq: See Ex.25.7 for Mahler's excellent bowing.

219: In P.35, Vnl 8va from 2nd note.

276-84: All Ww removed, except Fl in 276. Hrl/2 & Trl/2 also removed,
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In February 1899, Natalie Bauer-Lechner reported that...

"...Mahler told me that in his performance of Beethoven's Seventh Symphony, the last movement had a dionysian effect on the audience; everybody went out as if intoxicated. "And that's the way it has to be", he said. "But you should have heard the power that I unleashed! And yet it didn't sound out of proportion, because the melody kept the upper hand; but, in addition, every figuration, passage and ornament came through as clearly and distinctly as possible.

"But in order to achieve this, everyone must give his all - in fact, more than that: he must go a step beyond his own capacity. And I force them to do it; for each one feels that I'll immediately pounce on him and tear him to pieces if he doesn't give me what I want. This extreme concentration of all their faculties enables them to achieve the impossible." <8>


5 etc: Upbow start to give a good sforzando.

5-11 Vn2 joins Vnl, and Va/Vc, both divisi, play the original Vn2 & Va parts. These are detache in b.8 and b.12. To compensate for this Cb is 8va. Vn2 return to their part briefly for b.12 each time.

13-20: As 5-12.

20b - 28 (1st note): Hr3/4 double Hr1/2.

24-8: Ob1/2 reinforced by Cll/2 and by Hr1-4 8va bassa.

37-43: Semiquaver figures reinforced: Vn2 by Cll and Va, Va by Vc and Fgl. The reinforcement of the semiquaver motif is a feature of Mahler's changes throughout the finale, and one of the prime reasons why the
by a line encircling the notes, this change was made in P.35 by players. It appears in the m/s timpani part and not in the printed part.  <9>

52-61: Pk has two C-sharps in all bars. St have two bows per bar.

62-7: In b.62-3, Ww doubled ff, & Fg2-4 join Fg1 f instead of p. St fff in b.62, mf in b.63 with diminuendo in b.65. In b.66, all instruments are ff on the second crotchet. In b.67, Fg2 joins Fg1 f and St are mf. Pk has G-sharps in b.62 & 66.

74-7: Br & Pk rewritten allowing Trl/2 to reinforce Vnl/2. See Ex.25.9.

106 et seq: Fg2 plays lower C-sharp.

104-22: See Ex.25.10 for Hr1-4 & Trl/2. Pk have C-sharp instead of E, and also have C-sharp in b.111-3. All sforzandi are changed to fp, and in b.121b there is a crescendo from piano to ff. In b.114-120, Obl-4 reinforce Vn2 and Cl1-4 reinforce Va who are also doubled by Vc.

124-8: C natural added in Pk This has the rhythm of Trl/2 in b.124, and thereafter quavers on 2nd crotchet.  <10>

129-32: See Ex.25.11 for Mahler's notation for the Strings.

Additionally he writes a note at the bottom of the page in P.34 to explain the fermata: N.B. Kleine Halte zur Hervorbringung eines furchtbaren crescendos und zwar durch starken aber unmerklichen Bogenwechsel! (N.B. Small stops for the production of a terrific crescendo through frequent but unnoticeable changes of bow.) It seems to me that this is a note, not for a copyist, but for another conductor, since it does not appear in P.35, and Mahler could easily have explained his intentions to the orchestra.
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138-45: Vc has C-saite in P.35.

133-6: In P.34/5, Cb and Tr1/2 were removed at the same time as Tr1/2 were removed from b.124-8. Ww piano. This reduces the impact of the interlude between the impassioned string interchanges, which Mahler wishes to have the fullest intensity possible.

136-45: Strings as in 129-32, but without fermatas.

146-161: Va/Vc as at the beginning of the movement. Pk are now tuned in C-G thus fitting the harmony better.

161b - 165 & 169 - 172: Vn2 joins Vnl, Va1 playing Vn2 original.

165 - 169 (1st note): Ob1 8va; Cl1/2 reinforce Ob1/2; all Ww doubled. Hr3/4 reinforce Fgl/2. Dynamic fff for all.

173 (2nd half) - 191 (1st half): Ww doubled, Hr3/4 reinforce Fgl/2, Cl1 8va from 2nd half of b.177 to 1st half of b.188. Mahler develops maximum power at the beginning of this passage, b.161b, which enables him to make a stronger diminuendo from b.189.

202: Fll mf; Ob, Cl, Fg pp.

235-9: Hr/Ww as b.24-8.

248-62: Semiquaver motif in strings doubled as in the exposition; but without reinforcement by woodwind. Ww doubled in b.257 -63, Fll a 4. Tr1/2 and Pk omitted until b.255.

274 & 278: Similar to b.62-7, but Cl1/2 join Fll/2.

285-8 & 295-8 Ww have a uniform forte dynamic. Tr1/2 originally reinforced Vn1/2 on each 2nd crotchet; but Tr1/2 and Pk later removed.
333-9: Cll-4 reinforce Vn2 and Fgl-4 reinforce Va/Vc.

349-404: Mahler makes major changes in the orchestral layout, the final version of which is best described in layers:

**Accompaniment:**

Ob1/2 removed from b.358-92, and from b.371 (2nd crotchet) replaced by Cl1/2. Fgl-4 tacet in b.366-7 and reinforce Vc from b.368. Hr3/4 take over Fgl/2 original from b.366 (8va from 2nd crotchet of b.397). <11> Cb 8va from b.379.

**Semiquaver motif:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>BEETHOVEN</th>
<th>MAHLER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>349 &amp; 353</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 &amp; 354</td>
<td>Vn2</td>
<td>Vn2/Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351 &amp; 355</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>Va/Vc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352 &amp; 356</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>Ww plus F12, and Cl1 8va. All Ww doubled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357 &amp; 361</td>
<td>Vc/Cb</td>
<td>Vc/Cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358 &amp; 362</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>Vn1/Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359 &amp; 363</td>
<td>Vn2</td>
<td>Vn2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360 &amp; 364</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>Vn1/Vc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>Vn2</td>
<td>Vn2/Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367, 369 &amp; 371</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368, 370 &amp; 372</td>
<td>Vn2</td>
<td>Vn2/Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>Vn1/Vc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>Vn2</td>
<td>Vn1/Vn2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>Va/Vc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Vn2</td>
<td>Vn2/Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>Vn1/Vc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>Vn2</td>
<td>Vn1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>Va/Vc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
<td>Vn1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>Vn2</td>
<td>Vn2/Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
<td>Vn1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>Vn1/Vc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>Vn2</td>
<td>Vn1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>Va/Vc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389 - 392</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393 - 396</td>
<td>Vn2</td>
<td>Vn2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mahler's prime aim in this recasting is to make the semiquaver motif audible at all times, and to ensure a gradual crescendo led by the gyrations of the chromatic bass line. The substitution of the clarinets for the oboes can only be intended to produce a better blend with the horns and flutes. In making these changes, Mahler willingly destroys Beethoven's carefully organised scheme of alternation of the string voices, substituting a pattern based on sonority rather than colour.

405-9 & 413-6: Vcl & Cb 8va. Va, Vc & Cb play semiquavers. Having reinforced the bass line so heavily in the previous bars, Mahler is obliged to avoid an anticlimax by increasing the string tone.

405-17 (1st note): Fgl-2 reinforce Vc.

409-13: Hr/Ww as b.24-8.


427-34 & 443-50: Hr3/4 reinforce Fgl/2. Ww doubled in b.429-30. In b.431-4, sforzandi removed from St and fp substituted for sf in all wind and Pk. This ensures a warm string-dominated texture.

435-42: Cl1 8va. Fll/2, Cl1/2 and Fgl/2 ff.

451-65: See Ex.25.12 for string parts.
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25.3 The Budapest Score, P.33

25.3.1 Reduction of Strings

Using the notation of 1/2 and Alle, indications of reduced strings are given as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st mvt:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (2nd note) - 14</td>
<td>Vn2 only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Vn1 only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 - 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 - 52</td>
<td>Vn1/2 alle from 2nd half of b.53.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Vn1/2 still reduced in 1st half of bar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 - ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142 - 145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 - 200</td>
<td>Va/Vc/Cb from 185.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 - 322</td>
<td>alle originally at the end of b.318.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354 - 357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391 - ?</td>
<td>alle: Va/Cb in b.405, Vc in b.401.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2nd mvt:

| 19 - 26 | |
| 43 - 50 | |
| 183 - 213 | |
| 243 - 246 | |

3rd mvt:

| 37 - 43 (1st minim) | |
| 53 - 59 (1st minim) | |

25.3.2 E-flat Clarinet

In P.33, the participation of the E-flat clarinet is indicated by the circle with a horizontal line and the plus sign. The part mainly reinforces Fll. Examples of this are:
21-4
207 - 211 (1st crotchet)   Reinforces Obl
211 (3rd crotchet)        Reinforces Fl1

4th mvt:

352-3
366 - 367 (1st crotchet)
371 (2nd crotchet) - 372 (1st quaver)
373 (2nd crotchet) - 374 (1st quaver)
379 (2nd crotchet) - 380 (1st quaver)
383 (2nd crotchet) - 384 (1st quaver)
429 - ?
435 bis zum Schluß

25.3.3 Contrabassoon, Trombone and Tuba

Mahler calls for reinforcement of the bass line by contrabassoon, trombone and tuba in several places in the first movement, writing Contrafag in b.250, and 1.Pos, Contrafag, Tuba in b.417. In the finale, the contrabasson is required at b.104, and there are strong, but inexplicit indications that Mahler used extra instruments to reinforce the bass line later in the movement.

The first instance of this is in b.367 where Mahler writes under the basses: Verstärkung. Due to its position on the score and the fact that there are no woodwind doubling players called for in P.33, this can only refer to a reinforcement of the bass line. In the same place, but at another time, Mahler has written: Fagotti mit Bass; and above the violas, in b.389, Mahler writes: Tuba, Contrafagot, 1.Pos - p cresc ff. These may represent refinements of an initial need felt for a "Verstärkung"; but without the parts it is impossible to determine.

It could be that the "Verstärkung" of b.389 consists of double bassoon, trombone and tuba, or whichever was available; but, whatever it is, it continues until b.408, <12> plays again in b.413-6, and from b.427-434; and in b.443 Mahler writes: Verstärkung bis zum Schluss.
25.3.4 Selected Passages - 1st movement

15: N.B. Violinen viel Bogen.

89-96: Horns and trumpets interchanged as later.

101-8: Vc and Cb both divided. The first half play in first half of bar and the second half answer. Mahler must have done this for convenience, to avoid the large shifts involved in Beethoven's original.

109: Fl1 joins Vn1.

124-7: Tr1/2 as P.34/5.

181: Springender Bogen.

201-216: Hr3/4 play here, as elsewhere.

279-29: Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2.

344: Flute parts changed, but not Fg1/2.

399: Trumpets substituted for horns.

400-22: The participation of Hr3/4 appears to have followed this course:

1. Hr3/4 originally began to reinforce Fg1/2 at b.400.

2. Mahler removed Fg1/2 between b.401 and b.408 and substituted Hr3/4.

3. Hr3/4 now enter at b.405 and replace Fg1/2 until b.427, the bassons being occupied with the bass line from b.409.

442: Tr3 indicated to reinforce Hrl.
25.3.5 Selected Passages - 2nd movement

75 et seq: Changes to woodwind basically as in P.34.

123 et seq: Dynamics basically as in P.34.

275-6: Crescendo for Vn1 at the end of b.275, with suppression of the diminuendo in b.276.

25.3.6 Selected Passages - 3rd movement

199-206: Hr4 plays with Hr2.

25.3.7 Selected Passages - 4th movement

24: Hr1/2 already revised as P.34.

173 (2nd half) - 174: Octave reinforcement of Ob1 begins here with Pi/F12.


366 et seq: In the woodwind the passage begins ffp with an fp on each new chord. Es-cl reinforces F11 at the beginning of each new chord - for three crotchets at b.366, and for three quavers at b.371, 373, 379 and 383.

25.3.4 - Beethoven VII - P.33
Mahler conducted Beethoven IX on ten occasions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>12 Feb 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg PO</td>
<td>11 Mar 1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>4 Jun 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna PO</td>
<td>18 Feb 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 Feb 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 Jan 1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strassburg</td>
<td>22 May 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York PO</td>
<td>6 Apr 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Apr 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Apr 1910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mahler prepared Retuschen for his Hamburg performance of the Ninth Symphony and both these and a later version have been preserved in two different scores. Josef B. Förster refers to Mahler's Hamburg Retuschen und Verdopplungen without giving any details. <1> He also mentions Mahler's placing of a part of the orchestra in the wings during a part of the finale, undoubtedly referring to the Alla Marcia section discussed below in Ch.26.7.3.

Mahler refers to his Hamburg Retuschen when talking to Natalie Bauer-Lechner on 4 July 1896 about the instrumental requirements of his own Third Symphony:

"...I need five trumpets, ten horns and six clarinets; I have never come across such things, and nowhere will I be permitted them willingly. The choice is before me: I can adapt my scoring for an orchestra which is inadequate and obsolete for my music (as Beethoven naively did with his Ninth; for the orchestra of his day was totally insufficient for it - it was cramped and restricted until someone suitably competent came to loosen its bonds, as I did, much to its advantage, in a performance a year ago)..." <2>
It should be borne in mind that by the time of his performance of the Ninth Symphony in 1900, Mahler's Beethoven Retuschen were well-known in Vienna. In 1898 there had been a strong reaction within the orchestra to his employment of the E-flat clarinet in Beethoven III at his first concert as Music Director of the Philharmonic Orchestra. This had been leaked to the press, resulting in Mahler omitting that instrument from the concert performance. Since then Mahler had performed Beethoven's Op.95 Quartet with full strings, Symphonies V, VI & VII and the Weihe des Hauses Overture, all of which involved controversial Retuschen.

Mahler's Beethoven IX Retuschen were greeted with extremely negative reviews in Vienna: although many critics applauded his conception of the work, few acknowledged his right to modify Beethoven's original. We can imagine that Mahler must have been heartily sick of criticism of his hard work, and with the help of his friend Siegfried Lipiner he prepared a public rebuttal of the view that he had re-instrumented Beethoven. This he had printed and distributed at the concert of 22 February. See Ch.26.2.

Some of the New York critics were also hostile to Mahler's Retuschen, though it was not unusual for them to reject changes which appear to have passed without comment in Vienna. More positive reviews for Mahler's interpretation in New York are worth reproducing. In April 1909, Mahler gave the work as the second of his concerts with the New York Philharmonic Orchestra, which had not at that time received the reorganisation that Mahler was to give it before the next season, and after the performances of Walter Damrosch Mahler's interpretation obviously breathed new life into the work. One critic wrote of:

...the most stupendous interpretation of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony heard in New York within the memory of men, and one of the most overpowering orchestral performances in the musical annals of this city.

26.0.0 - Beethoven IX
effective emendations in Beethoven's instrumentation. By this process of instrumental illumination and balancing of parts, the conductor brought to notice hidden voices, harmonies and rhythms.

...Never before have we heard the first movement of the Ninth played with such smiting rhythmical incisiveness. Never the second given with such precision, such vital energy, and what a wealth of poetic feeling Mahler infused into every measure of the Adagio! The real climax of the performance came, however, in the choral finale. Interpretation, here, rose to creative magnitude. <4>

A year later Mahler conducted the work again; and again his Retuschen were accepted:

It is needless to say once more that one of the reasons why Mahler's Beethoven readings are so eloquent is that he does not hesitate to retouch the score in accordance with the methods which Beethoven himself would certainly have approved had he written for a modern orchestra. The audience is not conscious of these changes, except that because of them many places become clearer and more melodious. <5>

An interesting and tantalizing sideline to the study of Mahler's interpretation of Beethoven IX is an arrangement which he made for the opening of the Beethoven exhibition in the Secession Building on 15 April 1902. Originally he had wanted to put on a charity performance of the complete work with the Philharmonic Orchestra, but the orchestra refused to take part, and the sources indicate that Mahler then arranged for wind a section of the finale, probably Ihr stürzt nieder, and conducted it. Unfortunately no exact details are known of this arrangement which has disappeared. <6>
26.1 Sources

Three scores are of value in determining Mahler's performance practice in Beethoven IX.

26.1.1 Score, P.39

This score, which has no dealer's stamp, is in the Southampton University Library. It is a Peters Edition score and would appear to have been used in Mahler's Hamburg period. The best evidence for this is given by the marks in bars 331-431 of the finale indicating Mahler's performance with off-stage wind. The score is marked in lead, blue and red pencils, and purple and black inks. The E-flat clarinet is shown by the circle and horizontal line, and rehearsal letters have been added in blue pencil.

26.1.2 Score, P.40

This score, which is in the U.E. Archive, has received so much use that pages have fallen out. In 1983 the spine and many torn pages had been repaired, and since then the score has been re-bound. There is no name or stamp on this score which is also Peters Edition, though Mahler's hand is evident throughout. Rehearsal letters and numbers have been added and Retuschen have been added in red and black inks, and lead, blue, red and russet pencils. As in other cases, the red ink and blue pencil appear to come from earlier in the process than the black ink. This can be seen from the evidence of Tr1/2 in b.517-8 of the first movement, and noted below are several important Retuschen which are in black ink.
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26.1.3 Score, P.41

Also a Peters Edition score, this was prepared by several copyists working from P.40. In the front is stamped Mit instrumental retouschen (sic) / von / Gustav MAHLER and UNIVERSAL EDITION / WIEN - NEW YORK.

There are a few pencil additions in this score which do not figure in P.40, particularly concerning dynamics in the slow movement. These are of doubtful authenticity and have been ignored. Other unconvincing discrepancies have also been noted below. Some of the additions which bring the score into line with P.40 appear to be in Mahler's hand. If this is so, then the work of the copyists was done during Mahler's lifetime.

There are other copies based on P.40 in various parts of the world, including the Schoenberg Institute at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles.

26.2 Mahler's Manifesto

Mahler's own justification for his Retuschen in Beethoven IX was published in a leaflet which was distributed at the concert of 22 February 1900 when he repeated the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra's Nicolai Concert. <7> Unlike most of the published statements by Mahler about his Retuschen, this is not based on hearsay. From the fact that it was published as a response to criticism and from the intricacy of the language it is evident that Mahler and Lipiner considered and polished this statement before publishing it. For this reason, and because earlier English translations have been extremely free, it is quoted below in full:
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public, the opinion could arise as though on the part of the conductor of today's performance of Beethoven's works, and in particular of the Ninth Symphony, arbitrary re-arrangements had been undertaken in certain details. It therefore appears imperative not to suppress a clarifying note on this point.

Through the worsening of his hearing to the point of complete deafness, Beethoven had lost the indispensable close (innigen) contact with reality, with the physical sounding world, just in that period of his creation in which the mightiest intensification of his conceptions urged him on to the discovery of new means of expression and to an until then undreamt of drastic forcefulness in the treatment of the orchestra. Just as well known as this fact is the other that the constitution of the brass instruments of that time utterly excluded certain pitch progressions necessary to the formation of the melody. Just this deficiency has brought about with time a perfecting of those instruments; and henceforth it appears frankly offensive not to utilise them fully in the most perfectly possible execution of Beethoven's works.

Richard Wagner, who in word and deed was passionately at pains throughout his whole life to rescue the execution of Beethoven's works from what had gradually become an unbearable negligence, has in his essay "On the Performance of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony" directed one to that way of executing this symphony which corresponds as much as possible with the intentions of its creator, and to which all more modern conductors have conformed. Out of his own acquired and confirmed conviction and experience of the work, the conductor of today's concert has also done this, without fundamentally going beyond the boundaries suggested by Wagner.

Naturally, there can be absolutely no talk of a re-instrumentation (Uminstrumentierung), alteration, or even of an "improvement" (Verbesserung) of Beethoven's work. The long-practised multiplication (Vervielfachung) of the number of string instruments has - and that likewise already long since - had the consequence of an increase also in the wind instruments, which should serve exclusively the reinforcement of the sound (Klangverstärkung), but which in no way should be assigned to receive a new orchestral role. In this, as in every point concerning the interpretation of the work in the whole as in the details, it can be proved with score in hand, (the more cogently by examination in greater detail), that far from arbitrariness and preconceived design, but also misled by no "tradition", it has everywhere been the sole object of the conductor to sympathise with Beethoven's will down to the apparently most trifling detail, and in the execution also not to sacrifice or to allow to be submerged in a confused bustle of sound (verwirrenden Tongewühle) the least of the Master's wishes.

Gustav Mahler, Vienna, February 1900.
Robert Hirschfeld took Mahler severely to task for his distribution of this leaflet:

Herr Director Mahler has once more - no, he has not given a lecture, he has written it down and distributed it to everybody. Thus we now have a written document from him. The beginning is done. One is suspicious. - Complete Works! The document is a decree. According to order, the summons is dated and signed by Gustav Mahler. In tone and bearing the decree has fortunately mixed the seriousness of officialdom with good-will. The event was indisputably greater than this shadow which followed it...

...Herr Mahler is not obliged to know the laws of logic, but he is therefore just as little obliged to use it. Herr Mahler is not obliged to write in understandable German, but he is just as little obliged to exhibit a certificate to prove so. <8>

As in his Retuschen in other works by Beethoven and other composers there is no doubting Mahler’s sincere belief that he was sympathising with Beethoven’s will, but critical opinion has tended to disagree with him on this point. To what extent this is sufficiently informed criticism is a moot point which is discussed elsewhere in this study <9> There is no doubt that Mahler leaves no stone unturned in his desire to bring clarity to the score, and his practical evaluation of Wagner’s Retuschen shows that he was not hide-bound by tradition; but approached his task with an independent attitude.

26.3 Wagner’s Essay on the Ninth Symphony

Wagner’s essay, On Performing Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony, <10> which was written in 1873 - after his performance on the occasion of the laying of the foundation stone of the Festspielhaus in Bayreuth - was, at the end of the nineteenth century, the starting point for any conductor’s Retuschen in Beethoven IX. It is interesting to explore Mahler’s response to Wagner’s major recommendations in three passages
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Wagner declares himself concerned by a lack of clarity in Beethoven's score. He discussed Beethoven's expectation of a virtuoso ensemble and conductor, citing the case of the subito piano following a crescendo as something which is difficult to achieve without following modern usage of alternating instrumental groups. He discusses the difficulty, even in his own recent experience, of hearing an acceptable performance of the late sonatas and quartets, and praises Liszt and Bülow for having been the first pianists to master this style.

Wagner next discusses the limitations of the natural brass, quoting problematic passages from the second movements of the Fifth and Seventh Symphonies, <11> and then turns his attention to specific important passages in the Ninth Symphony.

26.3.1 2nd Movement, b.93-100

Here the unison strings and the horns obscure the theme in the woodwind and in order to avoid moderating the strings and brass Wagner recommends:

93-6: Ob1/2, Cl1/2 play Ob1 original and Hr3/4 play Ob1 original 8va bassa. Hr1/2 play Ob2 original, and Fg1/2 play Ob2 original 8va bassa.

97-100: Cl1/2 join Ob1/2, Hr1/2 replace Cl1 original and Hr3/4 replace Cl2 original. Fg1/2 reinforce Ob1/2 8va bassa.

The redisposition of the oboes and clarinets gives the theme more penetrating power; while the horns and bassoons provide body. There is no reason for the horns to stick out of the texture.
Although in the first edition of his *Ratschläge* Weingartner accepted Wagner's changes, in his 1928 revision he suggests the avoidance of a *false upper voice* by putting Hr1/2 in unison with Hr3/4. In this case, all four horns united on the same melody have ample opportunity of sticking out of the texture, and this is what one usually hears in a performance with Weingartner's Retuschen.

Weingartner's modifications go further than correcting the *false upper voice* that he complained of in Wagner's changes and, although the woodwind are also doubled, the textural timbre is changed.

Strauss has a different solution for the horns which is similar to Wagner and Weingartner in Hr1/2 and sticks to much of Beethoven's original in Hr3/4. See Ex. 26.1. This is a compromise which does not offer much in the way of increased clarity since the horns are simultaneously assigned two different roles.

As far as Mahler is concerned, in the earlier score, P.39, he adopts Wagner's horn parts and adds Trl/2, as well as employing the E-flat clarinet and piccolo to double Fl1, and raising Cl1/2 8va. See Ex. 26.2.

P.40 is substantially re-thought:

93-6: Ww as original. Hr1/3/5 as Wagner's Hr3/4, Hr2/4/6 as Wagner's Hr1/2 but 8va bassa, thus avoiding Weingartner's *false upper voice*.

97-100: Cl1/2 8va and Fg1/2 replace them. Hr1/3/5 reinforce Fg1 and Hr2/4/6 reinforce Fg2.

Throughout the passage Trl/2 reinforce Hr1/2 and Ww are doubled.

Mahler's later modification is the most radical, and does preserve one important characteristic quality of Beethoven's original which gets lost in both Wagner's and Weingartner's solutions: this is the voice
Mahler also preserves the pitch relationship of the two phrases, the second one higher than the first.

Wagner, who did not have an opportunity to put his recommendations for this passage into practice, concluded by writing:

What I now finally recommend is to go on reinforcing the woodwind, even if it means using trumpets, until they penetrate the string's \textit{fortissimo}, however violent...

Mahler follows this advice to its logical conclusion, and had the benefit of hearing its results.

26.3.2 \textit{4th Movement, b.0-7}

Wagner's changes to the fanfares which introduce the Finale are confined to the trumpet parts. By filling in the gaps and changing the octaves so that Tr1/2 reinforce the woodwind more consistently, he claims to have delivered the music from the tyranny of the 3/4 bar. See Ex.26.3. The only notes which Wagner employs which were not used by Beethoven are written E-flats. Apparently Strauss accepts this modification.

Weingartner goes further than Wagner: he continues the unison of the melody in Tr1/2 and Fl1 from bar 5, fills in the gaps in Hr3/4 and raises Cl1/2 an octave for the first three notes. See Ex.26.4. Though the changes to the brass are chromatic, his rationale is excellent.

Mahler's early thoughts, in P.39, were to use Wagner's trumpet parts, fill in the gaps in Hr3/4 in b.3-4, and to raise Fl1/2, Ob2 and Cl1/2 an octave in places. He also added the E-flat clarinet, and altered the pulsation of the timpani in b.5-6 to quavers to agree with the wind. See Ex.26.5.
of the woodwind octaves. <15> Trl/2 are still as Wagner recommended, though now doubled; but Hr1-4 have been rewritten and Hr5-8 join in. Pk still have quavers in b.5-6, and the bass line is strengthened by Ps3 and Tuba, from b.3 playing only on the beat. See Ex.26.6 for brass parts.

Ignoring stylistic questions, Mahler's reinforcement of Fg2 and Cfg by Hr6/8, Ps3 and Tb sounds well in b.0-2; but from b.3 onwards Ps3 and Tb actually emphasize the feeling of 3/4 of which Wagner complains. The strongest objection, however, to all this is the inflated sound which Mahler employs, which goes much further than a clarification.

26.3.3 1st Movement, b.138-47 and b.407-14

Wagner's Retuschen in the wind writing beginning in b.138 of the first movement are based on Liszt's piano transcription and were taken over exactly by Weingartner and Strauss. See Ex.26.7. In P.40, Mahler too follows Wagner. He also removes Trl/2 from the whole passage and Hr3/4 from b.143-4, and reduces the dynamics of the remaining brass and strings, beginning woodwind doublings in b.143-5:

143: Fl2 doubles Fl1. Fg1/2 tacent.

144: C12 doubles Cl1. Fg1 has a semiquaver rest at the beginning of the bar. Fg2 has this semiquaver rest and then joins Fg1 from the 2nd semiquaver until the 1st semiquaver of b.145.

145: Fl2 doubles Fl1. Ob2 doubles Ob1 from the 5th semiquaver.

146: All Ww doubled.

These doublings reinforce the crescendo prescribed by Wagner in 26.3.2 - Beethoven IX - Wagner's Essay
Mahler’s earlier score, P.39, has Wagner’s recommendations, but departs radically from them by using Pi in b.142-3 to replace the upper octave of Fll and continue the line of imitation, and in reinforcing Gll by Obl in b.144. Mahler’s change to Fg1/2 in b.143-4 derives from P.39, see Ex.26.9. Hr1/2, Tr1/2 and Pk are also modified.

In the parallel passage of b.407-14, which has more problems, Mahler follows Wagner’s advice in P.39 but instead of silencing F12 he uses it to double Fll. See Ex.26.10.

In P.40, Mahler treats the woodwind as Wagner for the first two bars only, though also doubling Fll. In b.409 and b.411 he rewrites Fll so that it imitates Obl, completing the diminished harmony in b.411. F12 is omitted and the woodwind balance is ensured by the selective doubling of Fll and Obl. In b.413-4 Mahler retains Fll and Obl originals, also doubling them. In b.414, Hr5/6 reinforce Fg1/2. The horn and string dynamics are reduced. At a late stage in Mahler’s revisions, Tr1/2 and Pk were removed. See Ex.26.11.

Mahler’s modifications to these two passages are good and probably went unnoticed.

Wagner also makes suggestions for changing the text underlay in the solo voices. Mahler writes these into P.39, and it cannot be assumed that he did not continue to adhere to them later even though they do not appear in P.40.
Many well-known musicians were enthusiastic about Mahler's Retuschen in
Beethoven IX, among them Schoenberg who conducted the work with
Mahler's Retuschen in Vienna in April 1915 and who who possessed a copy
of Mahler's score <16> and Zemlinsky who borrowed the score from Alma
Mahler and performed it in Prague. <17> Strauss, on the other hand, in
his advice on the performance of Beethoven symphonies, referred to
Mahler's Beethoven IX Retuschen in very uncomplimentary terms:

Gustav Mahler's proposed coarsenings are to be totally
rejected, even if well intentioned! <18>

Accounts of Mahler's Beethoven IX Retuschen were penned in the 1920s by
Julius Bittner and Egon Wellesz.

26.4.1 Julius Bittner

Julius Bittner makes a strong case for the continued performance of
Mahler's Beethoven Retuschen. <19> He gives the impression that they
were accepted by many in 1900; but that the quest for "historical truth"
and the fact that it is easier to perform Beethoven's original
accounted for their abandonment after Mahler's death. According to
Bittner

Mahler performed Beethoven with thoroughly Beethovenian
means and never altered the specific Beethovenian sound of
the orchestra. It never occurred to him anywhere to add
tuba or harp to the orchestra of the Ninth Symphony,
although there are not only places in the score of the
first and last movements in which the tuba could be
employed effectively, but also places in the Adagio which
need many harps. Besides the doubling of woodwind and
horns demanded by Wagner, he has used in addition only a
second pair of trumpets and supplemented both piccolos an
octave lower by the E-flat clarinet and thus immensely
heightened their luminosity (Leuchtkraft). The effect was,
It is clear from this that Bittner based his impressions on a hearing of Mahler's performances, and had not studied P.40; but we also learn from the statement that Mahler did not use the tuba in Vienna in this work. If he had done, the fact would surely have been common knowledge in 1900. The mention of the E-flat clarinet is not unexpected, but this instrument does not participate in the score P.40.

26.4.2 Egon Wellesz

In his book Die neue Instrumentation, Egon Wellesz discusses Mahler's "arrangement" of Beethoven IX as a means of demonstrating how the ideal sound of 1900 differed from that of Beethoven's epoch. From his mention of several of its features it is clear that his information is based on P.40. Beyond calling it an "arrangement", Wellesz makes little comment on the acceptability of Mahler's work, though he mentions that the employment of doubling woodwind and brass was nothing new in Vienna, citing this as Richter's practice with the Philharmonic. Bars 23-6 of the first movement are reproduced and described as

...despite obvious freedom, developed with full respect for the spirit of the composition; only in the case of the horns could there be dispute over the independent composition of the fifth and sixth instruments... <22>

26.5 Previous Study of P.40.

A thesis by William Bruce McKinney discusses the history of Beethoven performances before and after Mahler, and makes general observations on Mahler's score P.40. Initially I considered that the 76 page description in McKinney's thesis would make it unnecessary to
from a photostat copy and this fact coupled with a lack of experience with Mahler's notation and handwriting led him to make some errors of transcription. Just as important is the fact that McKinney's Appendix A - Catalogue of Changes attempts little explanation or critical appraisal of Mahler's Retuschen.

26.6 The Main Characteristics of Mahler's Interpretation

In this section all remarks are based on the evidence of P.40, unless otherwise stated. Although no direct reference is made to them here, since they would unnecessarily encumber the present discussion, some of Bülow's Beethoven IX Retuschen are described in Appendix Nine. Although they are different, they have often been made in the same spirit as Mahler's.

26.6.1 Repeats and Cut

In the Ninth symphony there are repeats marked only in the Scherzo. P.40 has ohne Repetieren in red ink at the beginning and ohne Repet in b.150, but these have been crossed out with blue pencil and P.41 indicates that, whatever his early practice may have been, ultimately Mahler made the first repeat but not the second (b.159-389) which contains the Development and Recapitulation sections. Both repeats are indicated for the Trio. The Scherzo returns verbatim after the Trio and Mahler just writes Alles wie im 1. Theil. As this gives no information, we must assume that he followed normal practice in omitting the repeats on the reprise.

Bars 531-8 are deleted from both P.39 and P.40, but in P.40 they have
mentioned this cut in his Deutsche Zeitung review of Mahler's Viennese performances of 1900. The critic of the New York Times informs us that Mahler also cut these bars on 6 April 1909 and the critic's justification for this is good:

...His revision extends even to the omission of a few bars in the return of the theme in the scherzo that probably seem to him a mistake in the copying of the composer's manuscript...

It would appear that Mahler, perhaps influenced by the above review, changed his mind about this omission of what he took to be an introduction which was not to be recapitulated.

26.6.2 Extra Wind Players

Mahler employs a full wind complement of 6,4,4,5 / 8,4,3,1, although they only play in full force for a very short time. For the most part the extra woodwind instruments are employed in doubling the primary players. The only instrument which is not doubled is the contrabassoon. There is no evidence in P.40/1 of any use of the E-flat clarinet, even though we know from Bittner's remark quoted earlier that Mahler employed this instrument in Vienna.

Mahler employs Hr5-8 in the first and last movements, and Hr5-6 in the Scherzo. Most of the time they have independent parts and are notated at the top and bottom of the page.

Already in the first movement Mahler's revisions to the original horn pair are extensive, giving them a much greater share of melodic material; but the newly composed parts are even freer in places. The best example is in bars 319-38, a passage in which the important bass line usually disappears, and where Mahler avoids this by using Hr7/8 to
making audible the three contrapuntal lines at the beginning of this passage. The main line in Vn1/2 & Va has already been strengthened by octave raising, and Hr5/6 are reinforcing Hr1/2 and the woodwind in the canonic answer, so that with the bass line carried by Vc/Cb and Fgl-4 in bars 315-8 there remains a certain confusion of texture up to the entry of Hr7/8.

Mahler's most significant use of Hr5/6 in the second movement is in the Trio where they reinforce Fgl and join the already much strengthened woodwind in bars 501 (second half) - 507 (first note) and Vc in bars 511 (second half) - 522. Obviously the notes are foreign to the scale of the natural horn; but, if one can accept this feature, the addition of horns to this countermelody is well done.

The contribution of Hr5-8 to Mahler's edition of the Schreckensfanfaren are discussed above, and their entry in b.164 of the finale is discussed below. Mahler changes the balance in the section Und der Cherub steht vor Gott by adding Hr5-8 to the woodwind line from the upbeat to bar 321, essentially until bar 330. As C11-4 and Vn1/2 are also reallocated this theme, the horns have a good chance of blending well and the theme is definitely rendered audible.

One place where the addition of Hr5-8 draws attention to itself is at the beginning of the Prestissimo section, Seid umschlungen Millionen, bar 851 of the finale. At this point Mahler completes the missing notes in Hr1/2 and Hr3/4 who are already united in octaves in Beethoven's original and who with the other brass are providing the accompaniment to the unison woodwind. However, Mahler also reinforces the woodwind parts by Hr5-8 and thus ruins Beethoven's careful differentiation of colours. He draws further attention to the

As in the other Beethoven symphonies, the percentage of time during which the extra four horns are employed by Mahler in the Ninth Symphony is very small. Moreover, their entrance would generally pass unremarked by most listeners and was not specifically commented on by the critics.

Tr3/4 are used only sparingly in the first and last movements.

The participation of a Tuba is noted at the beginning of the finale and in the first movement the words Pos. Tuba were written into P.40 & P.41 by Mahler under bar 315. As we learn above, according to Bittner, Mahler did not use this instrument in Vienna, so its employment can only have been in New York.

26.6.3 Timpani

Mahler was often criticised in New York for allowing his timpanists to play too loudly and never more so than in Beethoven IX. Krehbiehl wrote in April 1909 that

...Those who think that Beethoven wished to have the ears of his auditors assaulted as they were last night by the kettledrum player must have been delighted by the bombardment to which they were subjected; others must have felt outraged... <27>

The critic of the New York Times also noted at the same concert that

...Mr Mahler let the whole power of the orchestra loose in his climaxes, and he was especially prone to have the kettle drum brought out with a nerve-racking violence in many loud passages... <28>

A year later the same critic comments similarly that Mahler

...uses for some passages two pairs of kettledrums, which make a noise that passes beyond the bounds of musical
The use of the second player was in fact confined to b.301-37 of the first movement and to b.852-7 in the Finale.

26.6.4 Reduced Strings

In the first movement, from b.117-19, Mahler reduces the strings in P.40 according to a finely graded scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>Vn1</th>
<th>Vn2</th>
<th>Va</th>
<th>Vc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119*2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tutti is restored in b.120.

As the disposition of the parts is different in the recapitulation, the reductions are not made there. See below, b.382-7.

In b.763-6 of the finale, Mahler writes die Hälfte for the strings in P.40. This is in black ink, denoting that the change was decided later than many of the changes already added to the score in red ink and blue pencil.

As in other cases, these string reductions are to obtain a more delicate and thinner texture than can be produced with the full body of strings.

26.6.5 Extension of Compass of Violin and Flute

The top note of the violin in Beethoven's orchestral works is c'''.

It is used exceptionally in Egmont Overture, b.319/20 & 325/6, where it is approached by step. Elsewhere, Beethoven's normal top note for the
and Wagner assumed that there was no problem in extending the limits of both these instruments to a top B-flat in b.276 and b.280 of the Scherzo where Beethoven's original causes noticeable melodic discontinuities. Weingartner also recommends raising the violin part an octave in b.416-8 of the first movement. Mahler employs both these Retuschen and also raises the first half of Vnl an octave in b.501-2 of the first movement. In the finale, Mahler adds an upper octave to Vnl/2 in b.869-75.

As far as the flutes are concerned Mahler is much bolder, employing also the top B and C. Although there are many places - for instance in the finale, b.317-8, b.325-7 and b.457-8 - where these high notes are acceptable, sometimes they do not sound well even when the Retusche avoids a change of octave. Bars 444-5 and b.451 of the first movement, b.142-3 of the second movement, and bars 113 and 117-8 of the slow movement sound unstylistic with the high flute notes.

N.B. In the description of P.40 which follows, Retuschen which are also found identically in P.39 are denoted by an asterisk (*) immediately after their description.

26.6.6 Selected Passages - 1st movement

13-16: The crescendo is intensified by the doubling of Ww and the addition of Hr5/6 to Hr2 from the last quaver of b.14. Fgl/2 are doubled from b.13. To balance this Vn2 join Vnl from the 2nd half of b.15 and the bass is further strengthened by Vc2 who reinforce Fgl/2 from b.15 until the 1st half of b.16.

19-20: Hrl-4 parts completed in octaves.
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24-6: Fl1 reinforces Vn1 sva. Fl2 sva 1st note, then joins Fl1. Cl1/2 reinforces Fl2 sva bassa. Fg1 sva from b.25 to 1st note of b.26; Fg2 sva from b.25 until 3rd note of b.26. Hr2 sva bassa, Hr3 sva alta. See Ex.26.13 for string parts.

By allowing the flute to enter on a top B-flat and join in the melody, Mahler is obliged to strengthen the lower octaves of the melody in the woodwind, and then replace Cl1 by Hr3. Finally, the strings are rewritten and prescribed multiple bow changes to balance these alterations.

31-3: Cl1/2 reinforce Vn1 from the 2nd half of b.31 until the 1st half of b.33. All parts have quaver rests before each sforzando, and St have two bows to a note. The quaver rests and the bowing increase the force of the accents and, given that there are harmonies in the Fl/Ob which are above Cl1/2, the alteration to Cl1/2 improves the balance of the melody.

34-5: Vn1 & Va play the demisemiquavers fff without diminuendo and in two bows. All wind have fp in b.34 and the Ww doubling ceases in the middle of b.34. The diminuendo in b.35 is replaced by pp in Cl, Hr, Vn2 & Vc. Mahler's changes will sound good in a reverberant hall where the accompaniment will appear to make a diminuendo underneath the flourish of Vn1 & Va.

49-50: Cb reinforce Fg and Hr5/6 double Hr3/4 to produce a stronger bass than in b.14-5.

50-5: See Ex.26.14 for Hr1-6. Mahler's reinforcement of the string unison is masterly.
63-6: Fl\textit{ tacet} in b.64. Hr5/6 double Hr1/2 from b.64 until b.72. Vc doubles Va in b.64 after the 1st semiquaver and Va/Vc double Vn2 in b.66 after the first semiquaver of each half bar. By removing the flute Mahler avoids obscuring the leading part of Vn1, and the horn doubling solidifies the imitation in the lower octave.

67-73: Vn2 & Va double Vc after the 1st semiquaver of b.67, and instead of a minim Fg1/2 have a semiquaver rest and then reinforce Vc/Cb. Fl2 & Cl1/2 are 8va until the 1st note of b.71. Hr3/4 take over the parts of Hr1/2 in b.68-9, while Hr1/2/5/6 play Cl2 original in b.68-70. Ww are doubled. The theme in the bass is played only in its decorated version, while Mahler strengthens the wind imitation considerably by adding the horns and raising the Ww octave.

80-7: Strings \textit{sempre ppp} with hairpins removed. This transfers all the attention to the woodwind.

94: Fg1/2 doubled. Va/Vc reinforce Fg1/2 after 1st semiquaver.

95-100: Fg1/2 doubled from b.96; Fl2 & Cl1/2 doubled from b.97; Fl1 & Obl/2 doubled from 2nd note of b.99. By his selective doubling, Mahler brings out the melos effectively. Following Wagner, \textit{<30>} the general crescendo is also supported in the strings with \textit{pp} in b.95-8, and \textit{molto crescendo} in b.99-100. *

110: Apparently, Vn1 is directed to play on the D string; but I cannot understand what Mahler had in mind here.

116-9: In addition to the reduction in strings discussed above, Hr3/4 are removed. Apart from allowing a softer volume, this removes some reinforcement and harmonic filling.
120-31: Pk tacent. Although this motif is thematic, <31> its presence here robs the true bass of its significance, and on those grounds it is better omitted.

132-7: Tr/Pk tacent. In b.132-3, Fl2 joins Fl1. * See Ex.26.15. for Hrl/2 who complete the wind harmony in b.135-6. (This change essentially as P.39 - See Ex.26.17.) Vn2 tacent in b.132 after 1st C, in b.134 after 1st note which is a quaver, and in b.136 after 1st G. Va doubles Vn2 in b.135 and b.137.

Trl/2 and Pk tend to obscure the bass line and their omission is salutary. Mahler strengthens the interplay between Vn1 and Vn2 by bringing Vn2 into line with their part in the Recapitulation, and adding Va. <32> <33>

137 (last note) - 138 (first note): Ob2 replaces Ob1 to enable Ob1 to begin the solo fresher.

138-47: See Ch.26.3.3 above.

146-7: Cl1/2 8va and Fgl 8va bassa. Ob1 joins Fl1 in the 1st half of b.146, and Fl2 joins Fl1 in the last half of b.147. All Ww doubled. See Ex.26.9 for Hrl-6. This is a substantial "modernisation" of Beethoven's original.

159-60: Fg2 tace t last two notes. * This and the circling of Ob1 indicate that Mahler was striving for the softest pianissimo. The last note of b.159 is omitted in Vn2 to enable them to begin b.160 with a good rhythm. This is a excellent simplification which easily passes unnoticed.

179-85: Strings and accompanying wind ppp, except Hrl/2 who are pp. The
crescendo in Vnl/Va is removed from b.186, and they enter ff in b.188. The Ww solos are brought into relief by doubling and change of dynamics. Ob2 replaces C11 from the last note of b.181 until the 3rd quaver of b.183, to ensure differentiation of timbres. See Ex.26.17.

188-91: Trl/2 reinforce Vnl/2 8va bassa in b.188-9. Ob1 8va from the second note of b.188 until the first note of b.189; C11 8va from the 2nd note of b.188 until b.190. Ww not doubled. See Ex.26.18 for Hr1-4 who now all play nearly all the notes which Beethoven was obliged to share between them. *

191-2: Ob2 reinforces Fl1. The five Ww who play in b.192 are omitted from the last two notes of b.191 to allow them to breathe and re-enter with more poise. * This solves most effectively the problem which Wagner found with Beethoven's use of the subito piano. See Ch.26.3 above.

194: Accompaniment moderated to pp upon the entry of Fl1.

195: The last three notes have diminuendo with an accent on the first of the three.

196: Ob1 last three notes espressivo.

198-209: Basically as b.179-91, Vnl/Va now espressivo and Ww doubled in the six note motif. Ob2 joins Ob1 from b.204 until the 1st note of b.206; C12 joins C11 from the last note of b.204 until b.205; and Fg2 joins Fg1 from the B natural in b.205. Hr1/2 tacent in b.198 - b.200 (1st note). Hr3/4 reinforce C11/2 8va bassa from the 2nd note of b.206 until b.207. The strengthening of the woodwind and selective doublings make the voice leading clearer and lead to a strong climax.
that the printed score conforms to Beethoven's manuscript at this point and there is a persuasive logic to this change.

223-31: Most of the marks in this fugato are changes of dynamics to ensure a good balance. Thus Hrl-4/Trl/2 are p * and Vnl are ff in b.223. Fll/2 doubled.

232-5: An unknown hand has added and then deleted in P.41 a part for Obl reinforcing Vn2 which is not to be found in P.40. It is strange that Mahler does not use this Retusche, which Weingartner recommends and which was apparently introduced by Bülow. <35> Instead, Mahler marks Vn2 ff and Vnl mf.

236: Fgl/2 doubled. Cl1/2, Fgl-4 & Vnl ff.

240 (last note) - 248 (3rd note): Fll/2 doubled.

244 (last note) - 248 (3rd note): Obl/2 join Fll/2; Vn2 joins Vnl; Cl1/2 8va; Hr5/6 replace Cl1/2.

Markevitch writes of the Retusche in Vn2:

One can only deplore this arbitrary modification on the part of such a great musician. This is in fact a sacrilege which nothing excuses because this decision deprives the rhythmic construction of the passage of a fundamental element, the ternary pulsation constituting its major originality. <36>

248 (last note) - 252: Although using Hr5/6 to reinforce Vnl, Mahler manages by means of revision and doubling of the woodwind to make clearer the antiphonal effect. See Ex.26.19 for the changed parts.

257-8: Ob2 replaces Ob1 to enable Ob1 to enter fresh in b.259. Strings are ppp in b.258.

268 (2nd half) - 270 (1st half): Fl2 doubles Fl1. Beethoven's original
F11 is alone with the rest of the woodwind section and this doubling prevents the flute from being drowned at the top of the crescendo.

271: Ob2 replaces Obl.

287: Vn2 espressivo.


301-314: Ob2 & Cl1/2 reinforce F11 8va bassa from the last note of b.304 - Cl1/2 Schalltrichter auf! . Ww doubled in b.301-2, from last note of b.304 to b.306, from last note of b.308 to b.309, from last note of b.310 to b.311, from last note of b.312 to b.314. See Ex.26.20 for selective doubling and dynamics of Hr3/4, Trl/2 & Pk. Vn1/2/Va fff with "down-up" on the motif. Va 8va in b.302-4; Vn2/Va 8va in b.306-8; Vn2 joins Vnl and Va with the exception of the chords have 8va in b.309-10 and 311-2.

Apart from the changes to Ob2 and Cl1/2, Mahler does nothing more than double selectively. His dynamics bring order where Beethoven has prescribed a uniform ff.

315-38: Cl1 continues to reinforce F11 in b.315-6, joining Obl on the last note of b.316. Ob2 joins Obl from the last note of b.316 to b.318. Cl2 8va in b.321-2. In b.329-31, Ob2/Cl2 join Obl/Cl2, and Fg1/2 are 8va to replace Ob2/Cl2. Obl, Cl1/2 & Fg1/2 are 8va in b.332-5. <37> In b.336-9, Ob2 reinforces F12 8va bassa and Cl1/2 are 8va. With exception of Fg1/2 who are doubled throughout b.315-35, Ww are doubled from b.316 (last note) to b.319 (1st half), in b.321-3, 329-35. Vn2 join Vnl and Va double this 8va bassa from the last note of b.314 until b.316, and in b.319-20. See Ex.26.21 for Vn1/2 & Va in b.323-9. 8va continues in Vn2 in b.330-6, and Va in b.330-2. Fg1-4 reinforce Vc until b.325, and in b.326-7 are as in Ex.26.22.
Although from the point of view of instrumentation the result is totally out of style, Mahler here achieves a remarkable clarification. The main theme acquires the necessary strength from the change of octaves of the upper strings and the excellent bowings, while its imitations are also strengthened in the woodwind. At the same time, the dynamics and doublings of the brass and timpani allow them to participate fully without overpowering anything.

Fgl-4 were changed and Hr7/8 added later than the rest of the Retuschen and enable the counter theme in the bass to be heard. Even later, in P.40, Mahler added the words Pos, Tuba in black ink above Vc and Cb in b.315. The orchestral materials are required in order to determine whether this addition was ever put into practice and, if so, where the reinforcement ceased. Despite the novelty of hearing the counter theme well, the introduction of these instruments has to be deplored on the grounds that Beethoven would not have contemplated it here.

346-7: Ob1 tacet in b.346 from 2nd note), and Fl2 reinforces Fl1 8va bassa. This has the advantage of allowing Ob1 to breathe and freeing Fl1 from domination by Ob1.

351-4: The string hairpins are not removed here. The woodwind motifs, having been heard before, do not need underlining this time.

362: Vn2, Vc & Fgl-4 reinforce Va, Vc/Fg playing the last note 8va bassa.
BAR | INSTRUMENT | CHANGE
--- | --- | ---
363 | Vn1, Vn2, Va, Vc, Cb | pp cresc
364 | Vn2, Va, Vc, Cb | p cresc
365 | Ww | mf cresc, and doubled until 1st semiquaver of b.367
366 | Vn2, Vc | molto cresc,
366 | Vn1, Vn2 | and doubled until 1st note of b.367 *
366 | Vn1, Vn2 | p cresc
366 | Vn1, Vn2, Vc, Cb | fp cresc
366 | Va | pp cresc

382-7: Hrl/2 tacent. Vn2 tacent from second semiquaver, Va replace them from the 2nd note of b.385. There is no reduction in desks this time, because the melody is now balanced strictly in three octaves without the doublings of the earlier passage.

397-400: Vn2 8va and all strings two bows per bar to balance the non thematic wind parts.

401-6: FgL/2 doubled. Fll/2 demisemiquavers doubled. Trl/2 & Pk tacent. <40>

407-14: See Ch.26.3.3 above.

415-8: In b.415, Cl1 joins Ob1 for the 1st two notes, and Cl2 joins Ob2 throughout. In the 2nd half of b.416, Ob1 & Cl1 reinforce Fl1 and Cl2 replaces Cl1. Ww doubled. See Ex.26.23 for Hrl-4 who reinforce Cl2 & FgL/2. These doublings and reinforcements help the crescendo and are in line with Wagner's recommendations.

Until the 1st half of b.418, Vnl/2 are 8va, as also practised by Weingartner, with four downbows. Although this brings the melodic line into conformity with the Exposition, Beethoven's ff in the second half of b.418 makes the octave raising gratuitous. The four downbows ensure
426: Ww doubling ceases here. Unlike b.191 and b.209, Mahler does not remove Ww here, but Vnl tacent from the 3rd note, returning p on the last note of the bar.

427-52: Mahler's bowing begins as in Ex.26.24. For a complete knowledge of the bowing here, the orchestral parts are needed; but P.40 indicates a rich cantabile treatment utilising long bows. Hrl/2 tacent until the last note of b.428, with the dual purpose of making clear the imitation and also allowing them to breathe. *<41> Changes are made to Ww to preserve the melodic contour and to balance the strings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>Fll 8va. *&lt;42&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>Cll 8va on last three notes *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436-8</td>
<td>Cll doubled from last three notes of b.436.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438-52</td>
<td>Fg2 doubles Fgl; Fg3/4 join in from b.450.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444-5</td>
<td>Fll 8va on first two notes of entry. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449-50</td>
<td>Cll doubled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Fll 8va on first two notes of entry. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445-52</td>
<td>F12 doubles Fll from 2nd note; F13/4 join in from b.451.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

457-8: F12, Ob2 & Fg2 double Fll, Ob1 & Fg1.

459-60: F12 doubles Fll. Ww doubled until b.468. All parts (subito) p cresc.

461: St (subito) p cresc.

462: Vn2 & Va 8va until 1st note of b.463.

463-8: Vn2 8va. Hrl/2 replaced by Hr5/6 in b.467-8 to allow them to prepare for b.469. In b.465-7, Hr3/4 reinforce Ob1 (Hr4 8va bassa).


With quite moderate means, and with good taste, Mahler builds up the climax of the first half of the Terminal Development. In the context of
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circumstances the original text is perfectly acceptable.

469: Ww, Trl/2 & Pk tacent. Hrl/2 pp, St ppp. Vnl have a harmonic A.

These changes, which appear by the use of black ink to have been made late in Mahler's practice, as well as obviating the subito piano in the wind, all make a more dramatic contrast. The harmonic implies a stillness and lack of vibrato in the strings.

469-94: In line with Obl, Fgl has top A in b.481, which should certainly draw attention to the entry. Subsequently Mahler doubles and reinforces the woodwind at the unison in an attempt to make them audible:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>BEETHOVEN</th>
<th>MAHLER</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>Obl</td>
<td>Obl/2</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>Fll</td>
<td>Fll/2</td>
<td>f cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>Fgl</td>
<td>Fgl-4</td>
<td>mf cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>Obl</td>
<td>Obl/2</td>
<td>f cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>Cl1</td>
<td>Cl1-4</td>
<td>f cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>Fll</td>
<td>Fll-4, Obl/2</td>
<td>ff cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>Fgl</td>
<td>Cl1-4, Fgl-4</td>
<td>ff cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Obl</td>
<td>Obl-4</td>
<td>ff cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>Fll</td>
<td>Fll-4</td>
<td>ff dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>Cl1</td>
<td>Cl1/2</td>
<td>mf dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>Fll</td>
<td>Fll</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>Obl, Fgl</td>
<td>Obl/2, Fgl/2</td>
<td>Ob: p cresc, Fg pp cresc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further than this it is not possible to go in reinforcing the woodwind, unless the brass were to be involved. If Mahler's aims represent the undoubted effect intended by Beethoven, as Wellesz clearly states, <43> then the Retusche may be considered good; but Vaughan Williams has a different and enlightening point of view of this passage:

...As the strings get louder the wind figure gets drowned, but as they die down again it is found that the wind is still persistently playing its part - a wonderfully poetical conception which is, I am sure, intentional. If it is a miscalculation, it is a lucky accident... <44>

Weingartner also concurred with this view. <45>
from b.495. Fl2, Ob & Cl are doubled from b.495. Fl1 doubled from b.494. Fg1/2 doubled from b.496.

499-504: Fl2 joins Fl1. Vn1 divided in b.501 until the 2nd note of b.502, with the upper voice playing 8va. Vn2 joins Vn1 from the last note of b.502 for eight notes. This ingenious redistribution of the violin parts is well supported by the woodwind in the high notes and retains its strength to the end.

In b.499, all instruments have (subito) pp with crescendo in b.500 and p cresc for the instruments entering in b.501.

505-12: Accents and hairpins as in b.195.

513-22: Hr5/6 double Hr1/2. Fg1/2 removed in pencil in b.513-6 to give a quieter beginning to the Coda. Tr1/2 tacent in b.513-5 and b.517-9.

In b.513-5, Mahler originally marked Tr1/2 pp in red ink, then he removed Tr2 in blue pencil, subsequently deleting Tr1 in black ink.

Tr1/2 were changed several times from the second half of b.517 until b.519. In P.40 Mahler at first wrote them an octave lower in red pencil, then went over this to erase it in black ink. It is therefore not clear whether he had decided to restore Beethoven's original, or to remove Tr1/2 completely, as found in P.41.

523-30: Fl1/2 doubled to end of movement from 2nd note of b.523; Ob1/2, Cl1/2 doubled to end of movement from b.527. Cl1/2 reinforce Ob1/2 from 2nd note of b.523 and Cl1/2 original assigned to Hr5/6 who are doubled by Hr1/2 in the 1st three notes of b.530.

531-8: Cl1/2 reinforce Fl1/2 original 8va bassa. Fl2 doubles Fl1 from b.535. Fg1/2 doubled to end of movement. Ob2 8va in b.535-8. Tr3
Ex. 26.27 for brass parts.

Given his full complement, all Mahler's Retschen here make sense. The raising of C11/2 by an octave and their replacement by Hr5/6, plus the gradual introduction of the extra brass are well executed.

538: All strings have a demisemiquaver rest and a semiquaver D at the end of the bar, though it is more likely that Mahler intended a demisemiquaver upbeat into the theme in all parts. Obl/2 & C12 are in unison with Fl1/2 on the last note of the bar. <47> Tr3/4 double Tr1/2 from the last note of the bar to the end of the movement.

539: Ob2/C12 join Ob1.

545-6: Hr1-8 reinforce Va/Vc.

26.6.7 Selected Passages - 2nd movement

17-29: Hr1-4 tacent. These notes are reinforcements of Fg1/2, but only where natural notes were available and rather than fill in the missing notes Mahler prefers to omit them altogether and achieve a softer pianissimo. *

57: C12 8va and Tr2 8va on first note. This emphasises the octave drop of the Kopf-motif. *

57-77 (1st crotchet): Hr5/6 reinforce Fg1/2. <48> Fl1 plays top B-flat in b.61 and b.65, as recommended by Wagner.

93-100 & 101-8: See Section Ch.26.3.1.

127-34: Fl2 joins Fl1.
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142-3: Fl1 8va for last two notes.

166-72: Fl2 joins Fl1.

174-6: Fl1/2 8va; Ob1 doubled by Ob2 and reinforced by Cl1/2. Ww doubled. This increase of power in the higher octaves is supported by additions in Hr1-6. See Ex.26.27 for these and revised Tr parts.

268-71: Fl2 joins Fl1.


There are two processes here: the wind are strengthened by the octave raising of Fl2 and Cl2 and the addition of Hr5/6; and the octave disposition of the melody is altered to allow Vn1 to take the high notes and make a consistent tessitura.

330-7: Cl1/2 8va from 2nd note, Flg1/2 8va. In b.335, Fl1/2 reinforce Ob1/2 8va. Ww doubled. Hr1/3/5 reinforce Flg1. Hr2/4/6 play a sixth below Hr1 for four bars and then reinforce Flg2. Tr1/2 reinforce Hr1/2 8va.

338-45: Essentially as b.330-7. Cl & Flg stay in the same octaves, though here Beethoven has already raised Cl1 and Flg1/2 in b.338-41.

Mahler treats the return of the second subject as in the Exposition, but here introduces in the brass a second part a sixth lower in the first four bars. Weingartner also raises Cl1/2 8va, but reinforces the theme in octaves in Hr1-4 and Tr1/2.
b.351-2. Cll reinforces Obi in b.346-8; Cl2 8va until b.352. Fg2 8va in b.346. Mahler again rearranges the octaves for greater strength.

360-3: Fg2 doubled to strengthen the bass line.


404-14: Fl2 joins Fl1.

412-3: Ob1/2 & Cl1/2 replaced by Ob3/4 and Cl3/4 on last two notes of b.413. Ww doubled. See Ex.26.28 for brass parts. 〈49〉

Trio

483-91a: In P.40 only, at one time Cl2 doubled Cl1 and Hr5/6 replaced Cl2.

495 (2nd half) - 506: Fl2 doubles Fl1. Ob2 doubles Ob1 until b.505. From b.503 until the 1st crotchet of b.507, Cl1/2 reinforce Ob1. In b.499, Fg1 8va on the 3rd note. Fg2 doubles Fg1 from the 2nd half of b.497. Fl1/2, Ob1/2, Fg1/2 doubled from the 2nd half of b.499, and Cl1/2 doubled from the 2nd half of b.503. Hr5/6 reinforce Fg1 from the 2nd half of b.501 until the 1st crotchet of b.507. The dynamic nuance at the beginning of b.503 is fff for Fl, Ob, Fg, and ff for Cl & Hr5/6.

Mahler's inflation of the climax is achieved by careful addition of wind instruments. By the beginning of b.503 he has added to the principal line 14 wind instruments to Beethoven's four.
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reinforced by Hr5/6 from the 2nd half of b.511, joined by Hr3/4 from b.515. Dynamics in Va, Vc & Hr3-4 expanded to ff at the beginning of b.515. Ww doubled, Fl, Ob & Cl from the 2nd half of b.511, Fg from b.515, until b.518.

527-30: F13/4 replace Obl/2. All wind ppp in b.530.

As in the majority of cases in the Trio, this last change is intended to expand the dynamic range.

Coda

934- 924 (1st crotchet): Fl2 doubles Fl1.

942-3: Ww doubled. See Ex.26.28 for brass changes.

944 (2nd half) - 947: Fg1/2 doubled.

944-50: 2nd half of Vn1, 1st half of Vn2, 1st half of Va, and Cb tacent from b.948. Obl/2 & Fg2 tacent in b.950. * Cl1/2 tacent last two notes. * All parts have pppp in b.950.

By doubling the bassoons, dividing the strings and removing instruments, Mahler enlarges the diminuendo for maximum effect.

952-4: See Ex.26.28 for brass. Pk have D in b.954.

26.6.8 Selected Passages - 3rd movement

2: Climax of hairpins ff.

3: Strings Griffbrett.

6-17: Hr1-2 mit Dämpfer, pp. * Hr3 mit Dämpfer, pp until b.12. *
24-5: Cl2 tacet after 7th quaver of b.24, Fgl tacet after 1st quaver of b.25, Hr1/2 tacet after 3rd crotchet of b.24. Entry of new theme in b.24 ppp in St. Mahler thins out Beethoven's scoring to prepare the ppp.

25-27: Crescendo delayed one bar and Va/Vc play espressivo only from the middle of b.27.

33: All voices pp. Vn1 gewöhnlich. There is no other indication where the am Griffbrett direction is to end, except here above Vn1, so this direction may refer to all strings.

42-3: Fl2 replaces Obl.

52, 55, 59: All voices pp. Mahler continually returns to a basic pianissimo dynamic level.

55-6: Obl crescendo to forte, to avoid being covered by Fl1.

87-90: Diminuendo in all wind to ppp in b.90.

92 (last three notes) - 93: Fl1 doubled.

99-114: Instead of Beethoven's uniform piano, Mahler prescribes a general dynamic level of ppp for the wind, returning to this at the beginning of b.103, b.108, and b.111. The leading instruments are pp, Fl1 in b.99, Fl1, Obl & Hr4 in b.103 and Hr4 in b.111. Mahler supplements this by hairpins for Fl1, Obl & Fgl in b.104-6 and b.109. * See Ex.26.29. The crescendo for Hr4 in b.111 is delayed until the second half of the bar, and culminates forte on the top note. See Ex.26.30 for Fl1 and Fg in b.111-3.

Pk tacet until b.114. The removal of the timpani from this variation
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and in b.104 it conflicts with the true bass, from b.106 the part provides a continuity of quaver pulsation in the bass. However, Mahler is more interested in having the timpani enter in bar 115, as at the beginning of the movement, to underline the relationship between the original theme and its variation.

St pp in b.99, ppp on the last three quavers of b.107 and the beginning of b.111, with diminuendo from the last three quavers of b.113, culminating ppp on the 6th quaver of b.114. Vnl Griffbrett until b.110.

114 (2nd half) - 120: All instruments ppp in b.114. * Wind are forte at the beginning of b.118. Fl2 replaces Ob1 until the B-flat of b.116, and from the 2nd note of b.119 until the 4th note of b.120. * From the last note of b.116 until the D of b.118, Fl1-4 reinforce Cl1 8va.

It is interesting here to notice Mahler employing in b.118 the top B-flat of four flutes, and then in the next bar replacing Ob1 by Fl2 to obtain a better diminuendo.

120 (last 2 notes) - 123 (1st note): Hr2/4 & Tr2 play lower octaves instead of unisons. Hr3, who plays for the first time in this movement, has offen.

125-30: Vnl Griffbrett until b.127. General dynamic pp except for Vc/Cb who are ppp.

133-5: Vn2 mf in b.133, mp in the middle of b.133. Diminuendi in all bars go to pp, except for Vc/Cb who have ppp in b.113 & b.135 and p in b.134.

Mahler interprets Beethoven’s hairpins as long accents.
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147 (1st three quavers): Fg2 has notes indicating it doubles Fg1, and
0b2 has "col I" in P.40 which implies the same: but in P.41 0b2
continues to double 0b1 to the end of b.150. This looks like a mistake
on the part of P.41, since it is unlikely that Mahler would want to
double the alto voice in this way, though only the parts could confirm
this.

148 (last three quavers) - 150 (1st note): Vnl G-Saite.

150-1: Vnl are fff at the beginning of b.151, with the diminuendo
delayed until the 4th quaver. See Ex.26.31 for bowing in P.40 & P.41.

151: 0bl/2, Cll, Hrl/2 omit their 1st note.

151-2: Cll/2 & Fg1 have hairpins on the first note of each of their
first two phrases.

155: Fl1 has top B-flat and is doubled in this bar. Beethoven provides
no support whatever for the main voice.

156-7: Fl2 replaces Ob1 from the last six semiquavers of b.156. Ob2
tacet last four notes of b.157. All parts ppp on the last four quavers
of b.156. Vnl has hairpins under the upper D of b.156. Last note of
strings pp.

26.6.9 Selected Passages - 4th movement

Although in April 1909 Mahler was apparently prevented by practical
considerations from doing so, his normal practice was to follow the
slow movement immediately by the Finale, as the Finale of his own
Second Symphony follows without pause after the Urlicht movement. The
critic of the New York Times expressed himself on this in 1909:
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...His performance sacrificed one of the logical and most effective movements (sic) of the work that is to be found in the joining of the last movement, opening with the furious discord directly upon the close of the preceding. This was, however, made impractical, apart from other considerations, by the necessity of bringing the male members of the chorus upon the platform, where there was not room to provide for them comfortably during the performance of the instrumental movements of the symphony... <50>

And in 1910:

He joins it, as it should be joined, immediately to the adagio that precedes it, giving the clash of discordant tones that introduces it their mighty effect... <51>

Bar numbers are here used consecutively throughout the Finale. The bar numbers of the beginning of key sections, which in certain scores are numbered from bar 1, have been given below.

0-7: F12 joins Fl1. Ob2 joins Ob1 until 1st note of b.3 and replaces Fl2 from last two notes of b.6. Cl1 reinforces Ob1 until b.2. Cl2 8va until 1st note of b.2 and from 4th note of b.3. Fl1 8va bassa from 2nd quaver of b.3 until 1st quaver of b.5. <52> Ww doubled until b.29. See Ex.26.6 for brass parts. Pk has quavers in b.5-6. See Ch.26.3.2 above for discussion of these changes.

8 et seq: The rubato and dynamic nuances of the bass recitatives were fully and freely notated by Mahler. They are reproduced in Ex.26.33 from the copyist's score, P.41. It may be noted that Mahler omits the first quaver of b.38, as it is sounded by the rest of the orchestra anyway and the third recitative then begins similarly to the first, with a single note before the upward leap.

17-25: Fl1 8va last 3 notes of b.18 and 1st note of b.19. Fl2 joins Fl1 until 4th quaver of b.23. Ob1 8va until 1st note of b.19 and in b.20 from 2nd note. Ob2 8va until 1st note of b.19 and joins Fl1 from b.22 to 1st note of b.24. Cl1 8va on 1st note only. Cl2 8va plays Cl1
for brass parts. Pk has quavers in b.22-3. First note of b.24 is quaver in all parts.

29: Cll/2 8va and are replaced by Hr5-8. Ww doubling ceases. Ps3/Tb reinforce Fg2/Cfg.

30-8: Fg1-4 play only the last note of b.33 and the first note of b.34, and the same in b.37-8. In this way Mahler achieves a quieter pp, while emphasising the low notes which might otherwise be covered by Trl/2 and Pk.

81 (2nd crotchet) - 91: Ww doubled.

Joy Theme (bar 92)

95: Mahler inserts a comma after the first phrase to indicate the regularity and lyrical nature of the theme.

139-40: Vn2 pp on entry, all St pp in b.140. This prevents the volume increasing suddenly.

172-87 (3rd crotchet): Hrl/2 reinforce Fg1/2 in the 2nd half of b.174 and the 1st half of b.175. * Dynamics and doubling:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>BEETHOVEN</th>
<th>MAHLER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Hr1/2</td>
<td>Hr3/4 added  \textit{p crescendo poco a poco}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trl/2</td>
<td>\textit{mf cresc poco a poco}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Hr1/2</td>
<td>Hr3/4 \textit{f cresc}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trl/2</td>
<td>Hr7/8 added  \textit{p cresc poco a poco}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ww3/4</td>
<td>Tr3/4 added  \textit{p cresc poco a poco}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pk</td>
<td>\textit{p crescendo poco a poco}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strings</td>
<td>\textit{mf cresc poco a poco}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

182-3: Hr1-4 as b.174-5.

All parts \textit{fff} by the middle of b.186.
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passage of which Weingartner accurately writes: *...the melody is entrusted entirely to the first woodwind instruments and disappears for the hearer as suddenly as if the earth had swallowed it up.* <54>

Several solutions have been proposed to this problem as different as Weingartner's own of employing three players to each first woodwind part, and that of Markevitch which divides Vnl, half continuing to reinforce Obl. Neither of these is satisfactory; and if Mahler's solution succeeds it is only because it does not sound strange in the context of his other Retuschen in this work. In addition to woodwind doublings and octave raising, he utilizes his extra brass to reinforce the woodwind. See Ex.26.34 for the brass parts. The broad details of the reinforcements, doublings and dynamic changes are best expressed in tabular form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Ww3/4, Hr7/8 &amp; Tr3/4 tacent from 4th crotchet. Hr5/6 double Hr1/2, Hr3/4 double Hr1/2 8va bassa. Ww f from 4th crotchet. St fff from middle of bar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Cl1 8va from last note until 3rd crotchet of b.189. Cl2 8va from last note until b.191. Tr1/2 p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Hr1-4 reinforce Fl1/2 15mo basso from 4th crotchet. Tr1/2 reinforce Fl1/2 8va bassa and f from 4th crotchet. Ww cresc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Ww1/2 ff. Ww3/4 enter on 4th crotchet p cresc poco a poco Hr1-6 reinforce Fl1/2 15mo basso. Hr5/6 f. Tr1/2 tacent from 4th crotchet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>St piano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>St &amp; Hr5/6 cresc poco a poco.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Ww fff. Hr5/6 &amp; Tr1/2 reinforce Fl1/2 mf from 4th crotchet, Tr1/2 8va. Hr7/8 join Hr5/6, p cresc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Ww1/2 cresc. Pk mf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Hr1/2 reinforce Fl1 cresc. Tr1/2 reinforce Obl. Hr5/6 fff. Hr7/8 &amp; St f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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-434-
The success of Mahler's Retuschen in this passage may be attributed to the careful mixture of timbres and their scrupulous balance by means of the dynamic nuances.

203-5: Vn1 omit the last three notes of b.202, * and St & Fl1 have mf dim p in 1st crotchet of b.203. Vn1 have ppp in b.205.

208-15: As b.0-7, with the exception that Pk begin mf crescendo in b.207, arriving ff by the last crotchet of b.208.

233-4: Mahler allows the bass soloist to sing the syllable "-den" on the last four notes of b.233 and take breath before repeating Freuden- from the beginning of b.234. *

Allegro assai - Entry of Chorus (bar 237)

256 (last 3 notes) - 268: Ww doubled. In b.268, Fl2 8va on last two notes; Hr1/2 omit these two notes to prepare for their entry on the last three notes of the bar which are marked f dim p. *

284: Unusually, Mahler writes Chor to remind himself of their entry.


296 (4th crotchet) - 305 (1st note) & 308 - 312 (1st note): Hr4 doubles Hr2.
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315 - 320 (3rd crotchet): Hr1/2 reinforce Obl/2 8va bassa until the 2nd crotchet of b.316. Hr1 reinforces Obl 8va bassa in b.317-9. * In b.317-8, Obl/2 are reinforced 8va by F11/2 and 8va bassa by Fg1/2. In P.40, Hr3/4 originally reinforced Ob2 8va bassa from the last crotchet of b.316 until the 3rd crotchet of b.320. This was then deleted. In P.41 Hr3/4 double Hr1/2 in this place.

With the changes to Fl and Fg Mahler continues the octaves of the beginning and ending of the phrase.

320 (3rd crotchet) - 330: Cll/2 reinforce Obl/2 until b.323, Ob2 in b.324, and Obl from b.325. <55> Beethoven's omission of the clarinets here was to allow them time to change instruments. F11 8va on 1st three notes of b.325 and 3rd note of b.327, and doubled by F11. Ww doubled.

Hr1-8 and Tr1/2 reinforce Fg1/2 at unison and 8va from the last note of b.320 to the 3rd note of b.322. See Ex.26.35. From the last two quavers of b.322 until b.324, Vn1/2 reinforce Fl/Ob2 and Hr5-8 reinforce Fg1. Va has chords to replace the notes of Vn1/2. In b.325-8, Hr5-8 reinforce Obl/2 8va bassa. For eight bars only, Mahler employs the four extra horns chromatically to reinforce a counter melody, leaving Hr1-4 to play the original diatonic parts.

St have fp and Br ffp in b.326 & b.327 to allow the chorus to be heard.

There is a Luftpause before b.330.

In b.330, Tr1/2 doubled, and Va reinforced by Hr7/8 at the unison and Hr5/6 8va.

The critic of the New York Times referred to b.330 as one of the
...certain passages were given with imposing effect, as the
great climax followed by a dramatic pause immediately
preceding the march-like variation of the theme... <56>

**Alla Marcia (bar 331)**

In the *Alla Marcia*, up to the start of the fugue at b.431, Mahler's
main concern is to arrange the most gradual crescendo possible. His
Retuschen to this end are best tabulated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>331-42</td>
<td>Fg2 tacet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>Hr3/4 mit Sord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343-58</td>
<td>Fg2 omits all B-flats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Fll/2 substituted for Obl/2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>Tr1 mit Sord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>Pi 8va bassa from 2nd half of bar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352-4</td>
<td>Fll/2 a third higher on 3rd quaver of each bar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>St pppp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Pi loco. Hr3/4 offen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Obl2 enter as original.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>poco cresc deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>Hr3/4 poco cresc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>Fll reinforces Cl1 8va from 2nd note.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>All parts mf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410-2</td>
<td>Obl2 a third higher on 3rd note of bar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>Wind mf. Choir cresc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>Wind cresc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>Ww, Hr cresc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Ww, Hr ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>Cl1/2 reinforced from 2nd quaver by Fll2 8va, forte. Cl1/2 reinf. from 2nd quaver by Hr1/2 8va bassa, forte. Pi, Fll2, Obl2 &amp; Cl1/2 from 2nd quaver p cresc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Fgl2 doubled. Ob1/2 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>From 2nd note, Fll2 reinforce Obl2 8va. From 2nd note, Hr3-6 double Hr1/2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>2nd &amp; 3rd notes Obl2 parts inverted and Cl1/2 8va. From 2nd note, Fll2 reinforce Obl2 at unison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>Ww3/4 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>Ww 3/4 tacet, Fg3/4 from beginning of bar, the rest after 1st note. Hr5/6 tacet after 1st note.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mahler is again so skilful in arranging the increase in volume that the
crescendo is so gradual and smooth as to make the details of its
433: Second note of Hr3/4 is changed to A, so that the reinforcement of Vn2 is more complete. *

443-4: C11/2 reinforce Va.

445 (2nd note) - 449: C11/2 reinforce Obl/2 in b.446. Fgl/2 reinforce C11/2 from b.447 until 1st note of b.448. Hr3/4 reinforce Fgl/2 from 3rd quaver of b.448 until b.449. Ww doubled until b.448. These changes bring out a stretto figure which cannot be heard in the original.

452-62: Hrl/2 reinforce Fgl/2 from b.452 until 1st note of b.453. *

All these subtle changes increase the audibility of the thematic motifs.

467: Fl1/2 doubled.


471: Fg2 3rd quaver 8va bassa. <57>

475: Fl1-4 8va on 1st two notes.

477-8: Fgl/2 doubled until b.478.
480: F12-4 join F11.

490: F12/4 play F12 original.

491: Obl/2 & Cll/2 doubled.

493: Fll/2, Obl/2 & Cll/2 single.

493 (2nd half): Cll/2 & Fgl/2 doubled until b.501.

500-1: Hr2 has concert C-sharp instead of E.

503-25 (2nd note): Ww doubled.

The doublings from b.467 to b.501 all draw the attention of the listener towards important entries. From b.503, Mahler is concerned with building up the climax of the fugue in b.517.


529: Ob/Fg mf.

Mahler makes the long diminuendo more gradual.

541-2: Fll/2 & Cll/2 reinforce Obl/2 in this extremely short crescendo from pp to ff.

543-94: Cll/2 reinforce Obl/2, <58> and Hr3/4 doubles Hrl/2. In b.593-4, Fll/2 continue to reinforce Obl/2 8va. See Ex.26.36 for Hr5-8 and Tr3/4 from b.590.

Andante maestoso (first full bar is bar 595)

594-602: Each note is begun downbow, with two bows on the long notes.

618 - 626 (2nd note): Cl1/2 reinforce Gb1/2 until B.617 and are replaced by Hr5/6. Cl2 joins Cll and is replaced by Hr5 from b.620. Hr6 reinforces Fgl from b.620. Ww doubled.

627-42: Mahler inserts commas in the instrumental parts before the last notes of b.628, b.630, b.631, b.632, b.634, b.637 and b.638, emphasising the hesitancy in the presence of the Creator of the World expressed by the text.

637 (last note) - 638 (1st note): Ww doubled.

643-6: Ww doubled. See Ex.26.37 for Hr5-8 and Tr1/2 who fill in the gaps in Beethoven’s original harmony. All notes except the last are downbow.

647-9: Commas between String chords.

Choral Fugue - Allegro energico (first full bar is bar 655)

Until b.729, many of Mahler’s Retuschen in this section of the movement involve the filling in of notes in the brass parts which, except in the trombones, were unavailable to Beethoven. This has two effects: in principle it avoids sudden changes to the texture, but it also makes it very difficult for the players to take breath since, whereas Beethoven’s original parts often paused for one or two notes, the instruments are now often called upon to play continuously. Mahler also employs Hr5/6 and Tr3/4 chromatically here. Unless otherwise stated below, the instruments which Beethoven already assigns to reinforce the voices are not withdrawn from this task. The bars described in this section sometimes overlap each other.

654 - 662 (1st half): Tr1/2 reinforce altos, Cl1/2 reinforce sopranos. Psl tacer. <59>
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662 (2nd half) - 667 (1st half): Cll/2 abandon altos and reinforce sopranos. Obl 8va in b.664.

667 (2nd half) - 674 (1st half): Cll/2 reinforce sopranos.

671 - 678 (1st note): Hr5/6 reinforce Fgl until b.699, Fgl/2 in b.700 and Cll/2 in b.701-4. <60>

675-7: Hrl/2 continue to reinforce Fgl. *

678 - 692 (1st half): Trl/2 reinforce Vnl/sopranos. <61>

679-86: Psl replaced by Tr3/4 and notes added to reinforce Vn2 & altos.

692-700: Tr3/4 reinforce altos. Cll/2 reinforce Obl/2 & sopranos. <62>

699-711: Hrl/2 reinforce tenors. *

702-8: Trl/2 reinforce Vnl & sopranos. *

705 - 712 (1st half): Tr3/4 reinforce altos. Psl tacet in b.705. *

709-16: Trl reinforces Vnl & sopranos.

712 (2nd half) - 714 (1st crotchet): Hr5/6 reinforce altos.

716 (2nd half) - 729: Fll/2, Obl/2 doubled. Tr3/4 double Trl/2. Vn2 joins Vnl, playing tremolo in b.718 and the 1st half of b.719. From b.720, Va replaces Vn2.

718 -729: Cll-4 reinforce Obl-4. Fgl/2 doubled.

720 - 729: Hr5/6 join Hr3/4 until the 1st minim of b.724, then reinforce tenors from the 2nd half of the bar.
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722-9: Hrl/2 reinforce tenors. <63>

724-9: Tr2/4 reinforce altos, 1st note 8va. <64>

725-6: Psl plays 2nd note 8va bassa and then doubles Ps2. Psl/2 play minim A at beginning of b.726.

727-9: Psl doubles Ps2.

745 (1st note): Trl/2 tacent, allowing them to enter with more effect with Tr3/4 and Hr5/6 on the 2nd half of the bar.

745 (2nd half) - 748: Cll/2 reinforce Fl1/2. Ww doubled. See Ex.26.38 for Br parts which are filled out by Tr3/4 and Hr5/6.

751-3: Fl1/2, Obl/2, doubled, Fg1 tripled.

753-4: Cll/2 reinforced by Hrl/2.

755-762: Ww ff with diminuendo in b.711. All instruments ppp in b.712.

The Retuschen from b.751 cause the woodwind to stand out starkly from the chorus and the rest of the orchestra. The changes of dynamics in the woodwind and the addition of Hrl/2 are in black ink, indicating that they were decided later than the ppp which is in red ink.

Allegro ma non tanto (bar 763)

763-7: Vnl/2, Va Die Hälfte.

767: Va mf and Alle from the beginning of the bar, because this is the bass.

792 (last crotchet) - 795 (1st crotchet): Fl1, Obl, Cl2 doubled, to
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803 (last crotchet) - 805 (1st half): Fll/2 8va in b.805. Ww doubled. Hr5-8 reinforce Fgl/2 fff. Beethoven's horns and trumpets were unable to contribute anything but A here.

806 (2nd crotchet) - 809 (1st half): Fl2 joins F11 from 2nd crotchet of b.807, Gll/2 8va from 2nd half of b.807. Ww doubled. See Ex.26.39 for Hr1-8 parts.

813-4: On the last crotchet of b.813, strings replace wind with a chord which is the same as Beethoven provided for the beginning of b.814. The strings are removed from b.814. These changes are on black ink. Mahler here seeks a greater contrast of timbre, using the strings to obtain a softer-toned ending to the Poco Adagio and reserving only wind timbre for the Tempo lmo.

824-30: Ww and Hr1-4 essentially as 803-809, except that Fl2 plays original part. See Ex.26.40 for Hr5-8. Ww continue doubled until b.831.

832-42: The only change Mahler makes to the text underlay in the cadenza is that the alto sings -ter under the last two notes of b.835. Vertical lines in blue pencil after b.835 and b.840, both of which come at the end of pages, may indicate Luftpausen.

Prestissimo (bar 851)

In the final section of the Finale, Mahler keeps the woodwind consistently high and employs his extra brass to reinforce the chorus and provide warmth of tone to support the woodwind. Many conductors "prune" Beethoven's percussion parts, but Mahler goes further than any in almost completely suppressing the bass drum and cymbals.
Bs in b.856. * Obl/2, Cl1/2 8va on last two notes of b.857 and 1st note of b.858. Ww, including Pi, doubled until 1st note of b.916. Hr1-4 and Tr1-2 mf and, in b.852 & b.856 play as in b.851 but a tone higher. See Ex.26.41 for the chromatic parts of Hr5-8. Mahler originally introduced the 2nd timpanist here with drums in E and B. These were marked in red ink in b.852-3 and b.856-7. Mahler subsequently deleted Pk from b.851-4 with black ink. Cymbals and bass drum tacet.

861-8: Hr5-8 double Hr1-4. Bass drum tacet in b.861-4. Pi 8va in b.865-9, and original trill supplied by Fl1-4 and Cl1-4. Tr3/4 reinforce Obl in b.865-8. Vn1 8va from the 2nd note of b.865. Vn2 continue their figure in b.865-8, to reinforce Vn1 at the lower octave. Va double Vn2 throughout these 8 bars. <65> Mahler’s reinforcement of Obl by strings, horns and trumpets allows him to strengthen the upper woodwind trill.

869-75: 1st half of Vn1 8va, 1st half of Vn2 8va from last crotchet of b.869, 1st half of Va 8va in b.869-71. In b.872, Pi and Fl1/2 are 8va, * Flg reinforces Cl1 8va bassa until the 1st half of b.873. Tr3/4 reinforces Obl and Hr5-7 reinforce Flg at the unison and 8va bassa. Bass drum tacet. Cymbals tacet except in b.875.


880-6: Pi 8va until 1st note of b.885. Fl2 reinforces Fl1 from the upbeat to b.876, both taking the top B in b.882. *

887-94: Pi 8va from the 2nd note of b.894. * See Ex.26.42 for Tr3/4,
Ps1-3 tacet. The addition of the extra brass is good. The omission of the trombones, which is noted in black ink, can only be to allow them to rest before the next few bars.


The Retusche in the trombones, although not easy to play at the tempo, is particularly felicitous in allowing the bass line its full weight. At one time Mahler also removed Ps3 from b.895 and b.899 in blue pencil. <66> The only contribution of the trombones in this passage was then the reinforcement of the bass line, and to avoid conflict with this the timpani were omitted from b.896-8 and b.900-2. However, Mahler must have found the participation of the three trombones adequate to allow the restoration of the timpani part.


911-6: Trl/2 removed with black ink until 1st half of b.912. Hrl-4 & Trl/2 doubled from 2nd half of b.912 until 1st note of b.916. Ps1-3 removed with black ink in b.913-4 after 1st note. Triangle is deleted on the 1st note of b.912 and 915, though Mahler more likely meant to omit the cymbals, as in b.907 and b.909.

917: St enter ff.

918-9: Trl/2 reinforce Hrl-4 8va. Cymbals play only 1st two notes in b.918 and 1st and last notes in b.919.
26.7 Score, P.39.

Although very likely to be the case, it must be recorded that P.39 is not necessarily the score used by Mahler as the final version for his Hamburg Retuschen. In many ways it gives more the impression of a sketch than a considered piece of work, and it is strange, for instance, that the fourth trumpet does not make an appearance until b.745 of the finale, and that there are many places where the third pair of horns could have been used to advantage and where they are omitted.

There are two possible explanations for this, which are not mutually exclusive. It could be that the basic version was made for an orchestra of 4,2,3,3 / 4,3,3,1 and that Ob3, Hr5/6 and Tr4 were an addition. It may be that Mahler, who as we know was in the habit of marking up the parts himself when he was in Hamburg, made some of his Retuschen straight into the orchestral material.

The grounds for supposing the existence of a score intermediate between
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fundamentally different Retuschen which Mahler adopts in the two scores, which has caused a vastly more detailed list of features to be necessary to describe P.39 than is the case for P.47, an early score of Schubert IX.

It will be seen that, in comparison with P.40, Mahler is much more adventurous in P.39. The changes to the timpani move away from D and A, the role allotted Tr3 is more chromatic and the use of the trombones as early as b.67 of the first movement is more daring.

In P.39, in addition to Beethoven's complement, we find parts for Fl3/4 (doubling Pil/2), Ob3, Cl3/4 (doubling Es-C1l/2), Hr5/6, Tr3/4, Tb and Pk2, plus the off-stage band. This is consistent with the circumstances of Mahler's gala performance in Hamburg in 1895, for which he had a special podium built. <67>

26.7.1 The E-flat clarinet

The participation of the E-flat clarinet is indicated in many passages in the first, second and fourth movements by means of the circle and horizontal line and by Es-cl, though often there is no indication as to where this ceases. In one passage in the first movement, two instruments are called for. It has been assumed that Fl1 is reinforced by this instrument, unless stated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st mvt:</th>
<th>16 (last note) - 27?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31- 33? (Vn1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56 (Fl2) 58 (Fl2) 60 (Fl2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 (Fl2 until 4th note)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62 (2nd note) - 63 (1st half)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>146-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149 (2nd half) - 158?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>188 (2nd note) - 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>206 (2nd note) - 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>224-31 236-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>249 (last note) - 250 (3rd note)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>251 (last note) - 252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In b.488-92, two E-flat clarinets are employed.


After this there are no more marks, but the instrument undoubtedly continued to participate.

26.7.2 Introduction of the Piccolo

Although Beethoven uses the piccolo only in the last movement (in b.343-431 and b.849 to the end), in P.39, Mahler introduces it elsewhere:

1st movement: 142-4, 244-52?, 297-?.

2nd movement: 93-111, 113-5, 127-38, 272-?.


From b.851 in the finale, the piccolo part is marked a 2 and is frequently transposed up an octave.

26.7.3 The Off-stage Band

Several witnesses state that Mahler played the Alla Marcia of the finale with an off-stage men’s choir and band. Bruno Walter was one:

He had the B-flat march in the finale played by an off-stage orchestra, while the tenor and the male chorus sang on the podium, the main orchestra re-entering with the start of the subsequent fugato. This was no mere whim. He thought he had discovered by a glance into Beethoven’s workshop his intention as prefigured in Schiller’s text:
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though from a vast distance into a victorious presence. To
this effect he employed means which Beethoven, hampered by
the restrictions of his time, would not have dared to use.
Naturally, Mahler by his audacious interference with the
score was on the wrong track, and he never repeated the
experiment. <68>

According to Förster, <69> Mahler wished to suggest the approach of an
invisible multitude of the enraptured (Enrückter), with a jubilant
Hosanna on its lips, as on the first Palm Sunday. The composer Reznicek
recalls talking with Mahler about this passage in Vienna, at the time
of the premiere of Donna Diana in the autumn of 1898:

...According to his understanding the piece must be
performed by an off-stage military band, which begins
completely in the distance and which draws ever closer, in
a mighty crescendo. "You will indeed probably take me for
a completely vulgar fellow, but I think it correct." I do
not remember whether he added that he had done it that way,
or whether he intended to do the section thus in a future
performance. <70>

Although the details are not absolutely clear, there are strong
indications in P.39 of such an arrangement; and it appears that the
instrumentation was close to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Ps reinforce Fg, Tb reinforces Cfg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>Tr reinforces Cl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Es-cl reinforces Ob1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Vc &amp; Cb pizz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>F11/2 reinforce Ob1/2 from 2nd note.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>St pizz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Vn2/Va arco.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>St arco.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>St pizz from 2nd note.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>Vn1, Vn2, Va arco.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>Vc, Cb arco.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tr2 was omitted until b.390 and there is an indication for Hr1/2 to be
stopped in b.391-406.

It is not clear how many instruments Mahler had in the wings, or
whether Beethoven's original wind instruments were actually reinforced.
one advantage of this arrangement over the original is the reduced likelihood of the tenor being swamped by the choir and orchestra.

26.7.4 Reduction of Strings

In this score, there is only one place with a reduction in the string forces. This is in b.116-29 of the first movement where the reduction is differently disposed from P.40, and not differentiated as to different sections, at least not in the score. There is a bracket around the strings, except Cb, at the beginning of b.116, indicating 1/2. Then, as well as a *diminuendo* in b.117-9, b.117 has 3 *Pulte*, b.118 2 *Pulte*, b.119 1 *Pulte*, remaining so until b.124 when 2 is marked above Vnl. Further desks are added in b.226, b.228 and b.229 (5), arriving at *Tutti* in b.230.

The discussion which follows confines itself to noting places in P.39 where Mahler introduces Retuschen which differ significantly from those in P.40, Retuschen common to both scores having been already identified in the sections on P.40.

26.7.5 Selected Passages - 1st movement

16 (last note) et seq: Three trumpets are employed, playing the theme and reinforcing Cl1/2 & Fg1.

24 - 27 (1st note): Trl reinforces Vnl, Trl/2 reinforce Ob1/Cl2 in b.24-5.

56: Trl/2 *tacent*. Hr1/2, doubled by Hr3/4 reinforce Cl2/Fg1.

58: Fl1 has c'''-sharp.
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three notes.

61-2: Trl/2 much changed, but repeated Ds replaced by melody as in b.59. Pk omit last three notes. Vnl omit from B-flat to first F in b.62. This last change avoids the large jump and also gives an antiphonal effect between the violins.

63-71: Tr3 reinforces Vnl until b.67, and Obi in b.68-70. See Ex.26.44 for Tr1/2 & Pk in b.70-2.

67-?: Hr3/4 originally noted to reinforce Va. Later they were replaced by Ps1/2.

94: Cll/2 omit last note to prepare next bar.

97 - 99 (1st note) Fl2 doubled.

102-7: Trl/2 reinforce Hr3/4 8va.

116-29: See Ch.26.7.4 above for details of reduced strings.

132-7: See Ex.26.45 for Trl/2. Obi continues to reinforce Fl1 from b.136, omitting the last half of b.137 to prepare the entry on the 2nd note of b.138.

138-45: See Ch.26.3.3 above.

146-7: Hr3/4 essentially as P.40.

147-58: See Ex.26.46 for Trl/2 & Pk which are not entirely clear here. The repeated Ds of Hrl/2 in b.154-8 are abandoned with the note mit 3.


179-87: Fgl tripled from the last note of b.179 until the 3rd note of b.181. Obi omits the reinforcement of Cll in b.184-5, and reinforces
Cl1 from the last note of b.183. Given Mahler's means, these Retuschen are effective.

188-91: Tr1/2 omit the last note of b.187 and the first note of b.188 and reinforce Vn1 8va bassa from the 2nd note until the 1st quaver of b.191.

198-205: Cl2 doubles Cl1 from the last note of b.199 until the 3rd note of b.201, and from the last note of b.203. Ob2 doubles Ob1 in b.205 only. The hairpins in Vn1 reach ff on the last note of b.201.


236-52: All Ww in octaves reinforcing Vn1. Vn2 join Vn1 from b.240, returning to their part where Vn1 is silent. Tr3 reinforces Ob1 on the upward arpeggios of b.249-52. In b.236-9, Tr1/2 have concert Fs and Pk tacent. The contributions of Pi and Es-cl make an impressive climax.

287-94: Pk C in each bar. At the beginning of this passage is II implying the participation of a second timpanist.

297: Pi enters on the sixth note.

302-14: Ww have diminuendo in b.302, p in b.303, and cresc in b.304; and these dynamic nuances continue throughout the passage. Vn2 & Va are at original pitch fff; but from b.309 Mahler raises them an octave, essentially as in P.40. There is an indication that the last note of b.304 and 1st note of b.305 were doubled by an extra flute, and probably piccolo, and also in b.308-9, 310-11, on the last quaver of b.312 and from the last note of b.316. Pk have hairpins to allow Vn/Va to dominate.

315-38: Ps3 and Tb reinforce Vc/Cb. Pos is also written over Vc in
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of the participation of these instruments here. Unlike the evidence from later Viennese performances, there is no reason to suppose that Mahler did not put these Retuschen into practice in Hamburg. Tr3 reinforces Ob2 from the last note of b.316 and Obl from b.329, with no indication where this reinforcement ceases. In b.327-9, Vn2 & Va are 8va reinforcing Vnl. See Ex.26.47 for brass parts in b.327-38.

336-8: C12 replaces C11 until the 1st note of b.337. F11 & C11 omit the last five notes.

339 - 340 (1st half): F11 8va.

345-7: Mahler divides the line between Ob1/2 and Fg1/2 in a sort of hocket arrangement which is very attractive. See Ex.26.48.

369-70: Obl tacet from 2nd note to avoid dominating the melody and to prepare for b.371. In b.370, F11/2 continue the line of Vn1.

415: Hr5/6 are noted to reinforce Fg1/2. As this is the only reference to a third pair of horns in the first movement, and as Hr1/2 are unemployed in this passage, it is difficult to know definitely the significance of this.

420-6: Hr3/4 and Tr1/2 have sketched notes to reinforce the unison. Obl/2, C11/2 & Hr3/4 omit the last two notes. Fg1 omits the 5th note of b.426.

430: Fg1 8va.

440: F11 plays last note with C11.

446-52: Fg3 doubles Fg1, both 8va from b.448. Fg2 doubles Fg1 original. In b.451-2, F11 doubled by F12. The bassoon changes remove
453-4: Fl2 doubles Fl1 until 1st note of b.454. Fg2 plays A on the first note of b.453. Pk tacent in b.464.

463-6: Hrl-4 & Trl/2 notes changed to match Ww. Hrl/2 tacent in b.467-8

469: Hr2 plays low A throughout the bar. Tr, Pk & St ppp.

481-94: Except for the addition of the two E-flat clarinets, Mahler is here working towards his later version.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>Fgl doubled, 1st note 8va.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>Ob1 doubled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>Fl1 doubled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>Fgl at one time tripled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>Ob1 tripled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>Cl1 tripled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>Es-Cl1 reinforces Fl1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>Cl1/2 reinforce Fgl/2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Es-Cl2 reinforces Ob1-3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>Es-Cl1 reinforces Fl1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>Es-Cl2 doubles Cl1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>Fl1 doubled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>Ob1 &amp; Fgl doubled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

495 - 496 (7th semiquaver): Fl2 8va.

504: Ob1 tacet; Ob2, Cl1/2 omit last note.

513: Trl/2 pp.

545-6: Hrl-4 reinforce Va/Vc. Trl/2 as Hrl/2 8va.

26.7.6 Selected Passages - 2nd movement

30-2: Hr3/4 reinforce Fgl/2 and Hrl/2 tacent.

57-77: See Ex.26.49 for Pk part. Bars 57 - 68 (1st note) are in parentheses, implying that Mahler omitted the timpani at one time.
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subsequent replacement by the new part, or the omission of the new part is not certain; though the first situation is more likely.

Unlike P.40 where he leaves Hr1-4 intact, in this score Mahler fills in the gaps in Hr3/4 and changes notes in Trl/2. In b.68-9, the reinforcement of the Gs in b. 68-9 in Hr3/4, Trl/2 & Pk heralds the modulation to C major more clearly than Beethoven's original.

93-108: See Ch.26.3.1.

109-16; Hr1-4, Trl/2 & Pk extensively modified to participate in the melody. See Ex.26.50.

127-32: Trl/2 essentially reinforce Obl/2; Hr3 reinforces Ob2.

135-8: Tr reinforces the Kopf-motif in Vnl, 8va bassa.

172-6: Fl1/2 unite in the top octave, as in P.40. See Ex.26.51 for brass parts in which, more logically than in P.40, horns reinforce strings and trumpets woodwind.

268-79: Fl2 8va.

268-72: In the stave for Ps1/2 is a part which, when read in the tenor clef - the printed clef is alto - would indicate that Ps1 reinforces Hr1 8va bassa.

285-7: Originally Mahler continued Fl1 in the upper octave, then he lowered the first two notes, as in P.40.

288-96: Vnl 8va to match upper woodwind.

330-7: Cl1/2 8va from 2nd note, Fg1/2 8va. In b.335, Fl1/2 reinforce Obl 8va. Hr1/2 reinforce Fg1, Hr2 8va bassa. Trl/2 reinforce Hr1 8va.
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346-53: Brass melodic as in b.109-16.

366-71: Hr3 reinforces Vn1 8va bassa and Hr4 reinforce Va.

372-5: In addition to the trumpet Retusche retained in P.40, Hr3/4 also change octaves to reinforce Vn2 8va bassa.

388a: This repeat is the only one excised in this score.

412-3: Ob1/2 omit last three notes of b.413; Cl1/2 and Fg1/2 omit last two notes. Hr1/2 omit last two notes of both bars and are replaced by hr3/4 in b.413. Tr1/2 8va on 1st note of b.412 and the 2nd note of b.413.

The Ww changes give a slight breathing space. The horn changes simplify the part without sacrificing overall effect, and the upper notes of the trumpets agree better with the contour of the melos.

**Trio**

483 (2nd half) - 489?: Ob1/2 reinforce Cl1/2. It makes sense to have all the upper woodwind reinforcing Vn1, and the pedal A held by Hr1/2 only.

495: Fg1 8va 1st note.

495-506: With his limited means, Mahler carefully arranges reinforcements and doublings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>F12 joins F11 and Ob2 joins Ob1 from the 2nd half of the bar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>Fg2 joins Fg1 from the 2nd half of the bar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>F11 &amp; Ob1, and probably Fg3, tripled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Es-Cl enters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hörner marked in Fg2 part, probably indicating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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507-14: Ob2 doubles Ob1 until the 1st half of b.513, then Ob1/2 reinforce Trl 8va. Hörner written in Va/Vc from 2nd half of b.511, probably indicating the participation of Hr5/6 as in P.40 until b.522.

515-8: Hr3/4 reinforce Vc with no indication as to where this ceases. Hr1/2 reinforce Fgl/2.

26.7.7 Selected Passages - 3rd movement

39: Fl1 top B. In view of the difficulty in playing this note quietly enough, there is little wonder that this change was abandoned in P.40.

46: Rit. in red pencil. The easing of the phrase ending is commonly done; the surprising thing is to find it actually written into a score by Mahler.

99-102: Fl1 8va bassa from the 2nd half of b.100 to the 1st half of b.101. Ob1 8va in b.99 and the 1st half of b.100, and from the 2nd half of b.101 until the 1st note of b.102. Mahler here restores the melodic contours of the original theme which Beethoven preserves only in Fgl.

112: Fl1 noted col Ob, which presumably means continuing the octave reinforcement into b.113, though it would make for a shrill sound.

117-8: Fl2 replaces Ob1 until the B-flat of b.116, and from the 2nd note of b.119 until the 4th note of b.120. Fl1 8va until the 1st note of b.118, to continue in the same octave. Ob1 also 8va to support this.
120-1: Obl reinforces Fl2 from the last two notes of b.120. Fl1 8va from the 3rd note of b.121 to continue an octave above Vn1.

121-2: Hr2 plays lower Fs.

131: Fl1/2 8va as in b.121.

131-2: Hr2 and Tr2 play lower Fs, and Tr2 also lower Cs.

26.7.8 Selected Passages - 4th movement

0-7: See Ex.26.5 and discussion in Ch.26.3.2 above.

8 et seq: See Ex.26.32 where the comparison with the notation of P.41 shows the marks here to be an early version.

187-202: Mahler’s Retuschen here cannot be compared with the enormous changes of P.40. Tr1/2 are omitted from the last note of b.187 to the 3rd crotchet of b.189. They then reinforce Obl/2 8va bassa until the 1st note of b.191. In the same place, Hr1/2 also reinforce Obl/2 15mo basso. In b.192-3, Fl1/2 are reinforced by Tr1/2 8va bassa and by Hr1/2 15mo basso. In the following passage the score is not clear, but it appears that Tr3 reinforces Obl 8va bassa in b.195-8. In this way Mahler makes an attempt at keeping the main melody audible without woodwind doublings.

193-6: See Ex.26.52 for Pk.

203: Vn2 has a quaver a’ at the beginning of the bar and a quaver rest, joining the lower A on the second crotchet. Mahler is worried about the indeterminacy of the harmony as written by Beethoven and completes it, while at the same time fulfilling the voice leading of the previous bar.
208: Pk pp cresc ff. There is no indication in the previous bar, with the implication that Pk enter f there.

240-1: Mahler continues the syllable Freu- until the first f-sharp, thus avoiding in a different way the English oratorio style described by Wagner. <71>

260: Mahler writes frech above the alto part. This was the adverb used instead of streng in the original version of Schiller's Ode. Whether Mahler went as far as to have this replace Beethoven's text is not clear.

262: F1l/2 1st three notes 8va.

273-4: Notes a third higher added to Soprano solo, bringing the melody in line with the theme. Maybe Mahler inverted the soprano and alto parts, though there is nothing more to substantiate this.

294: F1l/2 reinforces Ob1/2 8va.

320 (last crotchet) - 324: Ob1 joins Ob2 in b.324. C1l/2 reinforce Ob1/2. Fl3 and Pi indicated, presumably doubling Fl1. See Ex.26.53 for Hr1/2 and Trl/2 in b.321-2.

325-30: As in P.40, Fl1 8va on 1st three notes of b.325 and 3rd note of b.327, and doubled by Fl1. Cl1/2 reinforce Ob1/2.

331-431: See Ch.26.7.3 above.

441-4: Hr1/2 tacent. Trl reinforces Va.

444 (last quaver) - 446 (1st quaver): Ob1 reinforces Fl1 8va bassa.

446 (3rd quaver) - 447 (5th quaver): Trl reinforces Ob1.

447-9: Hr3/4 reinforce Cl1/2 until the 2nd quaver of b.448, thereafter
reinforcing Fgl/2.

The horn and trumpet Retuschen in b.444-9 bring out the stretto and in the absence of doubling woodwind are Mahler's only way of achieving this.

458-61: See Ex.26.54 for Hr3/4 which reinforce Cl2 and Va.


477-8: Hr3/4 reinforce Fgl.

493-8: Fl1/2 abandon the original and reinforce Vnl. Ob2 joins Obl.

The Retuschen throughout the instrumental fugue are intended to bring out entries which are in danger of being overlooked. Not only does Mahler have different forces available for this task, but he reinforces different parts than in P.40.

541-3: Trl/2 reinforce Obl/2 and hold the last note of b.452 for an extra bar.

550, 558 & 574: Hr3/4, notated in F, join Hr1/2 until the 1st note of the next bar.

564-5 & 580-1: Hr1/2 as b.174-5.

584: Hr2 reinforces Fgl.

591-4: Cl1/2 reinforce Ob1/2. Fl1/2 reinforce Ob1 8va in b.593-4.
Hr1/2 reinforce Ob1/2 8va bassa from b.592.

643-6: Es-C1 reinforces Fll. See Ex.26.37 for Tr1/2 and Hr1/2.

654-61: Tr2 has missing notes completed, but Ps still plays. <72>

679-86: Ps1 tacet.

26.7.8 - Beethoven IX, P.39 - 4th mvt
703: Trl/2 tacet.

709-16: Pf1 tacet.

712 (2nd half) - 716 (1st note): Trl/3 reinforce Ob1.

716-29: Vn2 as P.40, Va reinforce Fl2 from b.720, playing tremolo.

745-6: Tr3/4 & Hr5/6 as in P.40.

801 (2nd half) - 805 (1st half): Hr1/2 reinforce Cl1/2 8va bassa. from the 2nd half of b.804, Tr1 reinforces Cl1.

806-9: Fl2 joins Fl1 from b.807 until the 1st half of b.809; Ob2 joins Ob2 from the last note of b.806 until the 1st note of b.808; Cl2 joins Cl1 from the last note of b.806 until the 2nd note of b.809. Hr1-4 as in P.40. These changes strengthen the penetrating power of the woodwind and add body to the harmony.

822-30: Fl2, Ob2, Cl2 join respective 1st parts from 2nd crotchet of b.827 until 2nd note of b.830. Hr1-4 as 801-9.

837-41: Tenor solo as recommended by Wagner. <73> Soprano and Alto begin Flü- on the 2nd note of b.839, with -gel on the 3rd note of b.841.

849-50: Hr1-4, Trl/2 join in unison melody.

851-9: Cymbals and bass drum tacet.

851 - 854 (3rd crotchets): Cl1/2 reinforced by Trl/2, and Hr1-4 8va bassa. Pi doubled.

861-4: Bass drum tacet.

865-8: Fl1/2, Obl/2 & Cl1/2 join Pi trill.

26.7.8 - Beethoven IX, P.39 - 4th mvt
869-79: See Ex.26.55 for Hr1-4 and Cymbals and bass drum.

880 - 887 (1st note): Bass drum tacet.

885 & 893: Pk has minim D at beginning of bar.


907-15: Cymbals and bass drum tacet on 1st beat of b.907, b.909, b.912 & b.915.

918-9: Bass drum tacet; cymbals tacet on last note of b.918 and 2nd note of b.919.
Mahler gave eight performances of Mozart's *G-minor* Symphony, spanning his entire career:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>18 Apr 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>6 Dec 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg PO</td>
<td>22 Oct 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna PO</td>
<td>6 Nov 1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris VPO</td>
<td>18 Jun 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Petersburg</td>
<td>17 Mar 1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York PO</td>
<td>29 Nov 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Dec 1910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, it cannot be regarded as a staple of his repertoire; and it may be that this was because he felt uncomfortable in programming it with the large orchestras normally at his disposal.

**27.1 Set of Orchestral Parts, P.44**

No score of this symphony has been found from Mahler's possession; but there is a set of orchestral parts in the U.E. Archive. This comprises a normal set of wind parts, including clarinets, and string parts numbering 9,9,6,5,5. All the parts are Breitkopf, and have the same *Gustav Mahler / Wien* stamp on them. These parts all show signs of much use, but they may not necessarily all have been in use in any given performance. There are bowings printed in the parts and most of these Mahler accepted. All the parts have pencilled-in dynamics, and the first desks have these dynamics also in blue pencil with bowings.
end of the Flute part is written: *Petersburg d Stem März 1902 A.* Niehoff; and the indications are that Mahler used these materials for his performances of this work during his Vienna and New York periods.

27.2 The Main Characteristics of Mahler’s Interpretation

27:2.1 Timings and Tempi

There are timings in some of the parts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vn2.1</th>
<th>25 Mi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Val</td>
<td>26 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrl</td>
<td>25 Min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is nothing unusual or illuminating about these timings which agree with the timing of 25:20 in Bruno Walter’s 1959 recording, <1> and in the absence of further detail no tempi can be evaluated.

27.2.2 Repeats

The parts show that Mahler did not make the repeats in the second movement, nor those of the finale. The repeat of the exposition of the first movement is not crossed out, giving the strong impression that Mahler took it.

27.2.3 Size of Ensemble

In New York, Mahler gave the symphony with reduced strings and doubled wind, according to the critic of the *New York Times*

...on the basis of eight first violins instead of the sixteen that make up the normal number of the orchestra. The other stringed instruments were reduced in proportion; some of the wind instruments were also lessened in number, but there were four flutes, though they did not always all

27.1.0 - Mozart, K.550
The critics felt that Mahler went too far in his reduction of the strings, the *New York Times* going on to say that

…it may be doubted whether the results falling upon the ears of auditors in Carnegie Hall were such as were heard by listeners of Mozart's time; for they were those of a small orchestra in a large hall, instead of a small orchestra in a hall suited to its number. They were interesting results, however. The sonority was greater than was to be expected, and the quality of the orchestral color, with the increased proportion of the wind instruments, was no doubt new to many to whom the symphony has been a lifelong friend. It may be questioned whether this attempt was convincing to those who know the symphony as it is usually played in these days, or whether many will wish to hear Mozart's symphonic music hereafter in no other guise... <3>

The *Daily Tribune* wrote that:

...The conductor put aside half of the string players which have so often been lauded as the chief glory of the Philharmonic Orchestra and doubled the flutes. The effect upon Mozart's music in a room of the dimensions of Carnegie Hall may be left to the imagination of the judicious... <4>

27.2.4 Doubling of the Flute Part

The description given above by the critics of the participation of four flutes is mysterious, as the work is only written for one, and there are no indications which substantiate this in the part. Presumably the critics were relying on the evidence of their own eyes, and the Tribune critic must have thought that there were two flute parts called for in the score. Krehbiehl alludes to this in his obituary when he writes of Mahler ...doubling the flutes in Mozart's G minor... But he is probably basing this statement on the review quoted above, which did not appear over his name. <5> In the flute part, we find the following indications in pencil:

27.2.3 - Mozart, K.550 -465-
2nd mvt:  
33: II 44: I  
55: II  
58: II 59: I  
60: II 61: I  
62: II  
102: II 106 (2nd minim): I.

3rd mvt, b.50, 61, 63 & 76: II.

4th mvt, b.263 & 267: II; b.275: I.

Presumably II is an indication of where Fl2 begins to double and I a sign for the end of the doubling; but this latter is frequently missing. Both these marks and the four flute statement need further information for their explanation.

27.2.5 Selected Passages - 1st movement

In what follows below it should be assumed that parallel passages are treated similarly unless otherwise stated.

1-2: The first note in the bass is played pizzicato and Va has mf with diminuendo for two bars. This establishes a "dying fall" effect which Mahler maintains throughout the movement:

20-1 & 183-4: Fgl/2 have diminuendo instead of subito piano.

102-4: Ww have cresc in b.102, with forte diminuendo in b.103-4. Vnl/2 enter mf with diminuendo, arriving pp at the beginning of b.105.

160-5: See Ex.27.1 where Mahler's justification for his treatment of the opening bars is found in his realisation of Mozart's intense lead back to the Recapitulation.

Apart from the effect itself which emphasizes the unusual nature of the soft opening theme, Mahler may also have wanted in b.20, 102 and 183 to keep the level of sound above that of the reverberation in the hall.

3 & 5: The last note of the first phrase and the last two notes of the
7 & 170: Vnl harmonic a''.

9-10 & 11-12: Hairpins and accents have been added to emphasise the change in declamation. See Ex.27.2.

44-51: The second subject was heavily phrased both here and later. See Ex.27.3.

58-61: Fl has hairpins in each bar to ensure that it stands out from the rest of the woodwind.

72-6: C11: mf; Fg1: f. Hairpins in Vnl, Va, Vc/Cb under each entry. There is a confusion here as to which is the main voice.

102-4: Ww have cresc in b.102 and f dim in b.103-4. Vnl/2 mf dim.

211 - 214 (3rd note): Vnl 8va to avoid the sudden drop of an octave which caused Bruno Walter to insert a Luftpause of approximately the length of a crotchet before b.211.

234: Mahler apparently did not like the smear which arises from the original Ob1 part and therefore added quavers to bring the part into line with the other woodwind.

299: The last note was shortened to a crotchet in Vnl.1, Vn2.1, Vn2.2, Vn2.3, Val, Va2, Vc1, Vc2, Cb1, Cb2, Fl1 & Ob1. The small number of string parts probably indicates that this was only done when Mahler used a small complement. It would not be difficult for the wind players to remember to do this. Mahler avoids an accent on the final note and lightens the ending thereby.
The direct influence of Wagner is found throughout this movement. <6> From the first note, the main theme receives hairpins. See Ex.27.4.

20, 22, 86 & 90: See Ex.27.5 for Mahler's changed notation. This emphasises the hemiola rhythm, but it is a puzzle why Mahler thought it necessary, unless it came from an inauthentic score.

33-6: In b.33 all instruments except Vn1 have forte dim. All instruments have piano at the beginning of b.34 and wind also have crescendo. In b.35 the wind have fp crescendo and the strings have crescendo leading to a forte in b.36. These changes in dynamics allow the demi-semiquavers to be heard and are found also in Walter's recording. <7>

37-43: The second theme is broken up. The first half of each bar played with hairpins and the second half played ppp as an echo. Mahler splits the first note of b.40 in Vn2 in half. See Ex.27.6.

44-7: Mahler enlivens this passage which can sound rather turgid, by hairpins, a fortepiano at the beginning of b.46, and a subito piano in b.47.

48, 50, 119 & 121: The last five notes are in one upbow with tenuto marks.

53 & 56: The crescendo in these bars is exactly as specified by Wagner. <8>

58-9 et seq: St have piano on the second quaver of b.58 and forte on the second quaver of b.59. This enables the demi-semiquavers of the woodwind to be heard.
and is replaced by Fgl.

103: Fgl reinforces Cl1 8va bassa.

123: All Ww except Fll and Fgl removed. Mahler has marked pp in the strings and wants a much quieter ending to the movement. <9>

27.2.7 Selected Passages - 3rd movement

Mahler's bowings fully utilize his penchant for accented down strokes. See Ex.27.7.

43-60: In contrast to Mozart's simple indication of piano with a single crescendo, Mahler puts hairpins in almost every bar. Some of the additional dynamics create a terraced effect, while others are inserted to ensure a good balance between voices. See Ex.27.8.

61-84: The second half of the Trio is also well supplied with additional dynamics. See Ex.27.9. There is a danger here that the accents of b.61-8 will become misplaced, giving the effect of a downbeat on the last crotchet of the bar. Mahler at one time removed the part of Fgl in the first two notes of b.78, replacing it by the part of Fg2, presumably to avoid Mozart's consecutive octaves with the flute.

27.2.8 Selected Passages - 4th movement

16-19: The unison Ds were separated by a Luftpause, on each appearance of this passage in both exposition and recapitulation.

33 & 53: Hr2 g'' changed to b'-flat.

71-101: Mahler supplies this passage with liberal additional dynamics
lies in knowing the dynamic range of the hairpins.

101 & 277: All instruments have piano on the first note: Vnl/2 play forte from the second note.

147-61: Except for b.152 & 156, Mahler inserts ffz on every note in the horns, making sure that they are prominent without drowning the strings. <10>

175-85: Vnl/2 have mf from the second note of b.175 until the first note of b.185 in order to accord prominence to the other voices.

191-201: Vc/Cb have mf for the first three notes in b.191-2 and these three notes are marked similarly in all string parts, wherever they occur, to allow the first eight notes of the main theme to be heard against them in this canonic passage.

247-261: The second subject with its intensified expression is treated passionately by Mahler. And is also a feature of Walter's recording. <11> See Ex.27.11

308: Like that of the first movement, the last note is a crotchet in many parts. Played like this the movement ends with a passionate spirit unlike the obviously premeditated deliberation of Mozart's original minim.
Chapter 28

Mozart, Symphony No.41, K.551

Mahler conducted Mozart's Jupiter Symphony four times:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vienna PO</td>
<td>5 Nov 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Nov 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trieste</td>
<td>1 Dec 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York PO</td>
<td>8 Dec 1909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28.1 Set of Orchestral Parts, P.45

At present the orchestral materials furnish the only information we have of Mahler's practice in this work. This set is a motley collection of manuscript parts, some dating from as early as 1826, and early printed parts which have been much used. Dates and comments indicate that at least some of this set was probably used by Mahler for all of his four performances. The original text of the manuscript parts left much to be desired in terms of authenticity; but it was, however, corrected so that it agrees generally with the Mozart Gesamtausgabe.

The stamps of the New York and Vienna Philharmonic Societies and the age of the parts tell us that they had originally belonged to these institutions; and this fact and the inconsistency of markings suggest that the sets were used by other conductors besides Mahler.
28.1.1 String Parts

The string parts are handwritten by at least four different copyists and are of different ages. They are numbered in red pencil, the rear desks comprising the older parts. The bowings are inconsistent: those written in blue pencil were in places changed later by players using lead pencil.

28.1.2 Manuscript Wind Parts, P.45A

There is a set of nine handwritten wind parts, plus timpani. The Flute part indicates a 2 at the beginning, but details of doubling are not generally given. This was the basic set of wind parts.

28.1.3 Printed Wind Parts, P.45B

This old printed set of woodwind and horn parts belonged to the New York Philharmonic Society. Letters had originally been pencilled-in, and others were added in blue to correspond with Mahler's parts. Doublings are indicated, but few dynamics. It would appear that this set was used in New York either just for the doubling players or, since they were more legible than manuscript parts, for all woodwind and horns. Evidence for the latter suggestion is found in the fact that Obl/2 and Fgl in b.46-51 of the third movement have pencilled-in dynamics, and this passage would surely not have been doubled. Most of the doubling indications appear to have made by players and they are inconsistent from part to part. This is unusual, since Mahler's doubling set was usually scrupulously marked up by himself or a copyist before the rehearsals. Because of the inconsistency of the marks these doubling parts have been ignored in the present study. If Mahler's
28.2 The Main Characteristics of Mahler's Interpretation

28.2.1 Repeats, Timings and Tempi

The following indications of timings are found in the orchestral material:

- Vn2.4 11 mins for first mvt.
- 32 Min ohne Repet nur I Satz repet. at end
- Vn2.6 33 Min at beginning.
- Cb3 38 Min mit Allen reps
- Hrl 32 Min at end (33 underneath)

We cannot ignore the possibility that Mahler at one time made all the repeats, as indicated by Cb3, but in view of his usual practice in other works this seems unlikely and we are left with the indications that Mahler made the repeats in the first and third movements, giving a total timing between 32 and 33 minutes. The first movement timing, with repeat, gives an average metronome indication of minim = M.M.78. These would not represent unusual tempi. The timing of 38 minutes for a performance with all the repeats would also seem reasonable.

28.2.2 Reduction of Strings

In America, Mahler reduced the strings in the first movement and this was noted by at least one critic:

To help secure the tonal effect that Mozart had in mind, which was of course that of an orchestra of fewer numbers in the strings compared with the wind instruments, Mr. Mahler had numerous passages in the first movement played by only a portion of the stringed instruments, and the effect was singularly successful... <1>
...during the performance of a Haydn symphony he made the experiment of dividing the orchestra according to the old manner in Grosso and Concertino and assigned the piano passages to a solo string quintet alone... <2>

The passages where Mahler used reduced strings were marked not by Mahler or by a copyist, but by players and are not consistent from part to part. A conflation of the directions in all the string parts gives the following bars in the first movement where Mahler used reduced strings:


Thus, not counting the repeat, approximately 75% of the movement was played by reduced strings.

As to the size of the reduced forces, these are variously notated in the first violin parts as 4 Pulte in Vnl.2, and 4 Desks in Vnl.5 & Vnl.7). Vnl.7 also uses the indication 1/2. This leads to the conclusion that in New York Mahler conducted the work with 8 desks of first violins, of which 4 desks were used in the reduced sections.

If Mahler used 8 desks of first violins, he also probably used a full complement of 8,7,6,5,4 desks in New York, as was his normal practice there, and the reduction to 4 stands makes excellent sense.

The second violin parts give variously:

4 Pulte: Vn2.4 at bar 56
3 Pulte: Vn2.4 at bar 101 and Vn2.7 at bar 56.

It is not impossible that 4 Pulte is a mistake, and this would not matter if this part were being used by the fifth desk players. The reduction to three desks makes more sense.
the Cello parts the indication is for 2 desks. In the Bass parts there are the indications 2 stands only and half only in the fourth desk, but the third desk contains the indication 3 only at bar 101.

Of course, there is no reason to suppose that Mahler used the same reduction for each passage, but the basic starting point seems to have been to use the full string section of 16,14,12,10,8 and reduce this to about half.

In other cases where Mahler reduces the size of the string section he does so for reasons of colour and to achieve lightness of texture; but, like Bülow, he does it here to make clear the terraced dynamics which Mozart uses and show the historical connection between this movement and the Concerto Grosso.

28.2.3 Selected Passages - 1st movement

1: The opening tag of the work is consistently played with three downbows in forte passages, shortening the crotchet.

9 - 17 (1st note): Va joins Vn2, Vc plays Va original.

39-46: The dynamic in all instruments is reduced to piano. Hr1/2, Trl/2 & Pk have accents (´) on each note. St & Fgl/2 have hairpins, phrasing the theme in two bar periods, b.45 & b.46 being both diminuendo. The forte is restored at the upbeat to b.47.

49 (4th quaver) - 55: Va joins Vn2; Vc plays Va orig.

56-80: See Ex.28.1 for bowing and dynamics. Originally Vn1 played b.56 upbow with hairpins. Later the hairpins were removed and the phrase was played downbow to give simpler style and discourage a crescendo. In
for the first two crotchets of b.73, 74, 77 & 78. This was later changed to begin downbow, with a portato bowing for the two crotchets. Although there is no actual evidence to support this speculation; it makes sense to assume that these alternative approaches represent the Vienna Philharmonic with 17 first violins and the New York Philharmonic with only eight.

81-5: Mahler reduces the power of Br and Pk with fp and sf, and puts diminuendi in Vn2 and Va to enable Vn1 and Ww to dominate the texture. See Ex.28.2.

107: The quavers are consistently marked to be detached from the following note.

157-9 See Ex.28.3 for Vn1.3. The fingering implies the use of the A string, and the separation after the second note forbids a portamento in returning from fifth to third position.

167-8 & 169-70: The 4-3 suspensions in F1 and Ob2 are emphasised by means of hairpins, one per bar.

197 - 205 (1st note): As b.9-17.

218-9: Hrl/2 inexplicably crossed out in pencil. This removes the bass, and changes the harmony.

237 (4th quaver) - 243: Vn2 are a fifth higher than in the exposition, so Vc joins Va to give weight.

246: Vn1 originally played the first two notes an octave higher, to match other appearances of the theme. It may simply be that Mahler decided to restore Mozart's original on principle; but the change would sound less strange with a large number of strings in the Musikverein

28.2.3 - Mozart, K.551, P.45 - 1st mvt
been the reason for the restoration of the original.

254-65: Hrl/2 out.

296 - 269 (1st note): Tr2 & Pk tacent.

299 et seq: There is erased pencil evidence that from the second note Vn1 played an octave higher.

28.2.4 Selected Passages - 2nd movement

All strings were muted for this movement.

5-10: The many additional dynamic nuances which can be seen in Ex.28.4 are typical of Mahler's treatment of this slow movement. They follow the expressive line of the melody. The harmony also influences Mahler's additions to the dynamics: he takes into account the slower harmonic rhythm of b.7-8 in comparison with b.9 and the unexpected feint in the direction of D minor at the beginning of b.9.

23-5, 51-5 & 73-4: Mozart's original has one note forte, the next piano. Mahler changed these to fp on the first note, giving a sharper accent to the dissonances in Fl and Vn1. <3>

34-6: Vn1 divisi, see Ex.28.5. This is partly to increase the delicacy of the sound, but also to emphasise the stretto effect.

38: The phrasing of Fl, Ob1/2 and Vc/Cb is made to conform to Fgl/2 and Va, fitting well with the harmonic sense of the passage.

67-70: Hrl/2 are marked out and the viola parts at one time had a glued in addition. See Ex.28.6. The most likely explanation of this passage is to assume that Mahler originally added the viola part to complete
the harmony of the horns; but that later he objected to these partly harmonic parts, and also preferred to save the entry of the horns until the climax of the passage. From the use of pencil and the fact that the deletion of the horns is marked in English, it would seem most likely that the removal of the horns and the return to the original viola part took place in New York at the same time.

82-4: Vnl *divisi* as in b.34-6. The G and F are raised an octave for consistency.

91: Vc/Cb are definitely marked *f* and Vnl has a break marked before the A, which has an accent and a *diminuendo* through the rest of the bar, with *rit* on the last three notes. Norman Del Mar has pointed out the inauthenticity of this *forte,* <4> and the consequence of Mahler's acceptance of it may be seen in the Luftpause, accent, *diminuendo* and *rit.* which he felt obliged to place in Vnl, all four being necessary to justify the *forte* and preserve the line of the movement.

95: Vnl has two semiquaver appogiaturas, d' and f', to intensify the *forte.*

28.2.5 Selected Passages - 3rd movement

Minuet

1 & 8: Hrl/2 & Trl/2 *ppp* in blue pencil at both entries. There are similar neurotic concerns in the pencilled markings of the string parts.

10 & 12: Hrl/2 have their crotchets replaced by quavers and quaver rests, as in Fgl/2.

13: The quaver rests are here notated by *staccato* wedges in Fl & Hrl/2.
the theme: legato versus staccato; soft versus loud.

17-8 & 19-20: Hairpins, two crotchets up, four crotchets down.

21-3: Hairpins, one bar up, arriving forte, and two bars down.

24 & 26: Second two crotchets have staccato wedges.

Mahler mirrors the melodic sequence with a graded increase in dynamic level. The legato of b.17-23 provokes a staccato reaction in b.24 & b.26. As so often, maximum contrast is the result of these modifications.

28-42: The first bar of the theme has hairpins every time it appears in Vn1/Va.

32-5 & 36-9: The theme in Vn1/Fl is phrased with two staccato notes at the beginning of b.34 and b.38.

Mahler phrases 32-9 in two bar periods as suggested by the imitation, but not as phrased in Mozart's original Vn1/Fl parts.

44-51: The head of the theme again has hairpins at every entry.

52-59: As b.9-16.

Trio

60-1 & 64-5: Diminuendo under each entry in pencil.

75-9: The piano begins in b.76 and is followed by dim which leads to ppp in b.79. By delaying the piano of b.75 until b.76 Mahler makes the periodic structure appear more symmetrical than Mozart's original.

80-87: Fgl/2 & Fl pp in b.80. Strings pp from the upbeat to b.82. All
the same as Fgl. By changing the articulation of the flute at the end the variety of phrasing is reduced. The echo in the dynamics looks impressive on paper, but probably took a lot of trouble to achieve in practice.

28.2.6 Selected Passages - 4th movement

1-4: Accents on each note in Vnl, with two bars per bow.

9-12: The bowing in this movement is often totally inconsistent between desks; except for staccato statements of the motto theme which are consistently played with four downbows, as here in Vn2.

14-5: Br diminuendo in b.14, piano in b.15.

16-7: Br & Pk forte on the 2nd note of b.16, diminuendo in b.17.

36-52: Collation of the string parts yields no sensible information as to the bowing.

57-60: Ww have fp at the beginning of each new note. Br p in b.57. The D in Hrl is tied between b.58 and b.59.

61-3: Wind cresc.

64-5: All entries in wind ff.

74-7: Vnl play this subject in two bows, beginning upbow and changing to downbow on the D. Fgl/2 forte in b.77.

86-93: Strings pianissimo.

115-22: Br & Pk piano, Vnl fff. Fl & Obl/2 are forte on the crotchets, with fp on the semibreves.
123-7: Vn1/2 mf with crescendo in b.127. Vc/Cb fff from the 2nd note.
Fl, Obl/2 & Hrl/2 fp on the semibreves and forte on the crotchets. Pk
fp on the first notes of b.123 & b.125. The sense of the dynamic
modifications is fine; even if the means employed appear excessive.

130: Fl, Hrl/2, Pk, Vn1/2 ff instead of sf on the re-establishment of
the major mode.

145-151: A crescendo of six bars leads to ff. This begins later in the
Br (b.146) and Pk (b.148).

154: St pp, Fgl doubled.

157: Repeat struck out in blue pencil.

161-5: Obl/Fgl f in b.161, Vn1/2 pp in b.162. Diminuendo in all parts
in b.164-5.

163: Obl/Fgl slur first two notes of each group of four. Vnl.1 & Vc3
have rit in pencil in b.165. The purpose of the added slurs in Ob and
Fg could have been to make life easier for the players; but, if so it
is strange that this is the only place where they occur. It seems more
likely, then, that Mahler did this as part of the transition he plans
to the A-minor section.

166: All instruments ppp. Hrl/2 have four accents, ">>>".

219-225: See Ex.28.7 for Mahler’s fine gradation of dynamics which
prepares the entry of Vnl and the beginning of the recapitulation very
beautifully.

233-253: Vn1/2 fp on the semibreves. This allows the violins to be
heard, while not overpowering the wind.

284-5: All instruments ppp, except Fgl and Obl who are mf and doubled.
344-9: Instead of the long crescendo of the Exposition, Mahler puts mf in b.344 and ff in b.347.

351: Fgl forte and doubled, and with the remark meno in pencil.

351-353: Strings diminuendo from 2nd half of b.351. All parts pp in b.353.

356: lma volta bar deleted.

361-372: Vnl has ">" accents on all notes, and two bars per bow.

372-402 Mahler's dynamic scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>ff (2nd note)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>Hr</td>
<td>ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Fl1/2, Ob1/2</td>
<td>fff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>Vn2</td>
<td>fff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>Vn1</td>
<td>fff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vn2</td>
<td>mf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>Fg2, Cb</td>
<td>ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hr</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trl/2, Vn1, Va</td>
<td>mf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vc</td>
<td>mf (2nd note)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>Vn2</td>
<td>mf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>Hr</td>
<td>ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cb</td>
<td>mf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>fff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vc</td>
<td>mf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vn1</td>
<td>fff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>mf (2nd note)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

389-423: Mahler employs Hr1-4 and Trl/2 in reinforcing the four note motif:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>REINFORCEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>389-92</td>
<td>Hr1-4 reinforce Fg2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393-6</td>
<td>Hr1-4 reinforce Fgl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397-400</td>
<td>Hr1-4 reinforce Ob1 until 1st minim of b.400.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-3</td>
<td>Trl/2 reinforce Vnl until 1st crotchet of b.403.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reinforcement by the horns can also be heard on Bruno Walter's last
not sound offensive and it allows the four note motif to be heard, crowning the work with an apotheosis of this theme. However, Walter does not add the trumpets, in which Mahler undoubtedly goes too far.

403-6: Mahler's dynamic scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td><em>forte</em> on 2nd note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td><em>diminuendo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td><em>mf</em> in Vnl/2, rest piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td><em>ff</em> from 2nd note</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This treatment mirrors that of b.14-7 with heightened intensity.

Moreover Mahler's dynamic scheme, with its emphasis on b.406, makes a good transition to a much simpler texture.

420: Pk *fff* on 2nd note, in pencil.
Chapter 29

Schubert, Symphony No.9, D.944

Mahler conducted Schubert's Great C major Symphony five times:

- Hamburg PO 5 Nov 1894
- Vienna PO 1 Apr 1900
- New York PO 1 Nov 1910
  4 Nov 1910
  6 Nov 1910

It is noticeable that Mahler only conducted this work with ensembles of which he was the permanent conductor, never as a guest. The performances represent three separate periods of Mahler's career and he would have reviewed his interpretation of the work each time. Nevertheless, it is surprising to find so many points in common between the sources.

As will become clear, Mahler's changes to Schubert IX are in many cases not so much Retuschen as re-instrumentation and restructuring, both in terms of dynamics and in terms of the actual notes. They have been presented here without detailed comment where no objective musical justification could be found for preferring Mahler's changes to Schubert's original.
29.1 Sources

29.1.1 Score, P.47

This score, in the library of Southampton University, is in the Peters edition with the stamp of Böhme, Hamburg. Rehearsal letters have been inserted throughout in blue pencil including additional letters, for instance Mm in the finale. Bar numbers have been inserted in lead pencil every five bars in the first movement. A part for E-flat clarinet is indicated by means of the circle with a horizontal line through it, and parts for extra horn and trumpet pairs are also specified. There are many other markings in pencil and blue pencil in this score which was obviously used to prepare orchestral parts.

29.1.2 Score, P.48

This score, in the Breitkopf edition, came from the estate of Theodore Spiering, Mahler's concertmaster during his two seasons with the New York Philharmonic Orchestra, and is in the Bayerischer Staatsbibliothek, Munich. It bears Mahler's signature in red pencil on the front cover, his facsimile stamp Gustav Mahler / Wien in the front and on the title page, and has Retuschen in red ink, red pencil and blue pencil. Extra rehearsal numbers have been added in blue pencil. There are 38 in the first movement, 19 in the second, 20 in the Scherzo, and 33 in the Finale. Cuts are marked in P.48 by the word Vi-de in blue pencil. This score was copied from P.47.
29.1.3 Set of Orchestral Parts, P.49

A set of orchestral parts is found in the U.E. Archive. The parts in this set have the facsimile stamp Gustav Mahler / Wien. There are a double set of woodwind and extra manuscript parts for Hr3/4 and Tr3/4. The string parts are in the proportion 9,9,6,5,5. All these parts have been prepared from the score, P.48, from which they differ in detail. There marks for cuts are various, many having been made by players in rehearsal.

29.2 Dating of Sources

The score, P.47, is clearly earlier than the other sources, and the Hamburg stamp and the part for E-flat clarinet are consistent with the supposition that this was the version of the work which he performed in Hamburg in 1894. P.48 and P.49 have Viennese stamps, and this fact plus the extra brass parts of P.49 which were prepared in Vienna give 1900 as the date of their first use. The marks in English and the association with Spiering indicate also that P.48 and P.49 were used in New York in November 1910.

29.3 Previous Literature

The only previous investigation of Mahler's Retuschen in Schubert IX was by Peter Andraschke in an article in 1975. <1> The study is entirely based on P.48. <2> There are many examples given of Mahler's changes of dynamics, including an examination of the opening theme.
29.4 The Main Characteristics of Mahler's Interpretation

Unless otherwise stated, the discussion below is based on P.48.

N.B. Bar numbers in the Eulenburg score are inaccurate in the first movement, being marked one bar too late from b.300.

29.4.1 Timings

Timings are found in the parts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ps2</td>
<td>47 Mi</td>
<td>at the beginning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vn2.4</td>
<td>14½</td>
<td>at end of 1st mvt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>at end of 2nd mvt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Pausen</td>
<td>at end of 3rd mvt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57 Min</td>
<td>at end of 4th mvt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vn2.7</td>
<td>Dir. Mahler ohne Wiederholung 58 min. 1./4/1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Va1</td>
<td>47 Min</td>
<td>at beginning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Va2</td>
<td>55 Minuten</td>
<td>at end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cb2</td>
<td>60 minute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At first glance one is inclined to disbelieve the total timing of 57 minutes, and to explain it as a mistake on the part of the record keeper; but there is sufficient agreement on this time to take it seriously as the duration of the Vienna performance. The timing of 47 minutes is also found in two different parts. This timing agrees with that recorded by Edwin Hyde at Mahler's 1 Nov 1910 performance in New York. <3> Hyde states that the performance had cuts, but unfortunately does not tell us which ones. Likewise, as far as the players' timings of individual movements are concerned it is difficult to assess them.
Without knowing whether they have been timed with or without cuts, the first movement timing of 14:30 is comparable to Walter's of 14:39 without the repeat. The second movement represents a metronome of 92 quavers per minute, without cuts. This is slow, but comparable with Futwängler's timing of 16:40.

8 Pausen in Vn2.4 cannot be a timing for the Scherzo if we are to arrive at a total time of 57 minutes; and given Mahler's predilection for slow Scherzi in Beethoven we can postulate timings for the last two movements at least as long as Walter's 9:55 & 12:35. Adding these to the timings for the first two movements given in Vn2.4, plus 40 seconds for the first repeat of the Trio, we obtain a total of 54:40 minutes which, even with gaps between the movements of 30 seconds each, gives around 56 minutes and is still short of the recorded 57-8 minutes.

The only conclusion that can be drawn is that even without cuts Mahler's tempi must have been exceptionally slow in the last three movements.

29.4.2 Repeats

P.48 gives no information about the repeat in the first movement, but there are many indications in P.49 that Mahler did not make it.

The first repeat in the Scherzo is struck from P.49, though not from P.48; while the second repeat is excised from P.48/9. The first repeat of the Trio is indicated in P.48/9, and the second one is removed.

In the finale the repeat is struck from P.48/9.

29.4.3 Cuts

In July 1900, Mahler spoke to Natalie Bauer-Lechner about Schubert's
...his technical skill is far from equalling his feeling and his inventive power. How easily he takes things when it comes to developing his ideas! Six sequences follow one after the other, and then comes still another one in a new key. No elaboration, no artistically finished development of his original idea! Instead, he repeats himself so much that you could cut out half the piece without doing it any harm. For each repetition is already a lie. A work of art must evolve perpetually (immer weiter entwickeln), like life. If it doesn't, hypocrisy and theatricality set in. For Schubert's melody, like Beethoven's and Wagner's, is eternal. That's why he shouldn't fall back on the formalism of Haydn and Mozart, which was intrinsic to the structure of their works."

*The Musical Courier*, reviewing Mahler's New York performances of November 1910, stated that there were three cuts without specifying where they were: <8> but according to P.48/9 there were more than that.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BARS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF BARS CUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd mvt:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-82</td>
<td>31 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178-205</td>
<td>28 bars &lt;9&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267-85</td>
<td>19 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th mvt:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-32</td>
<td>12 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293-336</td>
<td>42 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>853-88</td>
<td>36 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1017-20</td>
<td>4 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025-32</td>
<td>8 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1037-40</td>
<td>4 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1045-8</td>
<td>4 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1073-92</td>
<td>20 bars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that all these cuts were made at a late stage in Mahler's preparation of P.48, since the excised bars contain Retuschen. Although surrounded by passages in which demisemiquavers have been substituted for semiquavers in the timpani part of P.49, the lack of demisemiquavers in b.1073-92 suggests that the excision of these bars occurred earlier than the other cuts in the finale.

Bars 178-205 of the second movement were deleted in lead pencil as
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by Andraschke to indicate that Mahler first added the cut in rehearsal. But while this may be true, it could also be irrelevant, since the significance of the cut, and the fact that the same cut already appears in P.47, most likely indicate that Mahler simply overlooked it when copying P.48 from P.47.

In P.47, b.52-82 and b.182-209 <10> were cut in the second movement; and only b.293-336 in the finale, and it is possible that in the performance criticised above Mahler made only these three cuts. If this were true, the additional cuts must have been made only in his last performance, which was in Brooklyn. But the cuts to be described in the finale are so well done that only a listener who had memorized the work would be able to pinpoint them. Even with a score it would be necessary to hear the work several times to establish with certainty what Mahler actually did, and I therefore consider it almost certain that the critic heard Mahler’s final version but was only aware of the three cuts in the second movement and was ignorant of those in the finale.

Mahler removes approximately 20% of the second movement which, on the basis of the discussion of tempi above, shortens it by 3½ minutes. The first two cuts remove structural repetitions in the First Group which in Schubert’s original Exposition runs: <11>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24-29</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Codetta: A major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-51</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-57</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Codetta varied: A major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-82</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Varied restatement of B1: A minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-88</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Codetta again varied: A major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beginning at b.210 of the Recapitulation, B2 is replaced by a real development, which provokes a different Bridge to the Second Group.
Accordingly, Mahler removes sections A2 and B2 in the Exposition, and in the Recapitulation he cuts after the 2nd bar of A1 to the 3rd bar of A2, excising B1 and leaving the extended development of B2.

Although it does strengthen Schubert's structure, the cutting of these passages and also the first statement of the Second Subject in the Recapitulation (b.267-85) was probably also provoked by Mahler's slow tempo.

Mahler shortens the finale by 11%. By cutting b.121-32, he shortens the Bridge in the Exposition, in the process making the modulation to the dominant more cogent and losing no new motivic development.

As is his custom, Schubert includes developmental sections in his Second Group. There are three of these, the second in each case being a development of the first:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPOSITION</th>
<th>RECAPITULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>257-292</td>
<td>845-880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293-336</td>
<td>881-924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337-384b</td>
<td>925-972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mahler cuts the second section in the Exposition (b.293-336) and the first section in the Recapitulation (b.853-88), thus reserving the more discursive section for the Recapitulation.

The remaining cuts tighten the structure of Schubert's Terminal Development (b.973-1104). The original structure of the first half of this is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>973-84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>dev of A material (3 x 4 bars: modulatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>985-92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>dev of B material (8 bars: Eb major)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>993-1004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>section 1 transposed (3 x 4 bars: modulatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005-12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>section 2 (8 bars: F major)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1013-24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>section 1 transposed (3 x 4 bars: modulatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025-32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>section 2 (8 bars: G major)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1033-48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>section 1 transposed (4 x 4 bars: modulatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1049-56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>section 2 (8 bars: C major)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mahler removes Section 6 and trims Sections 5 and 7, making of these one section of 5 x 4 bars:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>BARS CUT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5'</td>
<td>1017-20</td>
<td>2 x 4 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7'</td>
<td>1037-40</td>
<td>3 x 4 bars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second half of the Terminal Development, Schubert’s structure is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1057-64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8 bars: &quot;C1&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1065-72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8 bars: &quot;C2&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1073-6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4 bars: &quot;D1&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1077-84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8 bars: &quot;C2&quot; (identical to Section 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1085-92</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8 bars: &quot;C1&quot; (identical to Section 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093-1104</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12 bars: &quot;D2&quot; (b.1093-6 essentially as D1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mahler removes Sections 11, 12 and 13, leaving a much tighter structure.

In all these cuts Mahler shows a strong grasp of the symphony’s structure and he very skillfully excises repetitious material, the omission of which does no damage to Schubert’s conception.

29.4.4 Extra Brass

From P.48 it can be seen that the employment of Mahler’s full complement underlines the climaxes of the work, but the New York critics claimed that Mahler went too far in allowing the brass to dominate. Krehbiehl in the *New York Daily Tribune* mentioned particularly that:

...the fine string tone - muscular is the favorite descriptive word - was of thrilling effect when not overwhelmed by the brass and the fairly ear-splitting kettledrums. This happened frequently in the symphony and the symphonic poem (Zarathustra). But it will soon become as great a weariness to the flesh to mention it as it will be to endure it... <12>
memorable and he made further express mention of it in his obituary notice, complaining of Mahler:

...fortifying the brass in Schubert's C major until the sweet Vienna singer of nearly a century ago seemed a modern Maly running amuck... <13>

The critic of the *New York Times* also noted that:

...The brasses blew so loudly in Schubert's symphony that the effect was more than once harsh and bleating... <14>

Probably the place which gave most offence was the end of the first movement.

Mahler employs Hr3/4 in the first and last movements and in the Trio of the Scherzo. The use of the extra horn pair gives examples of many functions:

- doubling of Hr1/2 which often have different parts from those written by Schubert: 1st mvt, b.662-84.

- the addition of notes to complete harmonies in conjunction with the original Hr1/2 parts: 1st mvt, b.96-101.

- reinforcement of bassoons: 1st mvt, b.288 et seq.

- replacement of original bassoon notes where Fg1/2 have been rewritten: 1st mvt, b.40 et seq.

- reinforcing clarinets at pitch: 4th mvt, b.241-56.

- together with Tr3/4, reinforcing woodwind at a lower octave: 1st mvt, b.228-40.

- together with Tr3/4, reinforcing Tr1/2 in unison: 1st mvt, b.608 et seq.

Tr3/4 are used in all but the second movement. Unlike their contribution to Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, it cannot be claimed that they are employed with restraint in this work, since Mahler had no qualms about using them frequently as melodic instruments, together with Hr3/4, and in such a way as to dominate the texture completely.
Often Mahler derives the extra notes for \( T3/4 \) by reinforcing \( F1/2 \) an octave lower; and when this is done the original pair of trumpets is often left untouched:


In these cases \( T3 \) reinforces \( F1 \) an octave lower, while \( T4 \) reinforces either \( F1/2 \) or \( O1/2 \), and in such circumstances the tone of the trumpets serves two functions simultaneously.

In bars 48 and 50 of the first movement, \( T3/4 \) play the parts originally written for \( C11/2 \) who are now united with \( O1/2 \) on the original \( O1/2 \) part. \( T1/2 \) do not play in this passage. Since the woodwind are doubled, there are 12 instruments playing with \( O1/2 \), and the introduction of \( T3/4 \) to reinforce \( F1/2 \) at the octave does not seem excessive, since the timbre answers well to the strings and trombones of the preceding bar.

At the end of the first movement, Mahler employs four trumpets and four horns. Thus, in bars 608-12, \( T3/4 \) and \( Hr3/4 \) join \( T1/2 \) and, with doubled wind and a powerful string section, this need not sound worse than extremely powerful. When the opening theme of the movement returns in bar 662, Mahler again employs all the trumpets and horns.

In P.49, \( T2 \) at one time had \textit{Schalltrichter auf!} here.

Apart from the bold addition of the second pair of trumpets, Mahler also extended the range of \( T1/2 \) in this work.

In the first mvt, bars 480-92, Mahler writes a new part, employing notes unavailable on the natural instrument, part of which agrees with \( F1/1 \). See Ex.29.4
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main voice of the violins, and it sounds well; but it is surprising that Mahler sought to add it. Perhaps the reason for its presence here is the fact that it appears also in the earlier score, P.47, which dates from a period when Mahler was more free in his additions.

29.4.5 Timpani

Mahler's Retuschen in the timpani are not extensive in this work. They involve the re-tuning of the C drum towards the end of exposition of the first movement, in the Trio of the Scherzo and in the Finale. Some of these pitch changes are not found in P.49. Although there are many passages where Schubert omits them for harmonic reasons, Mahler does not add the timpani by analogy with other passages in P.48, though he does this in the finale in P.47. This is different from his practice in Beethoven and Schumann. He adds timpani to reinforce the bass in the Trio of the Scherzo; an addition which can also be heard in Walter's last recording <15>

In many places the timpani have faster rolls than notated by Schubert, indicating a tremolo rather than a measured pulsation. Except for b.553 of the 1st movement, these changes of pulsation appear only in P.49, and were written in by a player. In the first movement, each occurrence of semiquavers is replaced by demisemiquavers. Demisemiquavers are also introduced in the finale. These replace quavers in b.143-4, triplet quavers in b.157-60, and semiquavers in numerous other passages including b.273-4, b.309-44, b.679-87, and b.1151-2. Semiquavers and quavers were retained in b.515-58.

The trumpets and timpani were removed altogether from the beginning of the first movement Allegro.
Selected Passages - 1st movement

In the descriptions which follow, one asterisk (*) is used to indicate that the preceding Retusche is present in P.47. Two asterisks (**) indicate that the version of P.47 is only slightly different.

1-8: See Ex.29.1 for the opening horn melody. * The phrasing and dynamics are perfectly consistent with the structure of the theme and are also applied in b.9-16 and b.61-6. Musical America, in reviewing the first of the November 1910 performances wrote that

...an exaggerated sense of dramatic contrast was given to the different phrases of the first melody. <16>

17 & 21: Va/Vc Piano espressivo with pp in b.19. This is a natural effect, which can be heard on Walter's recording <17>

36: Ww doubled ff, Br fp, St dim. This may enable the wind entry in b.36-7 to be perceived as an imitation of the rest of the orchestra in b.35-6.

38-53: Ww doubled in b.40, 43, 45, 47-8, 50 & 52-3. In b.40, 43 & 45, Cl1/2 reinforce F1l/2, Fgl/2 take over Cl1/2 original, and Hr3/4 take over Fgl/2 original. St pizz in the piano bars. <18> In b.48, 50, 52-3, Fll-4 play Fll part, Ob1-4 & Cl1-4 play Ob1 part, Tr3/4 play Cl1/2 original, and Hr3/4 reinforce Fgl-4. These Retuschen enlarge the contrast between piano and fortissimo, and the wind parts are no longer at a disadvantage against powerful string unisons.

59-60: Cl1/2 reinforce Ob1/2. Hr3/4 reinforce Ob1/2 8va bassa in b.59 only. <19> Hr1/2 tacent 2nd crotchet of b.59. Ww dynamics mf in b.59, p dim in b.60. Fl1/2 are ff in b.59. By the removal of the diminution of the theme in Hr1/2 and the strengthening of the original in the rest
of the wind, Mahler simplifies Schubert's texture and produces a climax in the middle of b.59.

74: C11/2 reinforce F11/2 original. Hr3/4 play C11/2 original. Fg1/2 reinforce Obl. <20> Cl, Fg, Tr & St mf, Ps fp on 2nd half of b.74, Pk p in b.74.

75: F11-4 play F11 original in b.75. C11/2, Hr3/4 & Fg1/2 have the same notes as in b.74. <21>

76-7: Ww doubled. Hr1/2 doubled. Tr1/2 doubled in b.77 only. Tr1/2 mf cresc, Ps p cresc and St f cresc. In P.49, Tr3 & Pk have accelerando in pencil in b.77.

Mahler employs his full resources here to strengthen the crescendo leading to the Allegro.

78-94: Tr1/2 originally had Ds and As added to complete the melody; but Mahler subsequently deleted Tr and Pk in P.48, leaving only the strings. <22> From b.90, Ww doubled, C11/2 8va, and Obl/2 as C11/2 in b.90. <23>

94-122: Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2 until 1st note of b.102. Ww doubled. Tr & Ps tacent in b.98. Ps & Pk removed from b.102 onwards. In P.49, Ps1-3 are removed in pencil from b.76-129.

By removing inessential doublings, confusing counter-rhythms in the timpani, and harmonic thickening, Mahler makes a much clearer and lighter texture at the end of the Andante and the beginning of the Allegro.

128-131: Ww doubled until the 1st half of b.131. Br & Pk dim p in b.131. This gives a better transition to the next bar where the strings are alone.

29.4.6 - Schubert IX, P.48/9 - 1st mvt
132-3: All downbows.

134-8, 142-6: Hr1/2 & Ps1/3 tacent. St pp. The omission of the brass and the softening of the strings allows Ww to stand out more easily.

155 (last note) - 156 (1st note): Ps tacent, Ww doubled. Pk have D at the beginning of b.156.

157-8: As b.155-6.

162-74: See Ex.29.2 for the brass parts which were rewritten to take account of valve instruments. ** Mahler subsequently removed Ps.

185-92: As b.155-6. <24>


Calling on his full forces for the second time in the work, Mahler ensures that the climax of the Exposition receives full weight.

240, 242 & 243: Pk have B in P.48, though not in P.49.

241-3: Last note of each bar tenuto in the wind, with wedges over 1st three crotchets of b.241 & 243.

248-9: Ds replace rests in Pk.

252-3: Cl 8va on 1st note and Hr adds the A. Obl-4, Cl1-4, Fgl-4 & Hr1-2 play here.

262 - 267 (3rd note): Vn2 tacent.

29.4.6 - Schubert IX, P.48/9 - 1st mvt
278-303: Hr3/4 reinforce Fgl/2 from b.288. Psl/3 have hairpins in b.278, 280 & 284 in P.49. Obl/2 join Fll/2 in last 3 notes of b.303.

Schubert's long crescendo is reorganised by Mahler:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
<th>PART</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>pp (subito)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>pp (subito)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td>wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>mf</td>
<td>FlOb Cl Vn Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Fg Hr3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Tr Vc Cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td>St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Fl Ob Cl St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>mf</td>
<td>Cl Fg Hr3/4 Vn Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Vc Cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>p (subito)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td>Fl Ob Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Fl Ob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mf</td>
<td>Cl Fg Hr3/4 Tr Vn Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Vc Cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td>Cl Fg Hr3/4 Vc Cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>p cresc</td>
<td>Fl Ob Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td>Vn Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Ww</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mf</td>
<td>Tr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mf cresc</td>
<td>Vc Cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302-3</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>ff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two processes in this scheme. One takes care of the balance of the parts, subduing the strings, particularly the basses, and bringing out the woodwind, particularly Fgl/2, who are reinforced by Hr3/4. The other process is the general dynamic which is organised in waves, with bars grouped 2, 4, 4, 4, 10. This latter process is already to be seen in P.47.

304-15: Ww doubled. Obl/2 join Fll/2 from the 2nd note of b.303 until b.311. Ps f in b.304, cresc in b.312-5.

forces and by grading the dynamics, Mahler makes b.324 the climax of the Development.

326-7: Cl1/2 ff dim.

328-55: A long diminuendo, with morendo in b.354, leads to ppp in b.356.

356-404: This whole passage has pp and ppp in all parts, with suppression of hairpins. To help this, Obl/2 tacent in b.368-72, and Hr1/2 tacent in b.370-72.

404-36: Vnl 8va in b.412-3. Fg1/2 have forte in b.406, 410 & 414. Ww doubled in b.424-7 and b.430-33. Mahler leaves Schubert's long crescendo, at a late stage asking Fg1/2 to emerge from the texture, and doubling the woodwind only where they answer the strings.

439-40: A Luftpause is marked in P.48 between these two bars.

440-52: Hr1/2 & Ps2/3 tacent.

453 & 457: Fl2 doubled in P.49 only.

464-6: Obl doubled in P.49 only.

Mahler must have had difficulty achieving the right balance and made changes to the doubling in rehearsal.

466 - 468 (1st crotchet): Fg2 doubles Fg1, ff in b.466-7. This removes the heaviness of the lower octave but also introduces a comic effect.

480-92: See Ex.29.4 for changes in Br and Pk. Ww doubled in b.486-91.

546-58: Reinforcement of Cl1/2 by Tr3/4 (unison) and Hr3/4 (8va bassa). Tr1/2 p and Ps mf in b.546. Pk have demisemiquavers in the

29.4.6 - Schubert IX, P.48/9 - 1st mvt
There is a Luftpause before b.555 and appogiaturas in Vn1 (e''') and Vn2 (c'''') in b.555. Ww doubled.

558 & 562: All downbows in P.49.

564-70: Br enter with fp and Pk p, making crescendo to ff. Ww doubled from b.568.

570 (2nd half): St ppp.

608-12: Tr3/4 & Hr3/4 reinforce Tr1/2 at the unison, dropping an octave as Ps1 in b.611. * Ww doubled in b.608-11.

626-33: Hr1 reinforces C12 in b.626-9 and Fgl in b.682-3. Hr3/4 reinforces C12 from b.630.

634-49: Ww doubled. Tr3/4 & Hr3/4 reinforce Tr1/2. ** In P.49, Ps have grace notes written in by players indicating that their rhythm is to match the trumpets and horns.

650-661: C11/2 forte and doubled. Ob, Cl, Fg forte and Hr1/2 mf in b.654. Ob/Fg doubled from b.656, Fl doubled from b.657.

662-end: See Ex.29.5 for Mahler's changes. <26> The most important are the shortening of the last note of each phrase, * the suppression of the strings in b.676-7, and the domination of Tr3/4. As in the Unfinished Symphony, <27> Schubert has here inverted the woodwind parts in such a way that the theme is not clear. Mahler clarifies the voice leading, leaving the woodwind parts intact while delineating the main voice with Tr3/4, an octave below Fl1. Tr1/2 play Schubert's original parts and the secondary voices are filled in by Hr1-4. Tr3/4 unite with Tr1/2 for the last two bars.
From Lovey we learn that Mahler was not the only conductor of his period to use the trumpet here:

The scoring ... is notoriously miscalculated; but there is a better remedy for it that the horrible marine-parade custom of giving the tune to the trumpet... <28>

29.4.7 Selected Passages - 2nd movement

38-41: Hr2 has C-sharp on 2nd note of b.38 & b.40. Cl doubled in b.38 & b.40. Fl, Ob & Fg doubled in b.39, and in b.41 until 5th note. Hr1/2 fp on both notes of b.39, ff in b.40, and fp cresc in b.41. Trl/2 fp on all notes in b.38 & b.40. Ps forte. By following the doubled parts we discover what Mahler wanted to be heard at any time.

38, 69, 223 & 233: In P.49, Cl2 has a drawing of an upturned instrument, indicating that Mahler had asked for "Schalltrichter auf!".

42: Ww and Hr1/2 have semiquavers and demisemiquaver rests instead of dotted notes.

51 & 82: All hairpins removed to allow Fl1/Obl to be heard well.

67-8: St, Trl/2 & Pk diminuendo piano to enable the other instruments to be heard. Fl1/2 reinforced by Cl3/4 (unison) and Tr3/4 (8va bassa). Hr1/2 reinforce Fg1/2. Ww doubled.

69-72: Similar to b.38-41. Cl doubled in b.69. Fl, Ob, Fg doubled in b.70. Fl & Ob doubled in b.72 until 5th note. Hr2 has C-sharp in b.69. In b.71, Hr1 reinforces Cl1, Cl2 reinforces Hr2, and Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2. In b.72, Hr1/2 reinforce the 1st five notes of Cl1/2. As earlier, the doublings are highly selective and well calculated to enable the line to emerge.
126: C13/4 reinforce Fl1/2. Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2. Ww doubled.

130: C13/4 reinforce Ob2. Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2. Ww doubled, ff.

133: C13/4 reinforce Ob2. Hr 3/4 reinforce Fg1/2. (Hr3 crotchet rest at beginning of bar.) Trl/2 reinforce Hr1/2 8va bassa. Ww doubled.

125-36: Downbows on all crotchets until b.132. Mahler supplements

Schubert's dynamics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>DYNAMICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125-6</td>
<td>f (as in Schubert)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>p cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129-30</td>
<td>ff (Hr3/4 f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>p cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132-3</td>
<td>ff (Hr3/4 f, Ps3 mf in b.133.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>mf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>mf dim (Ps3 p dim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>p dim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Retuschen in the wind and the dynamics are particularly scrupulously calculated. They are similar in P.47, though not as subtle.

148-55: In P.49 there are indications that Vc only held the notes for a crotchet, with a crotchet rest, and that Vn inserted a quaver rest at the end of each bar. This throws the interest onto Hrl and prepares for long notes in b.156-9. <29>

163-4: See Ex.29.6 for the different bowings of Vn1.1 and Vn1.4. However, these are both off the string effects which sound similar.

165-6: Obi hairpins, up in b.165, down in b.166.

190-4 & 219-225: Essentially as earlier.

227 & 229: Cl1/2 8va, C13/4 play original, Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2, Ww

29.4.7 - Schubert IX, P.48/9 - 2nd mvt
232-49: Ww & Hr1/2 doubled. Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2 in b.248. Cl1 has a picture of a raised instrument in the part. Ps fp on each note. In b.249, wind and Pk tacent, * Vn/Va two downbows.

253-4: Vc hairpins removed. Vc sul D until the 1st note of b.256, thereafter sul A.

258: Hairpin in Ob1 moved here from previous bar.

299-310: Ww doubled in b.300, b.302, b.304, & b.306-7. Fl1/2 reinforced by Ob3/4 in b.302 and Cl3/4 in b.304. The dynamic scheme in the strings supplements Schubert's nuances and reflects the 3 x 4 bar periods. <30>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>DYNAMICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Br p with accents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>p cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>f presumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>mf cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Ps p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

321-32: Ps con sord. Hr1/2 stopped in P.49. Diminuendo, to ppp in b.330. Commas indicate gaps between the chords in Hr1 and Ps. *

332: St crescendo begins from pp.

338-41: Cl1 two bars crescendo, two bars diminuendo.

342-7: Hr1/2, Ps, St ppp (sempre). A carefully notated scheme in Fl, Ob, Cl replaces the hairpins: [30]

29.4.7 - Schubert IX, P.48/9 - 2nd mvt
352-3: Essentially as 219-20.

356: Obl/2 tacent.

373: Tr1/2 reinforce Obl/2.

29.4.8 Selected Passages - 3rd movement

5: Throughout the movement there are discrepancies between P.48 and P.49 which indicate that at some time Mahler phrased the motif introduced here in Obl as one quaver staccato and five quavers legato, as Schubert notated it only in b.29; and it is not clear whether he eventually reverted to Schubert's original. He may have done this merely to simplify the playing.

11-2: Fg1 forte, Fl, Ob, Cl, Hr ppp, Pk pp. This is a good example of the consistency with which Mahler changes dynamics throughout the movement to ensure that the two bar motif emerges from the accompaniment, and is already a feature of P.47.

29-30: Tr, Ps & Pk tacent. Here as elsewhere, Mahler doubles the motif in Cl1/Fg1. Ww have diminuendo in b.30. <31>

33-6: In P.48/9, Fg/Hr removed from b.33-4. In P.49, Hr removed from b.35-6 also. Mahler replaces the accent by hairpins in Vn1 in b.33 and Vc in b.35, doing the same at every appearance of this theme.

29.4.7 - Schubert IX, P.48/9 - 2nd mvt
49-51: St ppp in b.49. Obl reinforces Fll in b.49-50. Fl2 doubles Fll in b.51. Mahler's *subito ppp* has two purposes: to make the crescendo more impressive and to allow the woodwind to dominate.

57-64: All wind have *fp* in each bar.

65: Obl/2, Cll/2 doubled. All minims shortened to crotchets, except in Fgl/2. This allows Ob and Cl to be heard in a reverberant acoustic.

78-83: Fgl/2 & Hrl/2 reinforce each other playing thirds. Ww doubled on the last note only of b.79 and 83. The doubling of Fg and Hr solves the problem of balancing the different timbres; and the doubling of the woodwind for one note expands the dynamic range considerably.

86-8: Fll doubled and reinforced by Cll. <32> All parts *f dim pp*.

97-104: Vnl *Griffbrett*. Crescendo removed from all parts, and hairpins added in Vnl, Obl and Cll/2 (cresc in b.97 & b.101, dim in b.98 & b.102). The hairpins in Obl were subsequently removed.

105: Pk has *f Holzschlägel* written by a player.

113: In P.49, St reduced to 8,6,4,2,1 until b.136. In contrast to P.47, this is the only place where Mahler reduces the strings in P.49. The reduction begins here six bars earlier than in P.47.

128-30: St *poco crescendo*.

131: St *subito pp*, Ww *subito p*. *

133: Ww cresc.

134: St cresc.

29.4.8 - Schubert IX, P.48/9 - 3rd mvt
193: Tr, Ps, Pk tacent to allow Obi-4 and C1l-4 to be heard in a reverberant acoustic.

195-7: Vnl.8 rit in b.195. Luftpause in all parts after b.196.

197-204: Hr1/2 tacent until b.200. Vnl Griffbrett! Hairpins as in b.97-104.

213: St (subito) pp, Fl1/C1l forte, rest of wind (subito) p. Mahler's Retuschen are different here from those in b.49 because Schubert's instrumentation is different.


229-38: Ww doubled. St mf in b.229 cresc in b.231 and ff in b.234.

Mahler substitutes a crescendo for Schubert's uniform ff and emphasises the wind instruments at the beginning of the passage.

TRIO

239-42: In P.49, Hr have mf with diminuendo, to pp in b.242. *

247-62: Tovey notes here that

...the scoring, though full of interesting points, does not easily realize Schubert's evident intentions: and until we can afford a double wind-band we are compelled (as in many passages in Beethoven's later works) to damp the accompaniment down till it seriously loses in energy of character. A very eminent conductor once made one of the leading London orchestras play the string parts pizzicato: a brilliant but thoroughly debased remedy, of which he had the good grace to be ashamed... <33>

Mahler not only uses doubled woodwind and substitutes pizz for arco, but also introduces Hr3/4 and Pk, the details of which are:

247-395: Vc4 & Vc5 join Cb. ⊗

29.4.8 - Schubert IX, P.48/9 - 3rd mvt
indicating that they should play on the bright C clarinet. Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1, and Fl1/2, Obl/2 & Fg1/2 doubled. Ps mf in P.48, p in P.49. All St pizzicato. Pk joins Cb, see Ex.29.7. *

262-82: St continue pizz, pp from b.263. Ww continue doubled until b.281. Cl/Fg mf. Ps1-3 omitted from the middle of b.262. *

282-94a: A further indication of pizz is found on the second crotchet of b.282, though there had been no indication of arco earlier. The explanation is probably found in the fact that b.294a has arco, and that the second time through of b.247-62 was therefore played arco. The parts indicate that Mahler slowed down in b.289-294. <34>

294b-302: Fl/Ob/Fg doubled. Cl3/4 reinforce Fl1/2, Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2. St arco from last two crotchets of 294b.

305 & 309: Mahler here and elsewhere interprets Schubert’s accents in Ww with a hairpin before and after.

318 (last note) - 334 (1st note): Ww doubled. (Obl/2 not doubled in b.324-5.) Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2. Trl/2 fp on each dotted minim, with f reinstated from each following quaver.

335: Ruhiger. <35>

334-42: Pizz in Vn1/2 from b.335, in Va/Vc from b.336, and in Cb from b.334. See Ex.29.8 for Mahler’s revised Cb part. Arco appears in P.48 for Va/Vc from the second note of b.343. But this is contradicted in P.49.

358 (last note) - 384: Ps initially marked mf then tacent. Ww doubled, Cl3/4 reinforce Fl1/2, and Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2 until the 1st note of b.366, and from b.379-84.

29.4.8 - Schubert IX, P.48/9 - 3rd mvt
384 (2nd crotchet) - 396b: St pizz. Rit found in many parts from b.385 to end of Trio.

Mahler uses pizzicato not as a device for balancing the strings with the wind but, as can be seen from its alternation with arco, as a means of securing variety of texture.

29.4.9 Selected Passages - 4th movement

N.B. As much of this movement is auftaktig, the reader will easily realise that some of the remarks below take effect half way through the bar. The first (incomplete) bar is numbered "0".

0-7: St tacet in b.0-1, b.4-5. * Mahler re-writes the opening fanfares to create an antiphonal effect between wind and strings. A reverberant acoustic is implied by the changing of dotted quavers into quavers and semiquaver rests and the forte dynamic for the first string reply. * Before and after the second string entry there are fermatas marked in some of the parts to allow the reverberation to clear before the piano and ppp entries. <36> Obl, Cl1, Trl 8va. Ww, Hr, Tr doubled. Ps mf.

14-25: Ww doubled except in b.18-9, b.20-1, b.22-5 where they are not solo but reinforcing the strings. Trl 8va in b.19-22. Vn1 8va in b.22-5, and Vn2 play Vn1 original. Gaps between the notes in all parts and downbows in b.15 & b.16. Between b.23 and b.24, the accompaniment has a gap between the notes: but between b.24 and b.25 all instruments have slurs.

25-35: Similar treatment to b.14-25, but Ww piano in b.30 with crescendo in b.31-2 and doubled in b.33-5. Fl1 has b'''-flat in b.32.
also Mahler's means of separating Schubert's long sentences. <37>

62-89: Mahler supplements Schubert's long crescendo: <38>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>CROTCHET</th>
<th>DYNAMICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>crescendo begins here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ww f, St mf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>cres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>cres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ww f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vc/Cb cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vc/Cb f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ww, Hrl/2, cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vc/Cb p : Vn/Va cresc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

83-6: Ww have 1st note shortened to quaver and quaver rest.

90-3: Obl & Cll 8va. Ww doubled. Tutti ff.


98-105: As 90-7.

107 (2nd crotchet) - 108 (1st crotchet), 109-10 & 111-2: Trl/2 replace Cll/2 and Hr3/4 reinforce Fgl/2. The addition of Hr3/4 and Tr3/4 is already a feature of P.47; but in omitting Cll/2 in P.48/9 Mahler substitutes a new colour as well as making the answer more easily audible.

118-21 & 130-3: Hrl/2 doubled.

137-62: Hr3/4 reinforce Fgl/2 until the 1st crotchet of b.145, then
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before b.157. In b.157-62, Hr3/4 reinforce Trl/2. In b.157, Ps & Pk mf cresc to ff in b.159. All wind pp in b.161 and ff in b.162. <39>

169 et seq: See Ex.29.9 for Vnl, Va bowing in P.49.

189-96: Ob & Cl doubled in P.49.

221-4: Fl1/2 doubled.


265-77: Ww doubled, except in b.269-72. Cl3/4 reinforce Fl1/2. In b.267, Ps have triplets in P.49 and P.47. St all downbows in b.265-8.

277-92: Fl1/2 reinforce Obl/2 8va in b.285-6. Dynamic scheme altered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>mf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>p (Tutti non cresc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>still pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind</td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

293: Vn p from 2nd note.

301-4: As 265-8.

309-32: Fl doubled. Ob, Cl & Fg doubled from b.317. Cl3/4 reinforce Obl/2 from b.325. Tr3/4 reinforce Cl2 from b.325. <40> Dynamics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Br, St</td>
<td>mf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Br, St</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Br, St</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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333 - 337 (1st crotchet): Hr3/4 reinforce Fgl/2, Trl/2 reinforce Cl1/2.

* 

337-80: Mahler adds supplementary dynamics in all parts, arriving ppp in b.387.

397-403, 409, 421-7: Hairpins on minims: Obl: b.397, Ob2: b.399, Fgl/Ps2: b.401, Ps3: b.403, etc.

433-56: St Am Steg (Sul ponticello).

457-66: Dynamic scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>pp (non fz, non cresc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>Ww, St</td>
<td>cresc, poco cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>fz replaced by &quot;&gt;&quot; accents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

467 (1st crotchet): Vn/Va tacent.

489-515: Fgl/2 doubled. Fll/2, Obl/2 doubled from b.490. Cl1/2 reinforce Fll/2 in b.490-505, and double Cl1/2 from b.506.

560-1, 568-9: Vn2 tacent. See Ex.29.10 for Vnl bowing from P.49.

598-603: Ww doubled. Trl/2 reinforce Fll/2 8va bassa. The thinner texture here causes Mahler to mark the strings f in b.600 and mf in b.604, continuing pp from b.606 with ppp in the wind.

608: Tutti crescendo.

613 et seq: Where not noted the Recapitulation is treated as in the
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616-9 & 624-7: Trl/2 reinforce Cll/2.

647-67: Pk reinforces Ps3. <41> Ob3 reinforces Cll in P.49 only.

692-4: All entries begin piano and make crescendo to forte. * St forte on 2nd crotchet of b.694. *

695-7: St and Ww ff. Ww doubled.

698-700: As b.692-4.

702-5: Ww, Psl fp; rest p with crescendo in b.703-4.

This scheme of dynamics continues until b.717, where the strings are piano on the 2nd note.


725: St p on 2nd note.

745-50: Dynamics as in Exposition. *

777: Obl/2 doubled in P.49 until b.785. Hrl reinforces Fg1 until b.780, omitting semiquaver turn. *

789 (2nd half) - 812: Va pizz, which unifies the colour of the lower strings, setting off Vn1/2 and the wind. *

813-844: Ww and Hr doubled. Hrl-4 reinforce Fg1/2 in b.819-20 and 826-36, omitting semiquaver turn. *

853-6 & 889-92: Ps 3 tacent in P.49. <42>

887-920: Cl3/4 reinforce F11/2. Hrl/2 and Trl/2 abandon their original parts to reinforce Ww:
<44> Dynamic scheme altered similarly to b.309 et seq.


925-9: Hr3/4 double Hr2. Tr3/4 reinforce Ob2. (*)

921-65: As at the end of the exposition, Mahler adds supplementary dynamics, arriving pppp in b.965. Ww doubled in b.941-5.

1049-56: Hr1/2 a third higher in b.1049. Crescendo delayed in all parts until b.1054.


1073-7: See Ex.29.11 for Hr3/4, Tr3/4 & Ps. (**) All Ww doubled.

1093-1100: See Ex.29.12 for Hr3/4, Tr3/4. Trl/2 & Ps have diminuendo in b.1093-4 and 1097-8. Rest of orchestra has diminuendo in b.1095-6 and b.1099-1100.

1101-5: Fll/2 8va in b.1101. Cl3/4 reinforce Obl/2. See Ex.29.12 for Hr and Tr parts. General diminuendo in b.1103-4. (*)

1111-3 & 1119-21: Tr3/4 reinforce Cl1/2. All instruments have a break after b.1111 and b.1119. See also b.3, etc.


In P.49 there are clear indications that Mahler understood the last unison as an accented note without diminuendo: in fact, most of the
crotchet. St two bows.

29.5 The Hamburg Score, P.47

29.5.1 The E-flat Clarinet

There are no woodwind doublings in this score; but the circle with a horizontal line through it and the plus sign are the usual indications for the E-flat clarinet. In bar 225 of the Finale Mahler also writes Es-clarinett. The involvement is extensive, comprising reinforcement mainly of F11, and occasionally Obl: <45>

1st mvt:

36-? 291-2
53-? (reinforcing Obl) 295-6
59-61? 304-25
74-? 424-7
90-4 430-3
228-50 546-58
252-3 (reinforcing Obl) 602-49 (marked earlier fr. b.634)
283-4 662-end?
287-8

2nd mvt:

39 217-21
41 (five notes only) 232-49
67-74 300-9
191-5 352-3

3rd mvt:

51-2 p cresc f (erased) 188-93 (later added in Ob 193-?)
53-6 213-20
57-65 229-38
117-8 (Obl - erased) 246-62
123-4 (Obl - erased) 294b-303
129-30 (erased) 318-34
135-6 358-66
139-51 379-84

4th mvt:

0-35 698-701
90-3 708-11
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29.5.2 Reduction of Strings

Mahler indicates a reduction of desks in the strings in many places in the Hamburg score. Mostly he just indicates this by means of brackets around the string staves, but sometimes he adds $\frac{1}{2}$. <46>

1st mvt:

57-8
61-9
327 - 404 (1st note) Vn1/2
348 - 404 (1st note) Va
348-403 Cb
356 - 403 (1st note) Vc <47>

2nd mvt:

160 (2nd quaver) - 181.

3rd mvt:

69-78 (Vc tutti)
89-104 (Vnl tutti)
119-36
157-93 Vn1/2 (Va/Vc end at 195) <48>
205-216 (Vnl and Vc only)

4th mvt:

385 (386 in Vc/Cb) - 466
789-812 (Vn1/2 only, originally Va/Vc also)
973-1056 <49>

29.5.3 Selected Passages - 1st movement

In general, P.47 is so similar to P.48/9 that it was clearly used in the preparation of the later score, and many of the points of agreement are noted above. It should be borne in mind that there are no woodwind
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doublings in P.47 and that the E-flat Clarinet part which does duty for them is not to be found in P.48/9. Apart from these features and the string reductions listed above, the following refers to those places where there are significant differences.

1-8: zu 4 with the same dynamic shadings.

38 et seq: No alternation of pizz and arco.

59-61: Tr3/4 reinforce Fl1/2 8va bassa.

74-7: Hr1/2 doubled and lower octave abandoned in b.77.

78-87: Tr1/2, Ps tacent. Pk also tacet in b.84.

92-4: Tr3/4 reinforce Cl1/2.

134-49: Hr/Ps not removed, but Hr1 replaces Ps1 in b.140-1 & b.148-9.

250-2: Hr1/2 doubled and all gaps filled with As or Ds.

256-65 & 276 (2nd note) - 277: Vn2 tacent.

266 (2nd crotchet) - 267 (3rd crotchet): Vn1 tacent.

303-11: Obl/2 join Fl1/2 from the second note, and Es-cl joins Fl1 from b.304 until b.325.

316 - 324 (1st note): Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2. Tr3/4 reinforce Cl1/2 from b.320.

424-?: Tr3/4 reinforce Obl/2.

480-91: See Ex.29.14 for different Tr1/2 part.

624-33: See Ex.29.15 for Hr1/2 & Tr3 parts.
Here and elsewhere in the slow movement, instead of the extensive and selective doublings of P.48 there are reinforcements by the E-flat clarinet <50> and by Tr3/4 and Hr3/4 selectively reinforcing Cll/2 and Fgl/2.

160-181, 184-5, 188-9: Hr1/2 and Tr1/2 con sord.

Mahler corrects the E-natural of the Peters score in Vc.

Only these bars are stopped in Hr1/2.

Selected Passages - 3rd movement

Fp only in these bars and only in Br.

In the Trio, the strings were originally directed to play pizzicato as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>DIRECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Tutti pizz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294b</td>
<td>Tutti arco from 2nd note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Cb pizz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Vn1/2 pizz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Va/Vc pizz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343*</td>
<td>Va/Vc arco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344*</td>
<td>Vn/Cb arco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Tutti pizz from 2nd note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396a</td>
<td>Tutti arco from 2nd note</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indications marked with an asterisk were deleted.

Tr reinforce Obl/2 until b.261 (1st crotchet). Hr3/4 reinforce Ps1/2 until b.262 (1st note).

Poco rit.

Poco rit.

Rit.
294b - 303 (1st crotchet): Tr1/2 reinforce Ob1/2, Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2.

318 (3rd crotchet) - 334 (1st crotchet): Tr3/4 reinforce Cl1/2. <51> Fg3/4 reinforce Fg1/2.

358 (last note) - 366 (1st note): Tr1/2 reinforce Fl1/2 8va bassa. Hr3/4 reinforce Ps1/2. Cl2 8va. Tr3 replaces Cl2 from b.362.

367-74: Hr3/4 reinforce Ps1/2.

379-84: Tr1 reinforces Fl1 8va bassa.

Given the forces available to Mahler, and assuming that the trumpet playing is not too raucous, the reinforcement marked in the Trio helps the balance considerably.

29.5.6 Selected Passages - 4th movement

The beginning of the finale is essentially as in P.48/9.

19 & 21: Hr1/2 removed from 1st crotchet. Pk removed from 2nd crotchet to leave only the wind unison.

27 & 29: Hr1/2 removed from 1st crotchet.

125-129: Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2. Pk has Ds.


309-32: Dynamics f in Ww & St, mf in Br. No modification of Schubert's dynamic scheme. Tr1/2 reinforce Ob2 (Tr2 8va bassa) until b.320, and Ob1 in b.321-32. <52> Fl1/2 play Fl1 original 8va in b.325-31.

433: Am Steg not a feature of P.47, but accents on the beginning of

29.5.5 - Schubert IX, P.47
each entry.

560 etc: Vn2 plays. There are no additional dynamic nuances in the passage leading to the Recapitulation.

721-4 & 729-32: Hr1/2 play Hr1 original. Hr3/4 reinforce Cl2/Fgl. Tr1/2 reinforce Cl1/Fgl.

837-44: Tr3/4 reinforce Obl/2 until b.840 and Ob2 from b.841.

861-4: See Ex.29.16 for Hr1/2 part. Ps2 has middle C in b.862.

897-920: Tr1/2 basically as P.48/9 except rests not filled in.

1049-57: Tr3/4 reinforce Cl1/2.

1093-1105: Tr3/4 play as in P.48, but both have Tr3 part until b.1100. In b.1101-2, Tr1/2 and Hr1/2 play 8va below Tr3/4. Hr3/4 reinforce Fgl/2.

1135 & 1137: Tr1/2 have Gs instead of Cs, recognising that b.1135 lacks a fifth and that b.1137 has a weak fifth.

1151: No indication about the last note.

29.5.6 - Schubert IX, P.47 -520-
Mahler performed Schumann's Manfred Overture on five occasions, representing two periods of his career:

Vienna PO 18 Nov 1900  
New York PO 31 Mar 1909  
15 Nov 1910  
18 Nov 1910  
20 Nov 1910

Like the Piano Concerto, the Scenes from Faust and other Schumann works involving orchestra, Manfred does not suffer from the generally accepted defects of instrumentation obvious in the Symphonies: it can be successfully played without any revisions, and normally is. Mahler's far-reaching Retuschen in the Manfred Overture represent a completely revised version of the work and, whether gratuitous or not, demonstrate his superior mastery of the orchestra and understanding of Schumann's sound world. His work is a graphic illustration of Mahler's understanding of the Werktreue principle.

30.1 Sources

30.1.1 Score, P.50

This score is in the Breitkopf und Hertel edition, has a grey binding and bears the stamp of Musikhaus Alexander Rosé / WIEN, I. Kärntner-Ring 11. In it there are manifold changes of scoring, woodwind
by Mahler are mainly in blue, brown and red pencils, and black and red ink.

30.1.2 Score, P.51

This score is in the same edition, but has a red binding and is without any stamp. The extra rehearsal numbers also appear in this score, and many of Mahler's Retuschen are inked in. There are less bowings marked in this score than in P.50. There are no woodwind doublings, but extra notes are indicated for a third flute.

30.1.3 Set of Orchestral Parts, P.52

The set of orchestral parts has printed wind parts in the Breitkopf edition, plus a handwritten part for cymbal, and strings of 9,8,6,5,5. The first desks of the string parts are in an old Breitkopf Edition printed set, the others being handwritten. With the exception of Vn2.6, all the parts are stamped Gustav Mahler / Wien. Va5, Va6, Vc5 and Cb5 are also stamped PHILHARMONISCHE / GESELLSCHAFT / WIEN. The covers are very coarse paper, some having been used before for binding other works. The last desks of the string parts, Vn1.8, Vn1.9, Vn2.8, Va5, Va6, Vc5 & Cb5, were probably bound separately from the other string parts as they all are bound in paper which formerly bore the title of Berlioz' Romeo & Juliet.

From the stamps and age of the materials we can state that these parts were used by Mahler for his Vienna performance; and from the indications in English, the presence of additions in the hand of Boewig, and some differences in the last desk of strings, it is clear that they were also used by the New York Philharmonic.

30.1.1 - Schumann, Manfred
30.1.4 The Significance of the three Sources

Usually when there are two scores of the same work with Mahler's revisions they date from recognizably different periods of his life and can be identified as such by the presence of stamps and other evidence. However, in this case we are faced with two scores with handwriting which points to their both coming from a similar period and only small differences between the Retuschen.

The orchestral parts, P.52, basically agree with P.50, and if on this basis P.50 can be taken on to represent Mahler's Viennese practice with doubled woodwind, what then is the significance of the second score, P.51, which agrees substantially with P.50, and which, appears to have been copied from it? P.51 often contains in ink what was in pencil in P.50 and this could mean simply that Mahler was preparing a fair copy of P.50. If this is true then the lack of any indication about wind doublings might be considered evidence that this fair copy is incomplete.

Indications of work in progress are found from an examination of the orchestral material which, though based on P.50, contains some features of P.51. The third flute part of P.51 is also a feature of P.52, though the semiquaver rests inserted in the wind between the opening chords, which are found in P.51, were not transferred to the parts.

Although the version in P.51 with single wind is quite satisfactory, that score's use of a third flute is not conclusive evidence that it was intended to be employed without a full complement of doubling players, since Mahler had access to such players both in Vienna and New York. But given that there is no weakness of woodwind balance in P.51, and that there are no parts for doubling wind players to be found at
become dissatisfied with the details of his Retuschen as represented by P.50 and had decided to make a new version. Confirmation of this is given by the size of the woodwind section when Mahler gave Manfred Overture with the New York Philharmonic in November 1910. In this concert he coupled Manfred with Debussy's Rondes de Printemps, and the programme booklet of 15/18 Nov 1910 indicates a woodwind section of 4,3,3,3 as required by Debussy. The programme of 15/18 Nov 1910 and the lack of any set of parts for doubling wind players provide the strongest evidence to support the assumption that Mahler in his later years performed Manfred Overture with a woodwind complement of 3,2,2,2, and this assumption forms the basis of the discussion below.

It has, however, proved impossible to accurately date the two scores as some Retuschen which were copied into the parts by Boewig in New York appear already in P.50. A good example of this is the change to Fg1/2 in b.19-20.

30.2 The Main Characteristics of Mahler's Interpretation

30.2.1 Timings

Timings are found in the parts:

- \( \text{Vn2.3} \quad 12 \text{ Min at end} \)
- \( \text{Vn2.5} \quad 10 \text{ Min at beginning and end in the same hand as Vn2.3} \)
- \( \text{Vt1} \quad 12 \text{ Min at beginning} \)
- \( \text{Vc4} \quad 10 \text{ Min at end} \)

The usual timing for Manfred is over 12 minutes, and the 10 minutes quoted above is therefore very fast.
30.2.2 The Opening Bar

The problem in the first bar is to give the impression that the three chords are off the beat, and not just the result of a delayed reaction to the conductor. This is difficult because of the lack of any rhythmic point of reference. In P.52 we find a part for suspended cymbal playing fff mit Schwammschlägel on the 1st beat. This cymbal part is reproduced as Ex.30.1 and, judging by the spelling and the curious mixture of languages, was obviously written by a player in New York, rather than in Vienna.

In fact it seems that Mahler only resorted to this extreme solution to the problem in November 1910, since it is only after the performance of 15 November that the critics mention the cymbal crash which Krehbiehl refers to in his obituary notice as ...a cymbal crash like that which sets Mazeppa's horse on his gallop in Liszt's symphonic poem...  <1>

30.2.3 Changes of Dynamics

In Manfred Overture there are many cases of Mahler expanding Schumann's dynamic scheme in order to underline the restless nature of the work.  <2>

- A simple expansion of the dynamic range of a phrase maximises the wild and passionate expression of the work in b.61-2, where Mahler writes forte for instruments on the last note of b.61 and piano on the 1st note of b.62. See Ex.30.2.

- In b.154-61, reproduced from P.50, Ex.30.3, and P.51, Ex.30.4, Mahler intensifies to the highest degree the potential for dynamic differentiation within a theme which Schumann marks simply mit
- Consistent with the musical line of b.26-31, Mahler replaces Schumann’s long crescendo in the strings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>VN1</th>
<th>REST</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>mf cresc</td>
<td>p cresc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ff dim</td>
<td>f dim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>mf cresc</td>
<td>p cresc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>fp</td>
<td>1st half of bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ff</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>2nd half of bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>1st half of bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>ff</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>2nd half of bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>p cresc</td>
<td>p cresc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In b.44-9, Mahler replaces Schumann’s uniform forte by a series of crescendi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>STRINGS</th>
<th>WIND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>p cresc</td>
<td>p cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td>ff on 2nd half of bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>p cresc</td>
<td>p cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td>ff on 2nd half of bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td>ff on 2nd half of bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>ff on 2nd crotchet</td>
<td>ff on 2nd crotchet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- He treats b.138-45 in similar, though more expanded fashion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>CROTCHET</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>fp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>fp cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sf dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In b.161-9, P.50, reproduced in Ex.30.3, Mahler prescribes a series of crescendi to take the place of Schumann’s uniform piano:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>CROTCHET</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p cresc in Hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mf cresc in C11/2 &amp; Fg2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p cresc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- A further example is given in b.258-76 where Mahler again replaces Schumann's simple scheme, bringing out the restlessness of the music:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>SCHUMANN</th>
<th>MAHLER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Ww, St p</td>
<td>Trl-3 cresc Ww single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Trl-3 dim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260-1</td>
<td>Trl-3 as b.258-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Vn1/2 accent on last crotchet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262-3</td>
<td>Vn1/2 f, rest p cresc Ww doubled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Va, Vc/Cb p and hairpins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Vn1 sf on 4th crotchet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Tutti piano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Vn1/2 accent on last crotchet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268-9</td>
<td>Hairpins in Vc/Cb as Va</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>(piano) p cresc (f in Vn1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270-1</td>
<td>Ww doubled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>subito piano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Ww doubled from 2nd half of b.273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>dim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>cresc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>dim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30.2.4 Small Changes of Tempo

In the parts, P.52, there are a few players' marks indicating places where Mahler pulled back a little:

- In b.74, Vcl has meno, and in the parallel passage of b.240 Vn1.3 has rit. This suggests that Mahler slowed down for the passages beginning in b.74 & b.239, in order to make a greater contrast with the passage with triplet pulsation which follows.

- In b.176, the timpani part has rit which may most likely be interpreted as a signal that Mahler slowed down during the intense lyrical passage which culminates here, and then returned to the basic
- Also in the timpani part there is the indication riten on the 3rd crotchet of b.206, a natural agogic change which prepares for the tutti restatement of the main theme.

30.2.5 Selected Passages in P.50

1: St three downbows. Ww doubled.

2-4: Hairpins removed from St to allow Obl to dominate. In b.3-4, Vc are divisi, VcI entering only for the last seven semiquavers.

4-6: Hr3 tacet. Obl/2, Cl/2 & Hr1 tacet from middle of b.5 until 1st note of b.6. Vn2/Va tacet b.4-5 & first note of b.6. Vn1 tacet 1st note of b.6. Vc/Cb have crotchet rest on 2nd crotchet of b.6. All this thinning out is to the advantage of securing a better diminuendo.

8-10: Obl/2 tacet. Ob2 also omits 1st note of b.11.

10-12: Fl1 joins Fl2 8va from last note of b.10. Cl1 plays 1st note of b.11 8va.

11: Ww doubled, Cl1/2 & Fg2 from 2nd note.

13: Ww tacet 1st crotchet. Vn2, Vc/Cb have crotchet rest on 2nd crotchet.

19-20: Fg1/2 play first note for one semiquaver and then reinforce Vc, omitting the 1st note of b.20, and then rejoining their original part. With the exception of Vc and Fg1/2 which have crescendo, all parts have diminuendo, arriving piano at the beginning of b.20 and continuing forte from the 2nd crotchet. This materially improves both the audibility of the arpeggios and the clarity of the bass line.

30.2.4 - Schumann, Manfred - Dynamics
21-2: Ob1/2 tacent first three crotchets then reinforce Vn1 on 4th crotchet. Cl1/2 and VcI reinforce Vn.

25: Tr tacent. F11/2, Ob1/2 & Cl1/2 abandon Schumann's semibreves and reinforce VnI on the 4th crotchet. Vc/Cb omit 1st quaver and Vc reinforced by Fg1/2 and Hr3/4 (Hr3 8va). Vn2 reinforces VnI on the 4th crotchet. Vn1/2 have grace notes b-flat & g'. This is a big improvement over Schumann's original in which the important triplet motif is easily overpowered by the wind.

26: F11/2, Ob1/2, Cl1/2 tacent.

26-31: See above for details of Mahler's dynamic changes.

35-6: Cl1/2 reinforce F11/2.

38: Vn2 doubles Vn1, and Ob1-4 & Cl1-4 reinforce Vn1 on the 4th crotchet. Vc/Cb omit last quaver. The crescendo goes to ff.

39-43: Ob2/Cl2 double Ob1/Cl1. F11/2 doubled from the 2nd half of b.42. In b.42-3, Vn2 rest in 1st half of bar and double Vn1 in 2nd half.

41 & 42: Vn2 tacent 1st half of bar and join Vn1 on 2nd half.

44-49: Cl1 8va until 1st note of b.49. Ob1 8va from 2nd half of b.47 until 1st note of b.49. Original parts of F11/2, Ob1/2 & Cl1/2 played by Ww3/4. See above for details of Mahler's dynamic changes.

53 (last note) - 57 (1st note): Cl1/2 & Fg1/2 tacent.

57: All instruments pp on last note of bar.

60: Va ff. It is clear from the piano of Va in b.61 that the crescendo in the other instruments is not as strong.
natural break in b.63.

65 (4th crotchet) - 67: Fl1/2 8va on the last note of b.65 and the 1st note of b.66. Ww doubled.

78 (2nd note) - 80: Fl2 joins Fl1. Fl1/2 doubled until b.83.

81 (4th crotchet) - 83: Ww doubled.

84: Br & Pk have fp. All wind and Vn2, Va & Vc/Cb have a dotted crotchet instead of a minim.

85-8: As b.81-4.

89: Vn1 play first quaver and then pause until 4th crotchet. The notes are adequately covered in Vn2 & Va and it is now clear that Vn1 have a different motif from the 4th crotchet of the bar.

90-3: See Ex.30.4 for this passage reproduced from P.51 where it is clearly marked in ink. Compare with Ex.30.4, P.50, which is in red pencil and is similar but with doubled Ww and without the multiple stops in Vc. These are clear improvements over Schumann's weaker original with more clearly differentiated functions for the wind and strings. Ww continue doubled until b.95.

109-10: Cl1 has concert f', completing the F-minor chord in the Ww.

111-2: Cl1/2 replace Ob1/2.

113: Ob1 deleted, as the B is already represented in Fl2.

116-7: Vn2 tacet in b.116, Va tacet in b.116-7.

118-9: Ob1 replaced by Cl2 until 1st note of b.119.

30.2.5 - Schumann, Manfred - P.50
119 (2nd half) - 121 (1st note): Vc/Cb have *pizzicato* crotchets with crotchet rests until b.120. Vn2/Va *tacent*. In b.120, Fgl plays the B-flat removed from VaII. This only marginally affects the voice leading which has the melody represented in four octaves. Ob1 omits 1st note of b.121, improving the instrumentation of the imitated motif.

123 (2nd half) - 124 (1st note): Cl1/2 abandon original parts and replace Ob1/2.

124 (2nd half) - 125: Va *tacet* and Vc/Cb have *pizzicato* crotchets, with crotchet rests.

126: Cl1/2, Fgl/2 & Hr1/2 *tacent*.

131: Tr1-3 & Ps1-3 *tacent* in 2nd half of bar.

147 & 149: Cl1/2 8va. Ob1 8va in b.149. Ob1/2, Cl1/2 & Fgl/2 doubled.

169 (4th crotchet) - 179: Vn2 join Vn1, VaI play Vn2 original.

170-7: See Mahler's expanded dynamics in Ex.30.3.

170-1: Cb has minim and minim rests.

172-3: Cb has dotted minim and crotchet rest in b.173 and is reinforced by Fgl-4 at the unison. See Ex.30.3.

178 (2nd crotchet) - 179: Ps3 reinforces Fg2.

180-5: See Ex.30.3d and Ex.30.4d (P.50 which is essentially the same.) for Mahler's extensive re-scoring. Trl/2 *tacent* until 3rd crotchet of b.181. Beginning of b.180 *ppp* in all parts. Instrumental contrast intensified by the removal of Ww from the 4th crotchet of b.181 and 1st crotchet of b.182. The harmony is enriched by the addition of Ps1/2 to
match the rhythm of Ps3 and by the extension of Hr3/4. Vc reinforces Fg2 on 2nd and 3rd crotchets of b.182-5. Vn2 divisi, 1st half reinforcing Vnl, 2nd half playing original Vn2 part. C11/2 join Fl1/2, Cl3/4 play original C11/2. Ww doubled.

185 (4th crotchet): Vnl mf instead of p, which is reinstated two bars later.

187: Hr1/2 rest on 1st half of bar.

188: Hr1/2 rest on 1st crotchet of bar.

189-91: 1st crotchet of each bar and 4th crotchet of b.191 in Hr1/2 is quaver and quaver rest.

192-3: Hr1/2 staccato wedges.

193-6: Fl1/2 tacent.

197-8: Obl/2 as Fl1/2 on 1st note. Ww doubled. 2nd half of each bar ff in St and sfp in Br and Pk. Schumann's original is against the melodic line and therefore impractical. Moreover, Mahler's Retusche brings the passage in line with b.29-30.

199-202: Ww & Hr1-4 pp, Obl/2 tacent in b.199-200, entering piano cresc in b.201. St, Trl/2, Ps3 & Pk piano cresc.

203-6: Vn2 join Vnl with double stop a'-flat and e''-flat added to the part. To accommodate this, Vnl omit the last semiquaver of b.202. VaI takes Vn2 original rejoining VaII on the last crotchet of b.206.

205-6: Ps3 tacet until 3rd crotchet of b.206. Wind (subito) piano - crescendo from 1st note, Va, Vc/Cb piano on 2nd note and crescendo on third note.
208 (4th crotchet) - 210 (1st half): Vn2 join Vn1.

211 (2nd half): Vcl doubles Vn2.

213 (1st half): Vcl doubles Va.

216 (2nd crotchet) - 218 (3rd crotchet): Vn2 join Va, Cll/2 & Fgl/2 replace Vn2.

218 (4th crotchet) - 222 (1st half): Fll, Obi & Cll/2 tacent. Schumann has confused the issue by writing two versions of the same thing simultaneously, and Mahler sensibly chooses between them.

222-5: Fll/2 doubled. From b.224, probably because of the high notes involved, Schumann has compromised the contours of the melody in Obi. Mahler puts Obi in unison with Fll to good effect.

230 (4th crotchet) - 231 (1st crotchet): Fll/2 & Fgl/2 tacent. As elsewhere in the overture, Mahler purifies the colour palette by removing unnecessary reinforcement. <3>

240 & 242: Cll/2 & St have hairpins with accents at their climax in b.240 and f at their climax in b.242.

243 (2nd crotchet) - 253 (3rd note): Vn1 8va; Vn2 divisi, playing the original Vn1/2 parts.

246 (4th crotchet) - 257: Ww doubled.

252-3: Trl omits last two note of b.252 and 1st note of b.253. Both Trl/2 omit notes two and three of b.253. This prepares the entry at the end of the bar.

256-7: Ps1 joins Ps2 to continue the logical answer of Trl/2. Trl/2
257 (4th crotchet) - 276: Vn2 joins Vn1 and both have grace notes of b-flat, d' on the fourth crotchet of b.257. <4>

262 & 270: Tr1/2 complete their reinforcement of C11/2.

258-76: See above for details of Mahler's dynamic changes and Ww doublings.

273 (2nd half) - 276: C11/2 8va. C13/4 play C11/2 original.


302 (3rd crotchet) - 304: Originally, Mahler exchanged the parts of Fl2 and Ob2 to obtain a more uniform texture. Later he abandoned both these parts, and in b.303-4 also removed Ob1, C11/2 and Flg1/2 in the interests of obtaining a softer tone.

306 - 307 (1st note): Flg1/2 doubled.

30.2.6 Selected Passages in P.51

The following list discusses only passages which are treated differently in P.51 than in P.50. It should be noted that the woodwind are not doubled in this source.

4-6: Fl2 tacet last crotchet of b.4; Ob2 tacet b.4. Ob1/2, C11/2 & Hr1 tacet from 3rd crotchet of b.5 until 1st note of b.6. Vn2 tacet until 1st note of b.6, Va tacet until 1st note of b.7. VcI omits 1st two notes of b.4. In b.6, Vn1 & Vc omit 1st note and Cb tacet on 2nd crotchet.

13 (2nd half) - 14 (1st half): Flg1 tacet.

30.2.5 - Schumann, Manfred - P.50
19: Vnl/2 have five downbows.

21-2: Cl1/2 reinforce Va, but VcI not so employed.

25: All Ww and Vn2 reinforce Vnl on 4th crotchet. Hr3/4 and Tr1/2 tacet.

51 et seq: Semiquavers played four to a bow, beginning upbow.

55 (1st half): Hrl/2 tacet.

71-3: Hrl/2 tacet.

76-8: St have crescendo in b.76, with piano in all parts in b.78.

78-80: Fl2 as original.

90-3: Vc have multiple stops. See Ex.30.6.

109: Fl3 plays the F instead of Cl1 of P.50.

109-15: Tr1-3 & Ps1-3 con sord.

129: Tr1/Ps1 tacet.

130-1: Tr1-3 & Ps1 con sord. Ps3 replaces Vc.

142 & 144: Hr3 tacet.

162-5: In accordance with Mahler's changed dynamics for this passage, he removes Tr1/2 & Pk from b.163 and b.165, inserting D-flat crotchets in Pk at the beginning of b.162 & b.164. See Ex.30.4.

172 & 176: Vn1, Vc & Cl1 have rest instead of 5th quaver.

180 - 183 (1st note): Vn2 continues to reinforce Vnl, and VaI to add Vn2.
187: Hr1/2 non tacent.

192-3: Hr1/2 have quavers and quaver rests instead of the staccato crotchets of P.50.

197-8 (2nd half of bars): C2l/2 reinforce F1l/Ob1 & Vn2 doubles Vnl with c''-flat grace notes.

216 (2nd crotchet) - 218 (3rd crotchet): Vn2 join Va, with four semiquavers per bow. The semiquavers on the third crotchet are difficult, whatever the bowing but, as in b.51, Mahler's bowing encourages a longer sforzando (over several notes).

225: Vnl reinforces C1l.

258-263: C1l/2 8va.

270 (2nd half): Tr1/2 as P.50, and Tr3 has three E-flats.

271 (2nd note): Tr3 has E-flat.

282: Ob1, Vn2 & Va tacent. Vn2.8 does not have this removal, indicating that it was probably a New York Retusche.

283-5: Tr1-3 con sord.

292-3: Ob1 not deleted.

302 (2nd half) - 304: F12 replaces Ob2, F13 replaces F12. Ob1, C1l/2 & Fgl/2 tacent in b.303-4.

30.2.7 Selected Passages in P.52

On the theory outlined above, I have assumed that the orchestral parts
divergences from this.

1: Vn1 8va in all except Vn1.9. Suspended cymbal \textit{fff mit Schwamschlägel} on 1st crotchet. See above and Ex.30.1.

10: Fl1 has last note d'\textprime\prime\prime\textprime\prime-flat to extend the octave raising of b.11-2.

21-2: VcI/II as in P.50.

56: Vn2 adds Fl1 part to complete harmony. Not in P.50/1.


78-80: Fl2 as in P.50.

111-2: Ob2 not marked tacet, but this could be due to player laziness.

131: Rests as in P.50.

154 et seq: Va/Vc dynamics as in P.50 and not P.51, see Ex.30.3 and Ex.30.4.

157 (4th crotchet) - 158 (1st crotchet): Fl1/2 reinforce Obl/2 8va bassa. Not in P.50/1.

185 (4th crotchet): Vn1 mf in P.50 & P.52 only.

197-8: Cl1/2 reinforce Fl/Ob ff on the 2nd half of each bar. Not in P.50/1. Obl/2 join Fl1/2 as in P.50.

205-6: Ps3 as in P.50.

233-4: Vn1.5 has notes added to agree with Cl1.

249: Vn1.4 has four downbows, which establish the connection with the
258-63: Cl1/2 8va only in b.262-3.

273 (2nd half) - 275 (1st note): Cl1/2 8va.

282: Unlike the other parts, Vn2.8 does not have tacet in b.282, indicating that this was introduced in New York.

298: Hrl stopped. Not in P.50/1. See Ch.10.3.6.
Chapter 31

Schumann, Symphony No.1, Op.38

Mahler conducted Schumann I four times:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg PO</td>
<td>21 Jan 1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna PO</td>
<td>15 Jan 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>18 Jan 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York SO</td>
<td>29 Nov 1908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retuschen in this work were already a part of his interpretation in Vienna and, according to La Grange, <1> the Viennese critics approved of them. In Frankfurt, one critic noted the revelation of hidden beauties, thanks to judicious retouches. <2>

31.1 Sources

31.1.1 Score, P.53

This score, which is in the Osborn Collection, bears the stamp of Böhme, Hamburg and proves to be the score which belongs with the orchestral materials, P.54. Particular evidence of this is given by the addition of the extra rehearsal numbers, including Nos. 10½ and 11¼. In this score Mahler went over earlier pencilled-in changes in red ink, so that it is quite likely that he used it for all his performances.
31.1.2 Set of Orchestral Parts, P.54

This is a full set in the Breitkopf edition, with strings 9,8,7,6,5. Most of the marks were made by a copyist in ink; while others can be assigned to players in English and German (Kurrentschrift). There are very few marks in the string parts; though, with the possible exception of Vn1.9, they have been used. There are no wind doublings or desk reductions indicated. In addition to the normal rehearsal letters there are orientation numbers matching P.53. There are no stamps on these parts.

It is clear that this set was used in New York; and in view of the large number of immigrant musicians in New York in the early part of the century it is possible that the parts were prepared there, even though the handwriting is European.

The present study is based on a detailed examination of this set of parts, clarified by a later brief examination of the score.

31.2 The Main Characteristics of Mahler's Interpretation

31.2.1 Schumann's Original Manuscript

As is well-known, Mahler restored the opening of the Symphony to its original pitch; but a comparison of his other Retuschen with Schumann's original version of the work does not reveal that Mahler based his revisions on seeing the manuscript. Even though Mahler restored the opening, he probably did so because Schumann's original was common knowledge; and he probably removed the trombones from many passages where Schumann did not originally employ them simply because of their
31.2.2 Repeats

Mahler made all the repeats in this symphony.

31.2.3 Mahler's Tempo for the Terminal Development Section

The critic of the *New York Times*, wrote of Mahler's performance with the New York Symphony Orchestra that:

...His tempi for the most part seemed natural, inevitable, not ostentatiously modified with the changing expression, nor obstructed with rubati. There was no anxious seeking after "expression", no rhetorical phrasing or extravagant modelling in high relief, to the detriment of the symmetry of the larger outline... <4>

Schumann does not mark any change from the *Animato (poco a poco stringendo)* of bar 381, but many conductors slow down and present the passage beginning in b.437 in a very dreamy fashion, continuing to get even slower at b.468, and only returning to the main tempo with a four bar *accelerando* starting at bar 483. <5>

This major modification to the tempo of the work was recommended by Weingartner, <6> but it would seem from the critic's remarks, and from the total lack of any notation in P.53/4, that any modification of tempo which Mahler carried out in this passage was subtle and that the excessive slackening indulged in by Furtwängler and others found no place in Mahler's interpretation.

31.2.4 Trumpet Doublings

In the score, P.53, there are several passages where the trumpets originally had a line written in blue pencil above the stave. This was subsequently erased:
As these are climactic passages, it is possible that the mark indicates a doubling of Tr1/2, and perhaps this took place in Vienna.

31.2.5 Selected Passages - 1st movement

0-6: Mahler rewrites the brass parts so that the trumpets and horns play as Schumann originally intended and then adds trumpets from the end of b.4. See Ex.31.1. (with bowings.)

19-20: Obl omitted until the 6th quaver of b.20, Fl2 taking over the A in b.19. Cl1/2 and Flg1/2 deleted from the first half of b.20. A quaver rest replaces the dot on the 1st note of St in b.19, and St have a minim and a crotchet rest in b.20. All this thins out the texture and Mahler thereby arrives at a much lower dynamic level in b.21.

40, 41, 48 & 49 (1st note of each bar): P3 tacet.

63/4 & 65/6: Vn1, Vn2 & Va lose their accents in b.64 & b.66 and are reduced to p (mf in Vn1) from the last note of the preceding bar. Fortissimo is restored where the wind are silent. By reducing the volume of the strings Mahler underlines the contribution of the wind. The removal of the accents makes clear the motivic structure of the passage.

63-6: Pk has D-flats instead of G-flats.

68 (last quaver) - 69 (3rd quaver): Pk has Cs, to reinforce the basses.
110-5: Trl/2, Psl-3 & Pk piano.

116-7: Pk continue the rhythm of b.115 on the C drum. Br cresc to forte in b.118.

117 (last note) - 119 (third note): Cll/2 reinforce Ob/2.

127-9: Va plays Vn2 original from the 4th semiquaver; Vn2 joins Vn1 from b.128. Pk loses 1st note of b.127 & b.129, bringing the part in line with the bass.

166 - 174 (1st crotchet): St pp; wind ppp, with no crescendo. Ob/2 tacet. Cl2 8va. Mahler changes the beams on the quavers in the strings to make the phrasing clear. See Ex.31.2.

209-13: Motif divided among the horns for emphasis and the avoidance of monotony. See Ex.31.3.

254-8: Hrl/2 tacet to allow Cl1/2 and Fg1/2 to be heard.

263-80: Pk tacet.

271-85: Ps3 tacet.

281-9: Woodwind reinforced. See Ex.31.4. Schumann's well-intentioned but inaudible stretto has been well reinforced by Mahler. Only the bassoons are left unsupported and one wonders why the trombones were not employed to carry the imitation through.

The significance of this emendation is not sufficiently emphasised in Carner's study. Not only does Mahler employ the brass instruments melodically; but he also intensifies the woodwind parts to the maximum, and considerably modifies the dynamics of the violins and violas. This
which the melodic parts, derived from the first subject, may be made to be heard in the foreground at the appropriate dynamic level.

It should also be noted that Mahler has prepared this page carefully by his modifications all through the first movement, so that it does not suddenly sound strange, as is often the case when changes of instrumentation are made only in dire necessity.

290-3: Flg/2 reinforce Vc.

290: P.53 has acc in pencil, and the parts confirm this.

294: P.53 has *piu mosso* in pencil, confirmed in many parts.

300-1: Pk adds Fs to match the bass.

310-6: See Ex.31.5, in which Tr1/2 are given prominence as at the beginning, and Pk give the impression of a second inversion of the harmony of b.305-6.

318 & 322: Ps1-3 removed.

326/7 & 328/9: St as in b.63-6.

330 (last note) - 333 (1st quaver): Fl1/2 reinforce Vn1/2 until 1st crotchet of b.332, then reinforce Ob1 8va.

371-2: Ps3 & Pk tacent.

374 & 376-8: Tr1 reinforces Cl1, Tr2 reinforce Ob2 8va bassa. This adds body to the wind parts.

379-80: Hr3/4 notes moved from 1st and 3rd quavers to 2nd and 4th, bringing them in line with Hr1/2 and strengthening the off-beats.

31.2.5 - Schumann I - P.53/4 - 1st mvt
sixteen bar passage into four sections, emphasising the four-bar periods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>385-8</td>
<td>last</td>
<td>Fgl/2 &amp; Hr3/4</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>last</td>
<td>Vn1/2</td>
<td>mf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Cb</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Fgl/2 &amp; Hr3/4</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Vn1/2</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Cb</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>last</td>
<td>Fgl/2 &amp; Hr3/4</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>last</td>
<td>Vn1/2</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Cb</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Fgl/2 &amp; Hr3/4</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Vn1/2</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>last</td>
<td>Fgl/2 &amp; Hr3/4</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>last</td>
<td>Vn1/2</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394-6</td>
<td>last</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

396 (last note) - 403 (first note): Cll/2 reinforce ObI/2.

405-20: Dynamics treated similarly to b.381-96.

429 (1st note): ObI tacet to enable the player to breathe.

429 (2nd note) - 450 (1st note): Cll joins ObI.

452-63: Lower octave of VnI removed in pencil, both in P.53 and P.54, indicating that this was probably done during rehearsal.

495-501: TrI reinforces Cll.

31.2.6 Selected Passages - 2nd movement

1-23: Vn2 takes over lower VnI part, Val playing Vn2 original. It must be recalled that Mahler's violins were divided left and right, as the effect of doing this with violins all massed on the left of the orchestra is not the same. In b.15 Schumann's double stop is played only by VnI and notated by Mahler as two demisemiquavers.
P.53 has vorwärts in the Hrl/2 stave. Also in P.53, the E-flats were at one time deleted from Vc.

29: St cresc removed. All instruments pp at beginning of bar.

39: Crescendo delayed until b.40.


41-7: Vc has hairpins in b.41, b.43 & b.45, replacing Schumann's forte in b.43 & b.45, giving the melody a more subtle nuance and a better chance of drawing attention to itself.

43-55: Hrl/2 tacent.

55 et seq: Sforzandi in violins played upbow.

63-4: Antiphony continued by the remodelling of Vnl/2 parts, while the crescendo is still supported. See Ex.31.6.

85-99: Hr2 tacet.

109-10: Fl1 has b'''-flat. Fl, Ob, Cl have crescendo in b.109, with forte in b.110 with sf on the second quaver and thereafter diminuendo, arriving piano at the beginning of b.111.

31.2.7 Selected Passages - 3rd movement

0-8: See Ex.31.7 for the many downbows in Mahler's characteristically energetic style.

96-100 et seq: Schumann's staccato made explicit by quaver rests.

140-52 & 216-228: Ps3 tacet.
328-335: Dynamics added to mirror the rise and fall of the imitative melody. F11/2 have b'''-flat in b.328-9.

372: P.53 has rit.

375: fermata removed in P.53.

398: The lower octave of Vnl deleted in this passage. Fl doubled and all parts ff. P.53 has these changes in pencil and the parts also indicate that it was a change made in rehearsal.

401: F11 has rit.

31.2.8 Selected Passages - 4th movement

1: In P.54, the change of Schumann's tempo marking of Allegro animato e grazioso to Allegro grazioso, indicates a moderate pace for the movement.

5: Diminuendo in all parts

6-7: Schumann clearly indicates that a tempo begins with the upbeat of the theme; but Mahler changes this to coincide with the downbeat, places an additional rit on the two quavers and inserts a Luftpause after them.

10-14: Mahler's redistribution of the violin lines, see Ex.31.8, which both avoids unnecessary doubling and also creates an antiphonal effect, has a further purpose in allowing Vn2 to prepare for their awkward passage which follows.

21-31: Cl1/2 & Fg1/2 tacent until b.24. Ps1-3 tacent in b.25-8. Vn2

31.2.7 - Schumann I - P.53/4 - 3rd mvt
Vorwärts marked in b.27. The crescendo is graded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>CROTCHET</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vn1, Fl1, Obl</td>
<td>hairpins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Vn1/2, Va</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vn1/2</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wind except Fl</td>
<td>fp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vn1/2, Va</td>
<td>ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Vc/Cb</td>
<td>ff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effect of all these changes is to promote a powerful climax at the end of the first subject.

40-2: Obl/2 tacent last two notes of b.40 until 1st note of b.42.
Cll/2, Fgl/2 & Hr3/4 also tacent b.41 and the first note of b.42. The remaining instruments have diminuendo to ppp. The removal of wind has two purposes: to facilitate the diminuendo, and to prepare for the following oboe and basson timbres. <7>

49: St dim on first note.

56: Vn2 diminuendo delayed until b.57. This change, which is in pencil in score and parts and therefore likely made in rehearsal, draws attention to Vn2 at the beginning of their solo.

66-9: Tr1 reinforces Fl1 8va bassa.

81-9: See Ex.31.9 for Tr1/2, Psl-3 & Pk which now make a worthwhile contribution to the climax of the exposition. Fl1 has c’’ for the first note of b.87.

90-96: See Ex.31.10 for Pk. The new part serves to underline the melodic and harmonic contours of the passage.
97a-100a: Vnl cadenza has a fermata over the G in b.99a, accelerando from the E-flat, and a break before the last two notes of b.100. All this is in P.53, with the rare indication of four vertical lines in b.100a to remind Mahler to beat four.

117-148: Schumann begins piano with a long crescendo in b.120. Mahler allows the entrance of the different instruments to give the gradual crescendo, underlining the rise and fall of the melodic contours by hairpins, placing mfp at the beginning of b.121 & b.125 and fp at the beginning of b.137 & b.141.

142-8: Tr1 tacet in b.145-8. Tr2 and Ps3 reinforce Va and Vc. See Ex.31.11.

149-50, 153-4 & 157-8: Fgl/2 tacet.

155-6: Pk has A-flat.

163-4: Pk has C.

173: The flute cadenza has a fermata on the top note (A) and then accelerando, with Schumann's rit delayed until the lower A. The last two notes are separated in Fl1 and Fgl from what precedes and follows.

174-7: Hr1-4 tacet.

192-5: As b.21-4.

198-201: Vn2 and Va and Ps1-3 as b.27-30.

253-61: Tr1/2 contribute to the melody. See Ex.31.12.

309 - 313 (1st crotchet): Ps2/3 reinforce Vc. Ps1 has g' in b.310 and joins Ps2 in b.311-3.

31.2.8 - Schumann I - P.53/4 - 4th mvt
Mahler conducted Schumann II only twice: on 22 and 25 November, 1910, with the New York Philharmonic Orchestra.

The critics discussed at length the fact that Mahler had changed Schumann's orchestration in places, without giving much detail of what he actually did and concerning themselves mainly with the question of the propriety of his actions.

32.1 Sources

32.1.1 Score, P.55

This score, the only one known to me with additions in Mahler's hand, bears the stamp of the Hamburg music dealer, Böhme, and has a small number of blue pencil marks in it, but no rehearsal letters or numbers. There are indications for the use of a third flute in the first movement, changes of dynamics and some rewriting of the horn parts. The revisions are clearly not representative of Mahler's late style.

32.1.2 Score Prepared by Copyist

In the archive of the Internationale Gustav Mahler Gesellschaft in 32.0.0 - Schumann II
Edition, in which most of the indicated marks look authentic.

According to Mahler's usual habit, there are 31 additional rehearsal numbers running continuously through the work.

Unless otherwise stated, the following remarks are based on this copyist's score, which is referred to as the "IGMG" score, and therefore do not have the same significance as any based on a Mahler original. Doubt is cast on the authenticity of certain aspects by the fact that marks differing in detail from these were seen by the author at Universal Edition in London during 1981, written into rental material which also purported to represent Mahler's revisions.

It is tempting to assume that some of the changes have been inaccurately transcribed from Mahler's score; but a full assessment of Mahler's performance practice in this work will have to await the rediscovery of his own score and orchestral parts.

32.2 The Main Characteristics of Mahler's Interpretation

32.2.1 Repeats

The first movement repeat, while struck out of P.55, is included in the IGMG score.

In the second movement, the repeat in Trio I is excised from the IGMG score, though not from P.55.

32.2.2 The Cuts in the Finale

The cuts in the finale of Schumann II, as given in the IGMG score,
remove b.399-422, b.438-41, b.492-507, b.515, and b.528-60, with appropriate changes to the instrumentation where necessary. Apart from their strangeness, it should be noted that these cuts are not the same as those in the set of parts circulated by U.E. and referred to above, and that they are also differently described by Carner. <1>

399-422: At first glance this appears to be a reasonable excision, if regrettable; <2> but it creates an inconsistency by the sudden appearance of the crotchet movement in the second half of the melody.

438-41: This changes the periodic structure of Schumann's original by omitting the 'consequent' and leaving merely its extension, and also loses half of the canon in Va. <3>

492-507: Here a stretto-like passage is removed. This is unfortunate, as the passage actually brings some variety to the movement.

515: The omission of this bar should be examined in the context of the change of notes in b.510. <4>

528-60: This cut is the strangest of all. Mahler has already modified the harmonic structure of bars 560-4 and now totally changes the rhythmic structure. See Ex.32.1. Whereas previously Schumann's music scanned in four bar periods with the strong bar being 559, and with the two bar chords lying across the periods, the cut has the effect of throwing out the periodic structure by two bars.

These cuts seem to be of doubtful value in improving Schumann's structure, and so odd are they that I consider it doubtful that Mahler actually made them all in concert. Critics writing of the concert on 22 Nov 1910 in the New York Times and New York Daily Tribune mention his reorchestration of certain passages without being too censorious, but the only mention of any cut by a critic appears to be by Max Smith.
in *The New York Press*. He mentions only one cut. The disagreement of the currently available sources makes it essential to have access to Mahler's own score in order to establish his intentions.

### 32.2.3 Selected Passages - 1st movement

1: Vn1/2: *Griffbrett*.

1-13: Ps1 *tacet*. Hr1 doubles Hr2 on the Cs of b.1-5, and is then until b.12, entering *mf* in b.13. Tr2 plays the lower octave where Schumann omitted it.

15 - 18 (1st note): Vn1/2 omitted. While not strictly necessary for improved clarity, the omission of the violins removes string doubling.

19-21: Hr1/2 *tacent*, leaving Tr1/2 & Ps1 playing the theme, and allowing them to enter *mf* with the echo in b.22

32: Fl1/2 8va.

33 (2nd note) - 36: Vn2 join Vn1. Vn2 original is adequately covered in Ww, and the extra power of the strings allows a stronger crescendo.

50 - 58 (1st note): Ob1/2, Cl1/2, Flg1/2 *tacent*, Fl1/2 *tacent* in b.53. St *pp poco a poco cresc.* Ob1/2, Cl1/2 & Flg1/2 enter *piano* in b.58 and continue the crescendo. These changes expand the dynamic range of the theme.

70 (2nd note) - 73 (1st note): Vn1/2 *tacent*. This allows them to prepare their entry in b.73.

75 & 77: Vn1/2 omit 1st note.

85: Vn1 omit 1st note.
three part flute chords.

172-3: Subito piano - crescendo.

199 & 201: First and last notes of Hr1/2 reinforce Obl/2 8va bassa.

206, 208 & 210: Vn1/2 & Va piano with cresc in the following bar, to allow other voices to dominate.

216: Hr1/2 sf dim to make a better transition to b.217, which is marked pp.

217: F11 doubled. Ww ff and St pp.

237 & 239: Va has quaver D and B and then doubles Vc.

240 & 241: ppp in all parts.

248-60: Pk tacet.


317-36: Dynamic structure in all parts re-modelled to emphasise periods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>317-9</td>
<td>pp after 1st quaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sforzandi removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>cresc poco a poco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>ff on 2nd crotchet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325-6</td>
<td>diminuendo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>diminuendo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334-6</td>
<td>crescendo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32.2.3 - Schumann II - 1st mvt -555-
32.2.4 Selected Passages - 2nd movement

Scherzo I

1 et seq: Schumann's accent on the downbeat is expanded to *sf* with hairpins leading to and from it. The quavers of b.2, 4 & 9 have staccato dashes.

10 (6th semiquaver) - 12 (5th semiquaver): Vn2 joins Vnl to prevent the accompaniment overpowering the melody.

13-4: St *pizzicato*.

14 & 18: Fl1/2 & Flg1/2 *sf* on last two notes.

35, 37 & 41: Accompaniment *fp*.

The above-described treatment is typical of the whole movement and implies a very rapid tempo with short accents.

90-7: Hr1/2 *tacent* from 2nd note; Tr1/2 & Pk *tacent* from b.93. Va double Vn2 from the 2nd half of b.90 until b.93.

Trio I

98-104: Hr1/2 *tacent*. Flg1 has three quaver Bs in b.98 & b.102. These changes are strange, since the part writing is not materially improved: the modification of the tenor voice in Flg1 produces consecutive fifths
of the D from the horn part.

115-6: Commas before the last note of b.105 in Vn2 & Va, and before the last note of b.106 in Vn1/2, Va & Vc imply a slight slackening of tempo to make short gaps in the melodic line, emphasising the imitation.

121: A sign above the wind stave reads: N.B. wo möglich verdoppelt.
(N.B. Doubled where possible.) Given Schumann's scoring, this note is likely to refer only to F11; but this is unclear.

132 (2nd half) - 138: Hrl/2 tacent, but Fgl unchanged. C11/2 tacent from 2nd half of b.134 for five notes, and from 2nd half of b.138 for four notes. The inconsistency of treatment of Fgl is curious, but the removal of C11/2 makes the Ww/St interaction cleaner.

139-45: St have crescendo in b.139-40, with piano crescendo in Vn1/2 in b.143. Fermatas on the last note of b.142 & b.145.

These changes are entirely consistent with the playful nature of this trio.

Scherzo II

162-73 (5th semiquaver): Vn2 & Va double Vn1.

195 (last three notes) - 198: Vn2 doubles Vn1.

217-33: Basically as b.90-7.

Trio II

263: All instruments ppp.

267-70: Hr1/2 & Tr1/2 abandon Schumann's original to play Ex.32.2. Interesting though this change is, it represents no contrapuntal...
282-98: The transition back to the Scherzo is heightened by a calando from b.292 and the following additional dynamics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Vnl</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Vnl</td>
<td>mf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Vnl</td>
<td>mf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Vnl</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295-6</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Vnl</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>morendo (Ob1/2 &amp; Hr1/2 tacent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Vnl</td>
<td>ff subito on last three notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scherzo III

354 (2nd note) - 359: Va tacent until 1st note of b.358. Hr1/2 tacent.

A comparison of b.90 & b.217 with this passage shows that the detail is different in all three places, indicating that either Mahler or the copyist was in a hurry.

Coda

Mahler removes wind instruments and changes dynamics to produce a more impressive end to the movement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>360-1</td>
<td>Quavers f diminuendo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361-4</td>
<td>Vn2 join Vnl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362-72</td>
<td>Wind tacent except Ob1/2, Cl1/2, Fg1/2 in b.362 - b.365 (1st note).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366-81</td>
<td>Va join Vn2, abandoning their chords.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373-81</td>
<td>Wind tacent except Cl1/2, Fg1/2, Hr1/2 and, from 2nd half of b.377, Fl1/2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

384-8 & 392 - 396 (1st note): Va joins Vn. <7>

32.2.5 Selected Passages - 3rd movement


32.2.4 - Schumann II - 2nd mvt -558-
22: Last note G in Ob1 and Fgl. Mahler here fills out Schumann's harmony. It should be noted that although this looks like a significant revision, the scoring of this progression is such that the missing G can only be detected either by careful study of the score or by an exceptionally acute ear.

34-5: Ob1 tacet in favour of Cl1.

62: Va, Vc & Cb pizzicato. Fgl/2 & Hr1/2 tacet. From the point of view, at least of the players, the resolution of the cadence is unsatisfactory without the last chord in the bassoon and horn, and the pizzicato strings are not an adequate substitute. This change can only have been arrived at in order to obtain the softest pianissimo possible.

101 (2nd half) - 102: Cl1/2 & Fgl/2 tacet.

118: Fg & Hr tacet. This is similar to b.62 and again unsatisfactory for the players, though here the texture becomes less cluttered to the ear by their removal.

32.2.6 Selected Passages - 4th movement

4 (last note) - 8 (1st note): Cl1/2 8va.

46: Fl1/2, Obl/2, Cl1/2, Tr1/2, Pk & Vn1/2 omit first note.


46-60: Hr1/2 tacet.

In a reverberant acoustic these changes give a subito piano effect while allowing Va and Fgl/2 to be heard.
56-62: Fl1/2 tacent in b.58, Ob1/2 tacent in b.56/7 & b.60-3, Vn2 tacent in b.56-9. These deletions, together with the deletion of Hrl/2 noted above, make the moving parts more audible, but remove important harmony notes in b.62-3.

70-1: Vn2 tacent in b.70; 1st note of b.71 is c'’, as in b.63.

75-6: Fl1/2, Ob1/2 cresc, Cl1/2, Flg1/2 & Va dim.

79-80: Tutti dim.

82-4: Tutti cresc.

135-77: Flg1/2 reinforced by muted brass ff, by Ps1/2 until b.164 and thereafter by Tr1.

156-90: In an attempt to bring more interest to the sequences which begin here, Mahler substitutes his own dynamic scheme for Schumann's unrelieved forte:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>fp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157-171</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>crescendo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>sfp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Br</td>
<td>fp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>fp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

191-4: Vn2 & Va have one bar diminuendo to piano, while Cl1 continues ff, with diminuendo in b.192, piano espressivo in b.193 and diminuendo in b.194.

195: Cl1 & Ob1 as Cl1 in b.191-4.

257-61: Tutti dim to pp at the beginning of b.261.

267-71: Tutti dim to ppp at the beginning of b.271.

313-23: Vnl tacent in b.313-5 and part added to Vn2 (in b.313-4 only).

32.2.6 - Schumann II - '4th mvt
with a two bar diminuendo to piano in 318. Fl1/2, Cl1/2 & Fg1/2 tacet in b.316-23. In making these changes Mahler’s intention appears to have been to emphasize the new section introduced by Vnl., at the expense of harmonic support.

324-51: Trl/2 & Pk tacet. The removal of the emphasis on the tonic - dominant cadences which Tr & Pk introduce here improves the flow of this passage.

356-9: Mahler removes Trl/2 & Pk from b.356 and transforms the trumpet part of b.357-9 into the motto motif. See Ex.32.3. A New York critic referred to this when he wrote

...perhaps if somebody had pointed out to the composer that the "motto theme", as it may be called, might have been used once again where Mahler interpolated it last night in the last movement he would have accepted the suggestion, though while composing the work he probably thought he had used it as often as he thought necessary for his purposes... <8>

This criticism might have been made more convincingly of the gratuitous interpolation in b.267-70 of the 2nd movement; but here the motto theme actually enlivens an otherwise conventional eight bar non-thematic transition.

394-end: See above for details of cuts.

445 et seq: Although the Hamburg score has directions for filling out Trl from this point, strangely there are none in the IGMG copy.

472-5: Br diminuendo in b.472-3, piano in b.474 and tacet in b.475. Cb also tacet in b.475. Cl1/2 8va in b.474-82. These Retuschen allow the woodwind to be heard in their canon with the violins.

476-91: Dynamics changed:

32.2.6 - Schumann II - 4th mvt
Ww tacet in b.489-91 after which there is a large cut.

508-17: Mahler completely rewrites this passage - See Ex.32.4 - avoiding another C-major chord and interrupting the regular and rather four-square progression of the harmonies.

553: Before making the cut from b.528 to b.560, Mahler removed the scale from this bar in Fgl/2, Va, Vc & Cb, replacing it by a low G.

560-4: Mahler rewrites these bars. See Ex.32.1.

565-6: Pk tacet.

572-3: Trl/2 tacet.

587-9: Ps2 has g instead of c'.
Chapter 33

Schumann, Symphony No.3, Op.97

Mahler conducted Schumann III only twice, at the end of his career, on 31 Jan and 3 Feb, 1911.

33.1 Score Prepared by Copyist

No score with Mahler's autograph marks in it nor any set of orchestral parts used by him is known to me; but there is a photostat of a copyist's score in the archive of the Internationale Gustav Mahler Gesellschaft in Vienna. The indicated marks look authentic, though there are no additional orientation numbers. This score, referred to as the "IGMG score" is the main basis for the discussion in this study. Several doubtful features are documented below, but an accurate determination of Mahler's interpretation will have to wait until his own score reappears.

33.2 The Main Characteristics of Mahler's Interpretation

33.2.1 Repeats

Schumann writes repeats only in the second movement and the IGMG copy indicates that Mahler made all four of them.
1-8: Mahler's revision of the opening is reproduced in Stein's article. See Ex.33.1. In it he places a *diminuendo* in b.1 for Trl/2 & Pk and removes them from later bars, employs Obl/2 to reinforce Vnl, and takes Fl1/2 up an octave from the C until the F, also reinforcing this one and two octaves lower by Cl1 and Hr1 respectively. In b.5-7, Fg1/2 have *8va* and Hr4 *tacet* to prevent these instruments playing lower than Vc and Cb.

18-20: Fg1/2 & Cb *tacent* 1st crotchet and Cb omits the two last notes of b.19/20. This helps the quaver movement to emerge.

21-4: Vc/Cb have the same note values as Fg1/2. Pk *tacet* until the 1st note of b.23.

31-7: Trl/2 *tacent*. Hrl/2 *tacent* until b.35.

48-53: Pk *tacet*. Vc doubles Va in b.48, and Va doubles Vn2 in b.52.

54: St *subito piano*.

58-61: Trl/2 continue the theme and then hand over to Vnl and Fl/2 which are raised *8va*. Hr1-4 bring out the countermelody. See Ex.33.2

62-70: Schumann's original is hopelessly confused. Mahler provides a better bass by changing the rhythm and removing Pk, reinforces Vnl by Vn2, assigning the original Vn2 to Va, Obl/2 & Cl1/2, replacing these instruments by Hr1/3 and omitting Trl/2. This sounds superb, though the virtuosity of the instrumentation is now completely uncharacteristic of Schumann. See Ex.33.2.

112 - 121 (1st note): Hr1/2, Trl/2 & Pk removed to reveal a clean texture.
BAR | INSTRUMENT | COMMENT
--- | ----------- | ---
153-65 | Trl/2 & Pk | tacent
153 | Vn1 | mf
Rest | P
154 | Tutti | crescendo
157 | Fl1/2, Ob1/2, Vn1/2 & Cb, Cl1/2, Fg1/2, Hr1/2, Va & Vc | fp
158-9 | Fl1/2, Ob1/2, & Vn | forte
doubled by Vn2
crotchets staccato
161-5 | Vn1 | crescendo
161-2 | Ww |

185-8: Fl1/2, Ob1/2, Cl1/2 & Hr1-4 **fff diminuendo** in b.185 and **crescendo** in b.188. Trl/2 **tacent** from the 2nd crotchet of b.186. Vn2 joins Va. All this allows the moving part to emerge without difficulty.

193-6: As b.185-8.

250: Va & Vc **forte** and other parts **fp** to bring out the imitation.

253-6: Va doubles Vn2.

273-80: Vc have long notes as Fg1/2 & Cb, and Hr1-4 reinforce Fg.

292-3: Tutti **diminuendo**.

294, 296, 298: Tutti **piano crescendo**.

299-302: Trl/2 **tacent**.

300 & 301: Minims omitted in Hr1-4 to emphasize accent on last crotchet.

311-27: Tutti pp. Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2, Hr1 8va, until the 1st crotchet of b.319, the **tacent** until the 2nd crotchet of b.321. Cl1/2 8va from b/318.

367-74: Fl1/2 **tacent**. Ob1/2 **tacent** until b.373. Vn2 **tacent** until b.370. Hr1-4 **forte, gestopft, espressivo** until b.370. All instruments have **ppp** in b.371. The different dynamics in the horns are to take account of the difference in projection between the stopped and open tone. The effect in...
383 (last note) - 386: Ob1/2 & Cl1/2 ff. These are the only moving parts.

387-90: Trl/2 & Pk tacent.

403-10: The removal of Hrl-4, Trl/2 & Pk and the rewriting of the string parts emphasize the stretto. See Ex.33.3.

411-22: See Ex.33.3. Trl/2 join in the melody. After the brilliant reinstrumentation of the preceding bars this is a makeshift arrangement since, unlike b.3-4, Fll/2 are left with the lower octave, and Trl/2 abandon the melody before the end. With the exception of Vnl/2 who are very high, and Trl/2, few instruments actually contribute continuously to the melody and this encourages Trl/2 to dominate, giving a coarse sound to the passage.

539-43: See Ex.33.4. By means of a general piano dynamic for the accompaniment and the removal of notes in the wind parts, Mahler brings out the stretto.

562: Trl/2 tacent in order not to obscure the thematic substance of the following bars.

563-6: From the last note of b.564, Trl/2 reinforce Hrl/2 8va.

567-70: As b.563-6.

571 (last note) - 578: Trl/2 & Pk removed to allow them to enter fresh in b.579.
33.2.3 Selected Passages - 2nd movement

0-8: Mahler expands the dynamic range, by beginning the melody mp to avoid too loud a start and then repeating it ff from b.5.

8 - 14 (5th quaver): Obl/2 tacent.

11 - 12 (1st note): Fgl/2 & Va forte to bring out the imitation.

15: The climax of the theme is heightened by double stops in Vn1/2 & Va. See Ex.33.5.

15-16: Hr3/4 double Hr1/2.

16b-23: Mahler sets off the semiquaver tune by accompanying it pizzicato. See Ex.33.6.

25-8: Fll & Cl1/2 tacent. Fgl/2 tacent until 5th quaver of b.28. Hr3/4 & Tr1/2 tacent in b.28 until 5th quaver. <2>

32b-40: Tr1/2 tacent.

51 & 55: Last note in Vc 8va.

52 (last note) - 56: Va doubles Vc 8va.

60 (last crotchet) - 62 (2nd crotchet): Cl1/2 reinforce Obl/2.

74 (last crotchet) - 76: Ww diminuendo to pp. Hr/Tr tacent.

77-8: Ww, Hr1-4 & Cb have quaver rest at end of b.78. Tr tacent. Vn2 tacent until the fifth quaver of b.78 and Vn1 adds Vn2 part. Vn2, Va & Vc enter ff with theme on last quaver.

79 (1st note): Tr1/2 tacent.
103 (2nd half) - 104: Vnl has crescendo in b.103 and a crotchet (sforzando - dim) at the beginning of b.104, returning to Schumann's semiquavers (pp) from the second crotchet of the bar. This ensures that the gradual development of the theme in Va and Vnl has a culminating point and does not just expire in the tremolo.

107: Pk trill terminates after 5 quavers and 6th quaver is used as an upbeat.


117: Climax of hairpin is ff in strings.

117-9: As b.115-7, except sf at climax of hairpin.

33.2.4 Selected Passages - 3rd movement

3-4: Obl/2 & Hrl/2 tacent. This thinning out of the texture is not strictly necessary, and the omission of Obl removes fifths from the chords on the 1st and 3rd crotchets of b.3.

4-7: For lightness, Vn2 & Va play pizzicato from the upbeat of b.4. Vn2 omit their semiquavers in b.5 & b.6 and the first note of b.6 and b.7, resuming arco at the beginning of b.8. Va have arco from b.6. The imitation of Vnl by Va is made more evident by the thinning out of the accompaniment.

9: The IGMG score has the 6th quaver in b.9 deleted from Vc/Cb; but Mahler may have intended to replace the preceding note by a crotchet. In any case, commas in Vnl/2 & Va indicate a slight separation which implies that the following bar is played as a refrain.
15-17: Vc & Cb pizz from 2nd note of b.15, Vn2 & Va pizz from last crotchet of b.15. All resume arco at the end of b.17.

35: Rit from the beginning of the bar and fermata on the third crotchet.

35-6: Vn2 & Va pizz from the last crotchet of b.35 until the end of b.36. Pizz in Vc & Cb at the end of b.35 implies that they may have played the 1st three notes of the bar arco.

40: Hr2 tacet 1st two notes.

43-4: Hr1/2 tacet from last note of b.43. Obl/2 tacet 2nd & 3rd notes of b.44. Cl1/2 a third higher than original on the 2nd note of b.44. The lack of any change to the third note in Cl1 indicates a probable copyist's error, as a concert c'' would be more appropriate.

51-2: Vn2, Va, Vc & Cb pizz from the last crotchet of b.51.

33.2.5 Selected Passages - 4th movement

1: By not actually printing arco, the published scores imply that the first chord should be pizzicato, as the last chord of the preceding movement; but the opening clearly demands a heavy, full bow stroke and I should expect Mahler to write this in his score. However, the IGMG score lacks this indication.

22: Schumann's diminuendo in Obl/2, Cl1/2 & Vn2 is replaced by crescendo.

50: Pk 8va bassa to the end of the movement. Ps3 and Cb also have the low E-flat in the last three bars. This is one of Mahler's finest changes and despite the anachronism it is impossible to disapprove of the exquisitely sombre effect on any other grounds than pedantry.
33.2.6 Selected Passages - 5th movement

0-8: St pp, Ww tacent. Hr1/2 play only in in b.3-4.

8-16: Trumpets enter p cresc with forte in b.9, and tacent from b.11. Pk tacent. All other instruments play the second statement of the theme ff.

21-6: Pk tacent. Tutti fp at the beginning of b.21 with cresc in b.23. Obl/2 reinforce Cl1/2 in b.22. Obl/2 8va bassa from b.23 until the 1st note of b.24.

26 (last note): Tutti pp.

27-37 & 40 - 43 (1st note): Hr1/2 tacent.

60: Last note downbow to place the accents on the downbow in b.62-3.

76-7: Ob2/C12 double Obl/Cl1 in order to balance Fl1, Flg & Vn1.

88 - 93 (3rd note): Bowing reversed to place the accents on the downbow.

97-8: Vn2 tacent to prepare the exposed and tricky passage in b.99.

126 - 129 (3rd note): Bowing reversed to place the accents on the downbow.

129 (last crotchet) - 133 (first note): Obl/2 reinforce Cl1/2.

133-4: Fl1/2 8va to match the contour of Obl/2.

138 (last crotchet) - 141 (1st note): Cl1/2 & Obl/2 reinforce Fl1/2 8va bassa. Trl plays original Cl1/2 part. In b.139-40, Hr1/2 reinforce Fl1/2 15ma bassa. This recasting is justified by the clarity it brings to the woodwind parts.

152-3: Tutti diminuendo with ff from the last crotchet.
221: Vn2 reinforces C11/2, as in b.222.

257 & 262: The long held notes in the wind and Pk become piano at the beginning of these bars to allow Vn1/2 & Va to dominate, each new wind fanfare beginning again ff.

262 (last note) - 266: C11 reinforces Ob1; and C12 takes original C11 in b.266.

285-6: Tutti diminuendo to piano.

286-95: Trl/2 omit the last note of b.286, and join Ps1 until the third crotchet of b.294, uniting with Hr1-4 from the last quaver of b.294.

315-20: Ps1/2 reinforce Hr3/4 in b.315-7. Trl/2 tacent b.316 and reinforce Hr1/2 in b.317-20. Ps3 reinforces Cb and Fgl/2 in b.317-8. These changes bring out the imitations of the part writing in a unified colour and lead much better to the final page of the work.

321 - 322 (3rd note): Trl/2 tacent.
Chapter 34

Schumann, Symphony No.4, Op.120

Mahler conducted Schumann IV five times:

Vienna PO 14 Jan 1900
New York PO 29 Dec 1909
            3 Feb 1910
            4 Feb 1910
            11 Feb 1910

In New York, the critics did no more than mention Mahler's Retuschen.

34.1 Sources

34.1.1 Score, P.56

This score, which is in the Osborn Collection, bears the stamp of the
Hamburg music dealer Böhme and is the one on which the orchestral material,
P.57 is based. Particular evidence of this is given by the addition of the
extra rehearsal numbers and the general agreement of the detailed changes.
The rehearsal numbers and the majority of the Retuschen are in blue pencil
and probably date from 1909, though the rehearsal letters and other earlier
changes using a russet pencil were probably used in Vienna. There are
additions in red ink which are later than the blue pencil. Other marks in
lead pencil most probably indicate changes made in rehearsal.
34.1.2 Set of Orchestral Parts, P.57

This is a set in the Breitkopf edition which has 37 continuously numbered orientation figures added by Mahler. The string parts number 8,7,5,5,4 and are from an old set printed by stone litho. They are stamped: J. Schuberth & Co. / Music Dept / N-York 820 Broadway and Philharmonic / of New York / Society. <l> The string parts have been re-numbered several times.

There is a complete set of wind parts in the same edition as the strings, P.57A; and a set of woodwind only in a later edition P.57B, which was used by doubling players. There are also indications of doubling in P.57A. All the parts were marked up by Mahler in blue pencil, with a few copyists' and players' changes added later, and the stamps on most of them give a clear indication that he only used them in New York.

34.2 The Main Characteristics of Mahler's Interpretation

The orchestral parts were used as the basis for the present study, with clarifications from the score which was consulted briefly.

34.2.1 Repeats

Mahler initially intended to make the repeat in the first movement, but this was later struck out. In the finale the repeat is struck out in the parts.
34.2.2 Timings and Tempi

Timings are found in the parts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>At</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vn2.3</td>
<td>25 Min</td>
<td>end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val</td>
<td>23½ Min</td>
<td>begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vc2</td>
<td>26 Min</td>
<td>begin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

but in view of the many different tempi involved these are not of much use.

According to La Grange, Mahler was accused in Vienna by the Deutsche Zeitung of starting the first Allegro slowly and accelerating at the beginning of the development section. <2> The New York Times wrote: The last movement he takes at a tempo that robs it of some of its effect. <3>

34.2.3 Selected Passages - 1st movement

1-8: Ob1/2 tacent from 4th quaver of b.2 to 1st crotchet of b.5, and from b.6 to 2nd crotchet of b.7. Hr3/4 tacent from 3rd crotchet of b.1 to b.4 and from b.6-7. Tr1/2 tacent in b.1 after 1st quaver. Mahler here enables a good diminuendo to pp and removes unnecessary harmonic reinforcement.

5 (2nd half) - 10 (1st half): Cl1/2 doubled.

10-18: (Subito) p in the middle of b.14 and cresc in b.15. Vn1 p and Vn2 f in the 2nd half of b.16. Mahler hereby clarifies the structure and simplifies what is otherwise a demandingly long crescendo.

20 (2nd half) - 24: Ob1/2 tacent. Fl1/2 8va bassa from b.21 to the 1st note of b.24. Fl2 plays Ob1 original from the second note of b.22 until b.24. Vn2 & Va tacent b.23-4. Pk tacent last three notes of b.21 and 1st note of b.22. Mahler again facilitates a better diminuendo and removes inessential harmonic reinforcement.

34.2.1 - Schumann IV - P.56/7
23-8: Vn2 tacent 8va and join Vi from the 1st note.
Va 8va, and Vc have quaver A and then replace Va.

28: A gap before Lebhaft indicated in P.56 and all parts by a comma.

32 (2nd half): Pk has four semiquavers on A.

29-38: The periodic structure is here 4, 3, 2, 1 and Mahler makes this clear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>ff</td>
<td>Ww doubled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Ww single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>ff</td>
<td>Ww doubled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>St f cresc</td>
<td>Luftpause at end of bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wind mp cresc</td>
<td>Va doubles Vn2. Vn1 tacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ww single</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39: Vn1 reinforce Fl1/2, Vn2 reinforces Obl/2. Va doubles Vn2 in first half of bar, then adds Vn2 original to its own part.

40: Obl/2, Cl1/2 & Fgl1/2 8va.

50 (2nd half): Va and Vc reinforce Fgl1/2.

57-9: In P.57, Obl and Cl1 parts interchanged. This is an unusual texture; but it must be admitted that it blends very well. However, in P.56, the indications are different: Obl-4 have Obl original, Cl2 has Cl1 original and Cl1 is 8va. Either way, Mahler's intention was to make this thematic material stand out.

59-60 & 63-4: Vn2 removed after 1st note, Va removed, except for 1st note of 63.

67-9: St pp. Fl1/2, Obl/2 & Cl1/2 have hairpins in each bar.

79-81: Va doubled by Vc in b.79. Vn2 join Vn1 in b.80 and the chord of b.81. Va play Vn2 original in b.80. Fgl1/2 doubled in b.79. Pk tacent.
83-5: Va join Vc from the 2nd half of b.83 until the 1st half of b.85. The notes in the strings are changed to more melodic semiquavers.

Mahler emphasises the motivic structure in b.79-85.

86b: Fermata removed.

101-2: Vn2 & Va join Vn1, leaving Hr1-4 to play the accompaniment. Hr3 has Va original from the 2nd half of b.101.

103-4: Vn1, Va & Ob tacent. Hairpins in Ps2/3, cresc in b.103, dim in b.104.

105-14: As 101-4. Hr4 has Va original in 105-6, 109-10 and 113-4.

117-20: Vn2 joins Vn1. Semiquavers in Vn1/2 & Va until the 1st half of b.118, then demisemiquavers. Vc 8va from the 2nd half of b.118, and Cb 8va from the 2nd half of b.119. Hr3 doubles Hr1.

120 (last semiquaver) - 133: Ww doubled, Cl1/2 8va, Hr3/4 double Hr1/2 in b.120-3, and replace Cl1 from the last note of b.126, 8va bassa from the last note of b.128. From b.129, Trl/2 reinforce Obl/2, but retain their original rhythm. Ps begin a semiquaver earlier in b.131.

133 (last note) - 146: Trl/2 tacent until b.141. Hr3/4 join Hr1/2. Vn2 join Vn1 until 1st note of b.141.

142-6: Trl/2 join Hr1/2. Ps begin a semiquaver earlier in b.144. A Luftpause before b.144. Pk deletes last note of b.141, plays A-flats in b.142, and a roll on C, ff dim p, in b.143. The notes of b.144 are omitted and another roll on C ff dim p is inserted in b.145.

155-6: Va join Vn1.
169 (2nd quaver) - 174: Vn2 join Vn1. Va add Vn2 original.

175-248: This section is musically identical to b.101-174, but transposed, and Mahler makes similar changes here.

277-84: Ob1/2 & Fg1/2 doubled to bring out the melody.

291-6: Ob1/2 reinforce Fl1/2, Cl1/2 replace Ob1/2, Cl3/4 play original. Ww doubled.

313-32: Ob1 reinforces Vn1. Ob2 reinforces Vn1 in b.329-32. Cl1/2 reinforce Ob1/2 until b.238, and then 8va. All Ww doubled. Vn2 joins Vn1 in b.329-32.

345-8: Notes removed from Pk leaving the same rhythm as Ps. Vn2 joins Vn1.

358: All parts, but not P.56, have *attacca* written in them by Mahler, but the fermata over the rest remains. According to the *Arbeiter Zeitung* Mahler played the symphony without any pause between the movements, <4> a procedure also mentioned in New York:

> Mr Mahler paid the tribute to Schumann's desires and intentions in this symphony of playing it through, as he directed, without pause between the several movements. <5>.

### 34.2.4 Selected Passages - 2nd movement

1-2: First chord of Cl1/2 & Fg1/2 doubled to make the transition less abrupt.

11-2, 25-6 & 51-2: Ob *tacet* from 2nd crotchet.

28 - 34 (1st half of bar): Hr3/4 *tacent*.

35 - 38 (2nd half): Vn solo abandoned, and Vn1 divided equally.
42b. *tenuto* - accent written in pencil by a player over the interjection of F1. 

49-53: In P.56, Cl1/2, Fg2, Hr3/4 *tacent*. <6> Ob1 *tacet* from 2nd crotchet of b.51 and Fgl from b.52. All instruments *diminuendo* in b.51 and *ppp* on the 2nd crotchet of b.52.

34.2.5 **Selected Passages - 3rd movement**

1-2, 3-4, etc: St have hairpins with apex on the G.

19-24: Tutti *diminuendo*.

47: Trl/2 *tacent* 1st note.

56-62a/b: Vn2 replaces rests by Vn1 notes.

65-80: Cl1/2 *tacent*.

65 & 73: Vc/Cb *pizz*.

77-80: Hrl/2 *tacent*. In b.80, Obl/2 *tacent* and Vn2, Va, Vc & Cb *pizz* on last two notes.

81, 85 & 89: Vc/Cb *pizz*.

93 (3rd crotchet) - 97 (1st crotchet): Vc/Cb *pizz*.

97-112a/b: Basically as 65-80, with Ob1/2 *tacent*, and Hr1/2 *tacent* in last four bars.

110b: *Rit* in P.56 and in some parts.

113-92: As b.1-80.

208-16: Ob1/2 *tacent* from 2nd note.
221: A tempo in P.56 only.

221-5: Tutti ppp. Hrl tacet. Obl/2, Cl1/2, Fgl/2 tacet last notes of b.224 and 1st note of b.225.

231-2: Cl/Fg tacet.

34.2.6 Selected Passages - 4th movement

N.B. Bar numbering from Langsam.

1-12: Schumann has prescribed a uniform crescendo from b.3, with a drop to piano in the middle of b.12: Mahler changes these dynamics, making two crescendi, with (subito) pp in b.7.

7-8: See Ex.34.1 for the horn harmonies.

10: Vn2, Va & Vc have p at the beginning of the bar, and Vn1 & Vc have ff in the middle of the bar to allow them to dominate.

21-4: Blue pencil in P.56 indicates that Ps1-3 & Pk tacet. Lead pencil in P.56 indicates that Trl/2 tacet in b.20-4.

28 & 30: Vn1 tacet.


39: Vn1/2 & Va Griffbrett. Vc/Cb pizz from 2nd note: arco in b.47.

39-41: Ob2 tacet.

51-55: In P.57, rit marked in Fl1 and rall in Vn1.3 in b.54, though in P.56
many of the parts and P.56. This would appear to be something Mahler asked for in rehearsal as a consequence of his ritardando.

59: Vn1.3 has jumping bow.

73-4: Tutti cresc with ff in the middle of b.74.

78 & 80: Ps1-3 & Vn1/2 have Luftpausen at the end of these bars.

79 & 81: Hrl-4 reinforce Fgl/2. All Ww doubled. Dynamics ppp cresc sf.

82: Fgl has b', added in pencil in P.56, and therefore probably asked for in rehearsal.

82 et seq: P.56 indicates staccato for the string entries.

91-103: Mahler restructures the dynamics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

104 - 110 (1st half): Va tacent.

129-31: Obl/2 tacent.

145-8: F12, Obl/2, Fgl/2 & Trl/2 tacent. Cl1 tacet after 1st two notes and until 1st note of b.149, Cl2 tacet until 1st note of b.149. St ppp, Vc/Cb pizz in b.145-6.

149 - 152 (1st note): Hrl-4 tacet. St & Ww ppp cresc.

163-4: Tutti cresc with ff in middle of b.164.

169 & 171 (1st half of each bar): Obl/2 tacent.
172-5: Hrl-4 tacent. Cl1/2 ff espr. Flg1/2 mf espr. Va mf molto espr. Vn1/2 & Vc/Cb p. Molto espr for Va is in pencil in P.56, and was probably requested in rehearsal.

178-9 & 186-7: Trl/2 reinforce Vnl from 2nd note. Tutti cresc with ff in middle of b.179 & b.187.

188-91: Mahler amplifies Schumann’s dynamics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Flg1/2, Va, Vc/Cb</td>
<td>p from last three notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>p from last crotchet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pk</td>
<td>tacent from last note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>f in middle of bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pk</td>
<td>crotchet A (mf),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>crotchet rest,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>crotchet A (f), rest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

192-5: As b.188-91.

196 (2nd note) - 203: Vn2 doubles Vnl, Va taking over Vn2 original. Vc plays Vn2 original 8va bassa.

204-6: Trl/2 reinforce Ob1/2.

204 & 208: All wind and timpani fff. In P.56 only, Tr and Ps have Schalltricher auf.

207: Vn2, Va, Vc & Cb have notes added to complete the diminished seventh chord under Vnl. These are the same notes as in b.208.

208-10: Trl/2 reinforce Ob2/Cl1.

210: Fermata removed.
211-20: Hr1-4, Trl/2 & Fl & Fc tacent until third crotchet of 211. Dynamics changed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Fgl/2, Vc/Cb</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Fgl/2, Vc/Cb</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cll/2, Va</td>
<td>mf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Cll/2</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Obl/2 Vn2</td>
<td>mf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Va</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Obl/2 Vn2</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Fll/2, Vnl</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ww doubled</td>
<td>Last three quavers ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Ww</td>
<td>ff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

223-4 & 227-8: Trl/2 reinforce Hr3/4 8va.

224-6: Vn2 joins Vnl.

228 (2nd note) - 230 (1st note): Cl1 8va, Ob2 joins Cl2; Vn1/2 in unison.

230 (second crotchet) - 231: Hr1-4 and Vc join Ps3, Hr1/3 8va.
Chapter 35

Smetana, The Bartered Bride Overture

Although Mahler conducted *The Bartered Bride* in the opera houses of Prague, Vienna and New York, he only began to conduct the overture as a concert piece in May 1908. This performance took place in Prague where Mahler had been asked to include a Czech work in his programme. <1>

Mahler conducted the Overture with the New York Symphony Orchestra on 29 Nov 1908 in his first American concert when the critic of the *New York Times* wrote that:

The overture to Smetana's opera, "The Bartered Bride" - an opera which Mr. Mahler expects to conduct at the Opera House later in the season - has been often played, but rarely at so breathless a pace or with so whispered a pianissimo in the fugato in which the strings unite with so deliciously witty an effect. The conception and performance of the piece were as of an actual prelude to a comedy to follow, and they were marked by the utmost vivacity and humor. <2>

On 19 February 1909, Mahler conducted the premiere of a new production of The Bartered Bride at the Metropolitan Opera, New York, using his own revision which included Retuschen and which placed the Overture at the beginning of Act II. <3>

The six subsequent concert performances which Mahler gave of the overture were all in January 1910 with the NYPO.

35.1 Sources

35.0.0 - Smetana, Bartered Bride
35.1.1 Copyist's Score, P.58

This score in the edition of Bote und Beck and now in the U.E. Archive contains the stamp of Schirmer, New York, and has marks, mainly in blue pencil in the highly distinctive and neat handwriting of the librarian of the New York Philharmonic Orchestra, H. G. Boewig. The original only has four rehearsal letters and in line with Mahler's usual practice, 26 rehearsal numbers have been added.

35.1.2 Set of Orchestral Parts, P.59

The set of parts is also in the U.E. Archive and agrees closely with the score, P.58. The string set numbers 8,7,5,5,4; and there is an extra set of wind parts which was used for the doubling woodwind. Boewig was responsible for the extensive modifications required by the additional woodwind doubling in b.237-72.

Some of the parts have comments written on them:

F14: Not needed written in blue at the top. This part has no extra rehearsal numbers, but does contain the blue brackets which indicate doublings.

Ob4: A m/s part signed at the end H. Boewig. 1910.

Cl1: On the back is written A. Bellucci New York.

Hr5: On this part is written: Diese Stimme ist noch mit der 1. zu vergleichen / ebenso die 6. mit den 2.

35.1.3 The Size of the Wind Section

Smetana's original is written for wind in the proportion 3,2,2,2 / 4,2,3,0 and the note on Hr5 described above indicates that Hr5/6 doubled Hr1/2. However, there is no further evidence of this doubling, and the modifications which Mahler made to the score do not seem to
Mahler also doubled the woodwind and, as he was unlikely to have access to more than four flute players, this means that the extra player doubled Fll, as confirmed by the comment written on the Fl4 part. Nevertheless, if Fll were doubled in b.211-6, as called for, then F12 would also have been better doubled. As the problem only exists in these bars the part could have been taken by the piccolo player, though there is no mark to this effect in the piccolo part.

35.1.4 Dating of Score and Parts

The size of the orchestra available for the Prague concert would not have permitted the Retuschen described below, and since the copyist responsible for the preparation of the score and for some of the additions to the parts was the librarian of the New York Philharmonic, this set was obviously used for the six performances of Jan 1910. This does not preclude Mahler’s use of the same Retuschen at the Metropolitan Opera; and it is in fact reasonable to infer that Boewig worked from Mahler’s parts, or from a score of the complete opera, perhaps one belonging to the opera house, in which Mahler had already established his Retuschen, since if Mahler already had his own copy of the score there would have been no need to prepare a new one.

The Clarinet player, A Bellucci, was not named in the lists of the New York Philharmonic, and this may indicate that the parts were used by the New York Symphony Orchestra, but I have been unable to verify it.

The best attempt to date the sources notes that the set of parts was certainly used in New York with the New York Philharmonic Orchestra in January 1910, and possibly also at the Metropolitan Opera in February.
1909 and with the New York Symphony Orchestra in November 1908. Without
doublings Mahler could also have used it in Prague as early as May
1908. The last Retuschen entered in the parts probably date from
January 1910. The score was also probably made towards the end of 1909,
or the beginning of 1910.

35.2 The Main Characteristics of Mahler's Interpretation

35.2.1 Tempo

In connection with the "breathless tempo" mentioned by the critic of
the New York Times we have a timing in Val of 6½ minutes, which
translates into a mean tempo of about minim = M.M.144. There is nothing
unusual about this tempo.

35.2.2 Articulation and phrasing of the Second Subject

Mahler employs a variety of different articulations for the second
subject and these are collated in Ex.35.1.

35.2.3 Selected Passages

1-8: Ww doubled.

2-5: Br and Pk fp cresc, with sf in Br and ff in Pk in b.5.

8-11: Ps ff. Pk originally shared this but were later marked f in
b.8-10.

The brass make a particularly brilliant contribution to the opening.

65 (2nd half): Strings dim.
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66-93: Reduction in the number of strings is marked in the parts by players. It would appear from the evidence that the reduction was:

- Vn1: 4 desks
- Vn2: 3 desks
- Va: 3 desks
- Vc: 3 desks in b.66 <4>

71: Str ppp.

78: Vc II and Cb fpp instead of Smetana's pp, bringing the bass entry into line with all the preceding entries.

100-3: See Ex.35.2 for Mahler's original Pk part which was subsequently struck out altogether in P.59 after the first note. See Ex.35.1 for phrasing and bowing for this and subsequent passages. The three consecutive downbows and other articulations indicate that Mahler viewed this theme as more of a dance than a cantabile melody.

104-7: Vnl ppp. All Ww except Fg2 f with dim in b.107. The transition to the piano statement of the second subject is not as abrupt as in Smetana's original.

115-29: Hr3/4 tacent. Fgl/2 tacent in b.128-9. St pp in b.116, pp dim in b.124 and pppp in b.128. The omission of Hr3/4 and Fg help achieve this diminuendo, the removal of the horns also considerably lightening the texture.

128-43: See Ex.35.1 for the consistent notation of the melodic cell. The dance-like character of the second theme is further emphasised by the shortening of the first two notes.

131: Acceler. in P.58. This presupposes that Mahler has also slackened the tempo during the diminuendo.

143-7: Pk has low G where this is part of the bass line. See Ex.35.1
for string articulation and bowing. The further change of articulation in the third bar of this theme seems to be an arbitrary decision on Mahler's part, and appears thus only here.

148-56: Mahler's dynamic scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>cresc sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>cresc sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152-3</td>
<td>cresc sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154-5</td>
<td>cresc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160-1</td>
<td>dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sforzati are removed from the horns in b.148 & b.150. All instruments have a crotchet rest at the beginning of b.156. Trl/2 have this written into their parts, although it does not feature in the score. Ww doubled from b.156.

Mahler makes wholesale changes here in the dynamic layout of the climax of the exposition. Smetana's original has a uniform fortissimo; but Mahler builds up to the climax in 156 in several steps, by means of his subito piano marks in b.148 & b.150. The original intention of the crotchet rest in b.156 may have been just to provide a good attack on the second crotchet and, with the exception of the descending bass line and the trumpet A, this change would pass unnoticed in a reverberant acoustic. Clearly, having shortened the tied notes, the bass line and the trumpet note would sound strange on their own and Mahler decided to dispense with them also.

162-3: Ps1-3 accents deleted.

170-6: Hr/Ps ffp in b.171. Pk dim in b.174-5. Fl2 joins Fl1 from the 2nd note of b.170 until b.174. Obl 8va b.174-6. Cl1 8va from the 2nd
Mahler's changes bring Ww into relief and remove the lower octave, making the texture more astringent.

182-4: Vn2: _dim_ with _p_ in b.184. In a reverberant acoustic this makes more sense than a _subito piano_.

190: Vnl _pizz m_f_.

195-210: Vn2 hairpins suppressed. Mahler prevents Vn2 from upstaging the woodwind.

207: _Rit_ in score with _a tempo_ in b.211. In most parts from b.208.

211-20: Fl1/2 _forte_ and doubled. Ob1/2 _tacent_ in b.211. Hr1-4 _tacent_.

Fg2 and strings _ppp_. There are indication in the parts that Mahler had the strings play _non espressivo_ in b.211-4. Vn2 _A-Saite_ from 215.

String hairpins replaced by _morendo_ in b.219-20.

Mahler brings the flute melody well to the fore in this passage and subdues all subsidiary material. The elimination of the horns improves the harmonic texture, and the passage is thereby greatly thinned out, making a large contrast with what follows.

221-8: Ob1/Cll _8va_ until the 1st half of b.224. Cl2 _8va_ in b.226-8.

Ww doubled. Mahler again throws the emphasis on the higher octaves.

237-53: Cl2-4 join Cl1, and Fg2-4 join Fg1. Fl1/2 doubled.

255-9: Ob1-4/Cll-4 double Ob1. <5> Fg1-4 double Fg1.

260-72: Fl2 joins Fl1. Ob2 joins Ob1 in b.261-5. Cl2 joins Cl1 until
Obl/2 from b.267. Fg1 joins Fg2 until b.265. In b.267, Fg1 has a
B-flat reinforcing Obl 8va bassa. All Ww doubled, Fg2 until the 3rd
crotchet of b.273. Hr2 tacet in 261-5. In b.267-72, P.59 indicates
that the volume of Vnl/2 was moderated. The parts are by no means
consistent in their markings, which were inserted by the players.

Mahler's motivation for the many doublings in the wind passages is hard
to understand, particularly in b.255-9, where four oboes, four
clarinets and four bassoons are employed. The effect is a gross
over-inflation of Smetana's texture and a mixture of colours that
Mahler himself did not often resort to in his own compositions. The
changes to the strings and the omission of Hr2 would probably go
unnoticed in the context.

273-88: General dynamic pp. fp removed from horns. Hr1-4 tacet from
b.285. Hairpins removed from Vn2/Va/VcI by players.

It would seem that Mahler was intent in keeping the woodwind in the
foreground. The omission of the horns again cleans up the harmonies
which in the original are unnecessarily confused by having the
appogiatura and its resolution struck at the same time.

289-96: All instruments pp crescendo poco a poco, leading to ff in
b.297.

297-312: Tr mf on the 2nd note. Ps tacet until b.304, entering in
b.305 p. Originally Pk replaced the 3rd note of b.302 by a rest, to
avoid disturbing the syncopation; but P.59 shows that Mahler later
decided to eliminate the part altogether from the 2nd note of b.297
until b.304. The articulation of the melody is here much more legato
than ever before, with downbows to accent the 2nd half of each bar.
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See Ex. 35.1. A general cresc, to ff, is written in b.311-2, although the parts show this as starting two bars earlier.

313-9: Vnl/2 omit the tied over notes at the beginning of b.313 and are fff on the 2nd note. See Ex. 35.1 for bowing. Ww doubled from the 2nd note of b.313 until the 1st note of b.319.

The new articulation of the theme gives it a majesty which it has not had hitherto, though because of the different key and disposition of the parts this passage is not as loud as it was in b.156. Mahler does not repeat his earlier dynamic scheme; and also does not place a rest just before the top of the phrase, as he did earlier.

319-25: Hr tacet from the 2nd note of b.319. Str: ohne marcato in b.320. The omission of the horns is again salutary, as they vitiate the clarity of the harmonies. The direction to the strings not to play marcato prevents them taking attention from the more important woodwind interjections, and lightens the texture.

334: General diminuendo, culminating pp in b.338, with cresc from b.339. The dim-pp-cresc follows the contour of the melodic line and is an enhancement of something which happens naturally in any case.


368-93: Strings one dynamic level less than the wind. Obl/2 tacet in b.390-1.

Mahler seeks a very spare texture towards the end of this section, with a bias towards the wind instruments.

394: Imo tempo. Cb stac. The implication here is that Mahler slowed down gradually in the previous section, and this would be entirely natural. The staccato wedges in the bass part may also indicate that...
all the strings played "off the string" in this section, naturally playing more "on the string" as the music gets louder.

422: Ww doubled to the end. Rest in wind parts only after 2nd note of b.422. The last return of the second subject is more legato than ever, since it is supported by quaver motion in the strings.

443: Brass and Pk fp.

446: Crescendo in brass & Pk in P.58, which begins one bar earlier in P.59.

448-53: Ww and Hn tacet from the 2nd half of b.448. Vnl f and Vn2 subito mf in P.59. Mahler's elimination of the wind parts makes a fine contrast and sounds clearer than Smetana's original. After the climax of the preceding section Vnl needs to be louder than the rest to be clearly heard.

454-60: Vnl joins Fll. The parts indicate that this was a late decision of Mahler's, since there are other changes written underneath the glued-in change.

454-7: Ww begin on the 2nd crotchet. C1l/2 begin in unison with Obl/2 with C and F as the last notes of b.455. Hn pp cresc in b.454. Tr and Ps tacet. Pk p. Vnl p cresc. Vn2, Va, Vc & Cb fp cresc.

458-60: Hn f cresc. Ps/Pk p cresc.

Mahler here grades the final crescendo by cutting out instruments. The woodwind and Vnl dominate the texture in the first four bars.

460-end: There are no changes in scoring here; but various marks in the parts which indicate that Mahler did not take the last six chords in tempo, possibly delaying them all and making a large ritardando.

35.2.3 - Smetana, Bartered Bride
Chapter 36

Wagner, Die Meistersinger Overture

The Prelude to Act I of Die Meistersinger was the most often performed work in Mahler's repertoire, receiving 38 performances in the concert hall, the first being in Budapest in 1890 and the last in February 1911. <1> In fact, 23 of these performances took place with New York orchestras, and critical opinions of two of them are of interest:

...The prelude to "Die Meistersinger" closed the concert. It was played with a most stirring effect, and the performance was as finished and ornate in detail as it was splendid and sonorous in its larger proportions. Its tempo was faster than that to which we have been accustomed, and to many the music doubtless lost something of its significance thereby... <2>

...The playing of the prelude of "Die Meistersinger" was broad and dramatically pulsing; yet it seemed that Mr. Mahler used his augmented forces a little too eagerly in the production of a merely loud sound without consideration of its stridency. There was much fine detail in the exposition of the complicated contrapuntal passages, and the performance was not finished and ornate in detail as it was splendid and sonorous in its larger proportions... <3>

From these two reviews by the same critic we learn nothing about Mahler's tempo since they contradict each other; but a review of Mahler's 1907 performance in Helsinki implies that his tempo was fast:

The overture to Die Meistersinger was given in a livelier tempo than has been the custom previously, but one cannot argue against an opera director with Mahler's instinct. <4>

From the Hyde timings we have a timing of 8½ minutes which gives an average metronome mark of crotchet = 105. <5> The key to Mahler's fast
tempo is the fact that he was an opera conductor and as such would hardly be expected to linger over the overture in the opera house, knowing that there were over four hours still to go before the final C major chord.

We have confirmation from the second review above that Mahler doubled and/or reinforced the wind, and the stridency mentioned above can be detected in the extant orchestral material.

36.1 Set of Orchestral Parts, P.60

In the U.E. Archive there is a double set of woodwind parts in the Schott edition, P.60A, bearing the stamp GUSTAV MAHLER/WIEN in Roman letters. Each part is printed with Fl1/2, Ob1/2, etc, on one part. Mahler has indicated in blue pencil the doublings required and added rehearsal letters A-K <6> and numbers 1-14. There are also pencil marks, probably made by players. There is no piccolo part.

There is a part for E-flat Clarinet in Mahler’s own hand, using black ink and blue pencil, P.60B. This part is also stamped GUSTAV MAHLER/WIEN in Roman letters. It is reproduced as Ex.36.1. Originally the part went only as far as bar 187; but Mahler later added notes from bar 196 on. The notes between bars 41 and 57 are also later additions.

36.2 The Significance of the Extant Parts

Mahler’s score and string parts are missing and it is most likely that the set described above represents only the doubling set. It is also
together using the same part. Whatever the truth of this, the changes described below do make sense as they stand.

It appears that Mahler used three flutes, one piccolo, four oboes, three B-flat clarinets, one E-flat clarinet, and four bassoons, though it is clear that he did not always have this complement available, as for instance in the concerts of 10/13 January 1910 when the programme booklet listed woodwind in the proportions 4,3,3,3, or in Prague in May 1908 when he had a woodwind section of 3,3,2,3. <7>

36.3 Description of Mahler’s Annotations.

2-8: Obl and Cll doubled from the quavers in b.2 until the 1st note of b.8, giving more emphasis to the main melody. <8>

8-13: Fgl/2 doubled.

15-8: Obl doubled from 2nd quaver of b.15 to 1st quaver of b.18. Cll doubled from 2nd quaver of b.15 to b.17.

18-26: Fll-3 play Fll part.

19-20: Obl doubled from 2nd crotchet of b.19 to 1st note of b.20. Cll doubled in b.19-20.

Most of these doublings reinforce the first violin line: the doublings of Ob and Cl in b.19-20 add body, since they are 8va below Vnl.

26-7: Obl doubled. Cll doubled from the 2nd half of b.26 to the 1st note of b.27. The doubling of these trills makes them slightly more pungent.
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the accompaniment more than indicated by Wagner in order that the woodwind are heard clearly. Mahler’s tripling of the solo flute helps this problem but increases the balance towards the higher octave and away from the clarinet part with questionable gain.

38-9: Fll tripled. Two flutes are normally adequate here since they are playing in a powerful register, and this modification can only make the texture more shrill.

41-58: Fll doubled. Obi & Cll doubled until b.45. Ob1 has a pencil drawing of an uplifted oboe to indicate that the instrument was to be pointed upwards, increasing its stridency. Obi & Cll doubled from the 2nd note of b.49 to b.53. Es-cl reinforces Fll, and Ob1 where Fll has rests. The 1st note of b.49 is omitted from Es-cl.

In this passage the melody has again been reinforced and the assistance of the Es-cl makes it certain that the woodwind will penetrate the texture.

62 (2nd half) - 63 (1st half): Fll reinforced by Es-cl and Obl/Cll doubled. This is a genuine improvement to Wagner’s original in which the woodwind do not have enough power to take over the line of the violins successfully.

67-72: Fll reinforced by Es-cl. Obl & Cll doubled. This may be thought to be overkill; but in many performances Trr obliterated any contribution from the woodwind and Mahler’s strengthening of the unison and octave probably produces a better blend, particularly considering the contribution of the Es-cl on the upper octave.

75-76 (1st crotchet): Obl doubled.
octave of the main melody played by Vn2/Va, while reducing the
colouration imparted by the contributions of the flutes.

81-9: Fl1 8va from the last crotchet of b.81 to the 1st half of b.83.
Es-cl reinforces Fl2 on the last note of b.83, rising an octave to join
Fl1 in b.84-6. Cl1-3 play Cl1 original in b.81-4. Ob1/2 doubled in
b.84. Ob1/2 & Cl1 doubled in b.86 - b.89 (1st half).

These modifications all strengthen the violin lines, particularly Vn2.

120-1: Fl1-3, reinforced by Es-cl, Ob1-4 and Cl1-3 8va play the
woodwind line. This is a significant increase in tone and helps
considerably in the audibility of this motif.

122: Fl1 doubled.

123: Ob2 has pp written in pencil. Although optimistic, this is a good
idea in view of the low register.

132-3: Fg1/2 doubled from the 10th semiquaver until the 7th quaver of
b.133. Fl1 doubled in b.133 and reinforced by Es-cl on the last six
notes. Ob1 & Cl1 doubled on the trills of b.133. These changes enable
a greater crescendo to be made and increase the contribution of the
trills. Mahler was unable to double the trill in Cl2 as the fourth
player was already busy playing the Es-cl part.

137: Cl1 doubled. This is a case of Mahler trying to make audible
something which hardly ever sees the light of day - a good idea, if
still rather optimistic.

146-8: Cl1 doubled. Ob1 doubled from b.147-8.

149-57: Fl1 doubled.
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Mahler intensifies the 
crescendo. It should be noted that he
from disturbing the balance of the clarinet and oboe parts in
b.149-50.

151-7: Fg1-4 play Fg2 original. Ob2/C12 doubled and Ob1/C11 tacet
until b.154. The effect of this is to strengthen the pedal G in the
bass and the woodwind semiquavers. The omitted notes contribute more
on paper than in real life.

158-88: Fg1/2 doubled.

174-5: Ob1 doubled and reinforced by C11. This part already reinforces
Vn1.

177 (3rd crotchet) - 178 (3rd crotchet): Ob1/2 & C11 doubled. Fl1
reinforced by Es-cl (ff) in b.178. This gives the wind parts a real
chance of balancing properly with the rest of the orchestra.

181-3: Ob1 doubled until the 1st crotchet of b.182. C11 tacet and C12
doubled in b.182-3, playing the same as Fl2 in the 2nd half of b.183.
Es-cl reinforces Fl1 in b.182-3.

Ob1 is important in b.180-1, although Wagner’s scoring has a tendency
to disguise this, as Tr1 and Vn2 have the same notes and tend to drown
Ob1. Mahler’s doubling of Ob1 may make this diminution of the opening
theme sound less disjointed. The strengthening of the woodwind in
b.182-3 will undoubtedly ensure the dominance of the main voice, which
is also played by Vn1.

184-5: In the 2nd half of these bars Es-cl doubles Fl1, playing dotted
crotchets with sf.

186 (3rd crotchet) - 187 (5th quaver): Es-cl reinforces Fl1. These
contributions of the Es-cl enhance the high points of the melody which
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187 (crotchets 3 & 4): Obl & Cl doubled.

193-203: Obl/2 doubled until the 3rd crotchet of b.201. Cl doubled until b.200. See Ex.36.1 (from letter K) for the Es-cl part. These additions are a useful reinforcement of the main melody, and the late addition to the Es-cl part shows that Mahler thought about them carefully.


207: Obl/2 & Cl doubled. This will probably help to prevent the trumpets and trombones from dominating.

211-2: Obl/2 & Cl doubled. Obl reinforced by Es-cl which holds the G for five quavers' length.

213-4: Es-cl reinforces Trl 8va, holding the F for three quavers' length.

218-end: Obl/2, Cl and Fgl/2 doubled. See Ex.36.1 (last six bars) for the Es-cl part. The ending is thus given a greater stridency than Wagner envisaged, the high notes of the Es-cl contributing most to this.

222-3: Mahler, like most conductors, Klemperer and Karajan being two exceptions, is content to end the overture as written in the Schott parts, rather than making a more satisfying close by adding a further two chords as at the end of the complete opera.
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Mahler's Most Frequently Performed Repertoire

The following list, compiled from Knud Martner's *Gustav Mahler im Konzertsaal*, shows those works which received a significant number of performances by Mahler.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER of PERFORMANCES</th>
<th>COMPOSER</th>
<th>WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Die Meistersinger Overture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Tristan Act I Prelude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bach/Mahler</td>
<td>Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Siegfried Idyll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Leonore III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Coriolan Overture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Liebestod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mahler</td>
<td>Symphony No.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mahler</td>
<td>Symphony No.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Tannhäuser Overture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Berlioz</td>
<td>Symphony fantastique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mahler</td>
<td>Symphony No.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Strauss</td>
<td>Till Eulenspiegel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>A Faust Overture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Symphony No.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mahler</td>
<td>Symphony No.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Fliegende Holländer Overture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Tannhäuser Arias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mahler</td>
<td>Symphony No.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Symphony No.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Haydn</td>
<td>Symphony No.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>Unfinished Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Egmont Overture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Smetana</td>
<td>The Bartered Bride Overture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Lohengrin Act I Prelude</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collated here is information from scores and parts regarding repeats which Mahler made. This data is discussed in Ch.13.2 and in the chapters on individual works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>MVT</th>
<th>REPEATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven III</td>
<td>P.26/7</td>
<td>1st mvt: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd mvt: Scherzo: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trio: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4th mvt: Yes, Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven V</td>
<td>P.31</td>
<td>1st mvt: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd mvt: Trio: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4th mvt: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven VII</td>
<td>P.35</td>
<td>1st mvt: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd mvt: Scherzo: Yes, No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trio: Yes, No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4th mvt: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven IX</td>
<td>P.40</td>
<td>2nd mvt: Scherzo: Yes, No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trio: Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scherzo: ?, ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart K.550</td>
<td>P.44</td>
<td>1st mvt: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd mvt: No, No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd mvt: Minuet: Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trio: Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4th mvt: No, No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart K.551</td>
<td>P.45</td>
<td>1st mvt: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd mvt: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd mvt: Minuet: Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trio: Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4th mvt: No, No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schubert IX</td>
<td>P.49</td>
<td>1st mvt: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd mvt: Scherzo: No, No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trio: Yes, No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4th mvt: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann I</td>
<td>P.53/4</td>
<td>1st mvt: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd mvt: Scherzo: Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trio: Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Album</td>
<td>1st mvt:</td>
<td>2nd mvt:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann II</td>
<td>IGMG</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann III</td>
<td>IGMG</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann IV</td>
<td>P.56/7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix Two - Repeats
Listing of Timings in Orchestral Parts

The following list collates all those timings made by players in orchestral parts which have been found by the author. The significance of these is discussed in Ch.13.3 and in the individual chapters on the works concerned.

Beethoven  Coriolan Overture, P.6
Vn2.3  8 Min (German Hand)
Val  6½ Min

Beethoven  Egmont Overture, P.11
Val  7½ Min

Beethoven  Leonore II, P.13
Val  13 Min 2 mal
Va3  15 Min
F13  16 Minuten
F14  16 Minuten
Cl4  15 Minuten

Beethoven  Leonore III, P.14
Val  13 Mins
Va4  13 Minuets (sic)
Vc2  13 Min
Tr1  9.18 (sic) at beginning; 14 min 9.30 at end
Tr2  9.16 at beginning; 9.30 14 Min at end

Beethoven  Die Weihe Des Hauses Overture, P.18
Vn2.7  11 Min
Val  10½ Min
Hr3  10 Min

Beethoven  Symphony No.3, P.26
Vn2.3  at end of 1st mvt 18 Min
Vn2.7  at end of 1st mvt 16 Min
at end of 2nd mvt 13 Min
at end of 3rd mvt  7 Min
at end of 4th mvt 12 Min
Beethoven Symphony No.5, P.31
Val 33 Min
Vc2 35 Min
Hrl 37 Min
Ps1 33 Min

Beethoven Symphony No.7, P.35
Vn2.4 1st mvt 15 Min
Val 35 Min

Bruckner Symphony No.9, P.42
Vn1.7 1st mvt 15 min
Vn2.3 45 min
Vn2.7 at beg 46 min
Val .47½ min (with cuts)
Va2 1st mvt 15
2nd mvt 11
3rd mvt 8
4th mvt 48 M
Vc2 1st mvt 15 min
2nd mvt 12 min
3rd mvt 12 min
4th mvt 15 min
Beck 1st mvt 19½ min
2nd mvt 13½ min

Mozart Symphony No.40, P.44
Vn2.1 1st mvt 25 Min
Val 1st mvt 26 Min
Hrl 25 Min

Mozart Symphony No.41, P.45
Vn2.4 at end of 1st mvt 11 min
32 Min ohne Repet nur I Satz repet
Vn2.6 33 Min
Cb3 38 Min mit Allen reps
Hrl 32 Min (33 underneath)

Schubert Symphony No.9, P.49
Vn2.3 50 min
Vn2.4 at end of 1st mvt 14½
at end of 2nd mvt 17
at end of 3rd mvt 8 Pausen
at end of 4th mvt 57 Min
Vn2.7 Dir. Mahler ohne Wiederholung 58 min 1./4/1900
Val 47 Min
Va2 55 Minuten
Cb2 60 minute
Ps2 47 Mi

Schumann Manfred Overture, P.52
### Schumann Symphony No.4, P.57

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vn2.5</td>
<td>10 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val</td>
<td>12 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vc4</td>
<td>10 Min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vn2.3</td>
<td>25 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val</td>
<td>23½ Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vc2</td>
<td>26 Min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX FOUR

Beethoven: Coriolan Overture (Miniature score)

The following is a transcription of annotations in a miniature score belonging formerly to Alma Mahler and now in the possession of Dr. Donald Mitchell, who kindly made available a photocopy for my use. The edition of the score was published by Ernst Eulenburg, Leipzig, and printed by C.G. Röder, Leipzig, Plate No. 4072.

There are annotations in Latin script - using pencil (and blue pencil where noted below). The score has been bound and pages trimmed.

Legible comments have been underlined, reconstructions by the present author left plain. There are no marks on pages 14, 15, 18, 19, 22, 23, 30, 31, or 34-9.

p.1, b.1-3 Blue pencil: Vn 1 has upbow in b.1, and downbow in b.3.
Bottom of page: Streicher hinauf! Beim Herunterstreichen würde das C zum Schluß an der Spitze des Bogens zu schwach werden.

p.2, b.15 Blue pencil: X in margin by Vn1 system. X above Vn1 in b.17.

p.2, b.19 Top of page: cresc ñ. to p.3, b.20
p.4, b.30 X above Hr3/4 and in left margin: X Horn!

p.6, b.40 Blue pencil: X in left margin and between Vn1/2 systems in bar 41.
At bottom of page: Wuchtig u. lang die Halbe. Mit dem Stock unten liegen bleiben!

p.8, b.54 Blue pencil: X in left margin and above second note of Vn1.
In left margin: Keine Achtel daraus machen!

p.9, b.62-3 Vn 1: Accents on each half note, repeated in right margin.

p.11, b.75 Above wind staves: Bläser espressivo - den Viertel halten nicht zu kurz. - with blue cross.
Above Vn1: Streicher abdämpfen. - with blue cross.

p.12, b.78 Above Viola stave: blue X Bratschen stark!
In left margin in blue: X G-Seite
At bottom of page: Bratschen heraus! Nicht auf der
mitnehmen.

p.16, b.103  In left margin Vn1, with X over last note of measure: Das muss krachen.

p.20, bl25  In left margin Vn1: Keine Triolen daraus machen.

p.24, bl44  Oboen heraus! blue X in Ob and in Fg.

p.26, b.157-8 Wuchtig die Bläser! Nicht elegant dirigieren sondern schwer.

Horns have ff ten in b.157-8 and b.163-4.

p.29, b.182 Above Vn1: schwach!!

p.33, b.201 Above Vn1: warm ruhig

p.33, b.204 Above Fl1: nicht eilen!

p.40, b.241 silence!

p.40, b.242. ruhig (vorbereiten)

p.40, b.243 Meno mosso Schönen weichen Klang ohne viele Nuancen! (Words underlined could be Mahler's hand.)

p.42 At top left: Immer ruhig

ff instead of f (three times)

p.43, b.260 anim.

p.43, b.264 By Vn2 and Va: heraus

p.44, b.266 In blue:sempre anim. (Could be Mahler's hand.)

p.44, b.267 Above Vn2: immer stärker - with blue hairpin.

p.47, b.299 allmählig etwas ruhiger

p.48, b.304 Over Vc: ausdrucksvoll with crescendo hairpin for three bars, until diminuendo begins on the A-flat.
Mahler's score of King Stephan Overture is one of those preserved in the library of the University of Southampton. It has the Böhme stamp of the Hamburg music shop and is in the third volume of Beethoven Overtures.

Mahler performed this overture with the New York Philharmonic Orchestra on 13 & 16 Dec, 1910, <2> although it is not certain that he used this score at that time, since the revision is so perfunctory. He used blue, brown and lead pencils to make the following few marks:

41-7: F12 joins F11. This is preferable to Beethoven's original which mainly reinforces Obl.

70 (last quaver) - 104: Vn1 8va, and Vn2 8va until b.74, and again from b.78 to b.80?. These two 8va signs are repeated in the recapitulation; but with no indication where Vn1 or Vn2 return to the normal octave.

141: F11 8va.

288 (2nd half) - 293: Hr1/2 reinforce Cl1/2 8va bassa and non legato with quavers instead of crotchets at the beginning of bars 289, 292 and 293.

From the cursory nature of Mahler's Retuschen in this score, which is not one of Beethoven's most brilliant examples of instrumentation, it would appear that they were made while Mahler was reading through and
that this actual score was probably not used as the basis of performance of the overture.
APPENDIX SIX

Beethoven: Symphony No.4, P.28

This is a Budapest score, bound together with Symphony III. The following marks were added by Mahler in pencil and blue pencil, and could be all that were necessary to serve for his two performances of the work, although it is probably significant that no rehearsal letters have been added.

First Movement

106-7: A vertical line in blue through the whole score emphasises the periodic structure.

111: St pp.

137-40: Pk has same rhythm as Tr, all notes C except 2nd in b.139.

162 & 166: Pk crotchet C in 2nd half of bar.

180 & 184: Pk crotchet Cs on crotchets 2 and 4.

185a et seq: There is no indication about the repeat; but it may be significant that Pk have no additions in b.186.

190-5: Fl 8va.

209-11: St diminuendo leading to pppp in b.211.

225: Vn1 ppp; Vc pp. While keeping the strings out of the way of the main melody which passes to the woodwind, this also allows Vn1 and Vc to blend better by throwing the emphasis on the lower octave.

Appendix Six - Beethoven IV
230-1: Vnl/2 crescendo.

232: Vnl/2 diminuendo.

233: Fl, Fg, Vnl have pp.

304-5: A vertical line in blue through the whole score emphasises the periodic structure.

333-6: Ww & Br p cresc fff.

337: From the 2nd crotchet, Fl reinforces Cll 8va.

385: St pp.

406: Ww, Br, Pk have p cresc, arriving f in b.409.

414-5: A vertical line in blue through the whole score emphasises the periodic structure.

Second Movement

44-8: See Ex.12.1 for Mahler's supplementary dynamics in Vnl.

58: Vnl/2 last two notes crescendo and tenuto.

66: Fl & Cl1/2, crescendo on 3rd and 4th quavers, diminuendo on 5th and 6th quavers.

67: Fl crescendo. Fg1 diminuendo on last two notes.

68: Fl & Fg piano. This probably refers to all Ww.

Fourth Movement

120: Vc crescendo.

121: Vc diminuendo.
215: C11 hairpins.

219-20: Obi crescendo in b.219, dimienuendo in b.220.
In the Archive of the Czech Philharmonic Orchestra there is a score and a set of parts which the author was able to examine for about an hour in November 1986. <3> These materials, identified here as P.36 and P.37, although having only rehearsal letters with no extra numbers, were evidently copied from one of Mahler's scores, probably P.34, apparently for use at his 1908 concert with the Czech Philharmonic Orchestra. La Grange relates the story that they were made without Mahler's knowledge, <4> but this is belied by the fact that Mahler's own hand can be seen in the score. Indeed, although the P.35 horn parts contain players' signatures indicating use on 22nd May in Prague, the day before the concert, there are in fact no such signatures to indicate use at the same period in the P.37 horn parts. Curiously the name of Reisner and the date 1903 occur here in Hrl, presumably copied from Hrl in P.35. It has been suggested that this set of materials was made to take account of the orchestra in Prague which did not have doubled woodwinds; <5> but the matter is far from clear; and so far, the more one probes, the more the mystery deepens.

Mahler's last performance of Beethoven VII before leaving for America was in St. Petersburg in October 1907 and it is possible that the new set of parts and clean score were made because Mahler could not find the orchestral parts, P.35, on his return. It is also possible that the material was already in Mahler's library in Vienna and was sent to Prague in error. This is speculation, but one thing is certain: that
To make use of the extra rehearsal numbers.

There are discrepancies between P.34 and P.36, and between P.35 and P.37 which are particularly noticeable in the manuscript parts for Hr3/4. For instance, P.36 reproduces the note: *NB Trompeten und Hörner vertauscht* in b.89 of the first movement, but not the note in b.130 of the *Finale*. An explanation for these discrepancies has not been found: they may be due to the copyist not understanding Mahler’s notation, or maybe the note in the fourth movement had not yet been written. In fact, it may emerge that the source from which P.36/7 was copied was yet another, at present unknown, score; but, as P.36/7 do not add significantly to our knowledge of Mahler’s interpretation and, as it was impossible in the time available in Prague to establish with certainty the provenance of these materials, and in certain cases to distinguish what has been changed by later conductors, they have been largely ignored for the present study.

**The Prague Hr3/4 Parts.**

The Prague parts of Hr3/4 do not agree with P.34/5 in the following particulars:

**First Movement**

66: Doubling of Hrl/2 missing.

153, 155, 159, 161 (2nd half of bars): Reinforcement of Fg1/2 in P.34/6/7, but not P.35.

405 et seq: Changes stuck on by a different copyist using different paper. The original began with a four bar tied E; the change continues to the end of the movement with Beethoven’s Fg1/2 part, pausing only.
Fourth Movement

In P.36/7, Hr3/4 do not enter until b.104: P.34/5 have earlier contributions.

121a-2a: Hr3/4 have notes in P.37, but not in P.33/4/5/6.

190 (2nd beat): Hr3/4 continue for four more bars in P.37 than P.35.

366 et seq: Hr3/4 reinforce Fg1/2 in P.37, as later added to P.35 by Mahler himself; but, unlike P.35, P.37 has Beethoven's octave jump preserved in b.397.

405: In P.35, Hr3/4 pause in 405-8 and 413-5: Hr3/4 continue in P.37 to reinforce Fg1/2 through these bars.

435-42: Hr3/4 continue to reinforce Fg1/2 in P.37, while in P.35 they pause.

463-7: Hr3/4 double Fg1/2 in P.37, but double Hr1/2 in P.35.
Beethoven: Symphony No. 8, P. 38

In the U.E. Archive there is a Budapest score of Beethoven VIII with a few cursory lead pencil marks in Mahler's hand. There are no rehearsal letters or numbers in this score and it is impossible to state with any certainty whether it represents the Retuschen which Mahler employed in his one and only performance of 18 December 1898 in Vienna. Most of the entries concern changed dynamics in the wind. The following other marks are noteworthy.

First Movement

190 - 197 (1st note): Hr3/4 and Va reinforce Fg1/2. Hr1/2 & Tr1/2 have diminuendo in b.190-1.

Second Movement

62: St cresc deleted.

Fourth Movement

376-8: All C-sharps downbow.
Walter Damrosch, conductor of the New York Symphony Orchestra from 1885 and active in that role during Mahler's years in New York, spent the summer of 1887 studying the Beethoven symphonies with Bülow in Frankfurt, in the course of which Bülow presented to him a score of the Ninth Symphony with his own Retuschen and marks of interpretation copied into it. This score was the subject of an article by Damrosch, and the features which are most relevant to the present study are summarized below. <7>

Damrosch sets the scene with the following statements:

...Such disciples of Wagner as Bülow and my father, accepted Wagner's deductions with enthusiasm, but among the older conductors they aroused a great deal of adverse comment. To-day they have been not only generally accepted, but even exceeded and sometimes distorted by such renowned conductors as Gustav Mahler and others.

...Bülow's "changes" consist mainly in certain amplifications of the dynamics employed by the composer, in the strengthening of certain important phrases by the doubling-up of instruments, in a more diversified treatment of trumpets and horns in places where Beethoven had evidently been hampered by mere technical limitations, and by a most subtle use of the "comma" or breathing sign at such places where one phrase is ending and a new one undoubtedly beginning, or where the declamatory conviction of a phrase is increased by it...

As far as the "comma" is concerned this would appear to represent a simple breath mark with no agogic disruption, at least as far as the example which Damrosch quotes, which is the end of b.16 of the first movement; but I consider it likely to represent too the Luftpause which Mahler also used. See Ch.13.5 for discussion of Mahler's use of the
First Movement

119: Last note removed in Vnl/2 to prepare the next bar.

304, 308 & 310: Last two demisemiquaver Ds omitted in Pk to "intensify the rhythm of the theme and increase its terrible significance".

405-6: Vnl 8va until the first note of b.406 to continue the upward motion of the melos.

481-94: Ww doubled and Cl added to Fg in b.489.

510: The "slight breathing pause" described here, before the last three notes is undoubtedly a Luftpause.

512: Fermata on the bar line.

Mahler's orchestral parts are needed to enable us to know whether he followed Bülow's practice in b.510-2.

545-6: Pk add three semiquaver Ds at the end of b.545, and a quaver A at the beginning of b.546.

Third Movement

...The indications by Bülow in the heavenly Adagio are so many and yet so subtle and delicate that it is rather difficult for me to give more than a general idea of their character. ... The innumerable bowing-marks indicate the minute study of the melos that Bülow gave to all the stringed instruments...

Fourth Movement

431 et seq: Additions to Hr3/4 enable them to reinforce Vn2 and Vc more consistently.

Appendix Nine - Bülow's Retuschen
541-2: Pk have A, \emph{p crescendo}.

655-61: Ps1 and Tr1/2 reinforce altos.

720 et seq: Altos replaced by tenors. "Bülow produces an electric effect because the penetrating quality of the higher notes of the tenors bring(s) out the theme with a verve and enthusiasm impossible for the altos in that register."

729-30: Fermata on the bar line.

938-40: Tr reinforce Ww.
Mahler’s String Quartet Arrangements

Mahler conducted three string quartets in arrangements which he made for string orchestra with double basses. In Hamburg he conducted Schubert’s *Death & the Maiden* Quartet, and in Vienna the Variations from Haydn’s *Emperor* Quartet, Op.76 No.3, and Beethoven’s Quartet in F minor, Op.95. Sources for two of these works are listed in Ch.15: Beethoven’s Op.95 as P.21-2, and Schubert’s Quartet as P.46.

Today there is nothing particularly remarkable about the performance of quartets by larger ensembles since it has been done many times. The quartet most frequently performed in this way is Beethoven’s *Grosse Fuge*, which has been conducted by Weingartner, Furtwängler, Klemperer, Ansermet and others, though it is interesting that no conductor has followed Mahler in conducting Op.95 or, until its recent publication, his arrangement of the *Death and the Maiden* Quartet.

Shortly after being appointed as conductor of the Vienna Philharmonic in 1898, Mahler replied to Natalie Bauer-Lechner’s question about his repertoire that:

He would definitely introduce a new type of work into the orchestral repertoire and he hoped that it would remain there. The compositions themselves would be nothing less than revelations; for he denied that anyone had really heard or understood them before. He referred to the great Beethoven quartets, for which four players were utterly inadequate. It was a bold and arbitrary idea in the first place to transfer the string quartet, which was written to be played in a room, to a concert hall. How much more so in the case of Beethoven’s mighty late quartets, which were no longer conceived for four pathetic little string players, but which, in their impressive dimensions, literally cried out for a small string orchestra. "As
I shall have Wagner’s text reprinted, and thus shall prove my point that this is the only way to play these works. Of course, the players will need a new technique and interpretation, much more sensitive than that required by the most difficult symphonies. But this will be to both their and my advantage, for only in this way shall I raise them to the highest possible level. The style for this kind of work remains to be created. Not a note of the composition must be changed. At first I’d thought of adding double-basses, but I had to give up that idea - the whole structure is so inexorable and inevitable as it now stands. You’ll see, the result will be beyond one’s wildest dreams!”

We see from the way Mahler talks that his ideas had not yet crystalised, and he finally chose the F minor quartet for his concert of 15 Jan 1899, preceding it by a performance of Haydn’s Emperor Variations on 4 December 1898.

The journal Die Wage reported an interview with Mahler a week before the 15 January 1899 concert:

A quartet for string orchestra! That sounds odd to you. I already know all the objections which one will raise: the destruction of intimacy, of individuality. But one is mistaken. What I am proposing is but an ideal performance of the quartet. Chamber music is fundamentally written for a (small) room. It is really only enjoyed properly by the performers. The four people who sit at their music desks are also the public to whom this music applies. When chamber music is transferred to the concert hall this intimacy is already lost. And still more is lost: in the large room the four voices disperse, they do not speak to the listeners with the power which the composer wanted to give them. I give you this power, because I reinforce the voices. I release the expansion which lies dormant in the parts and give the notes wings. Indeed, we also strengthen an orchestral piece by Haydn, an overture by Mozart. Do we alter thereby the character of their works? Certainly not. The volume of sound which we give a work, depends upon the room in which we perform it. I should have to perform the Nibelung Ring with a different, reduced orchestra in a small house, as opposed to an immense auditorium, in which I should even have to reinforce the orchestra. I am not acting against the composer’s intentions, but according to his wishes. Beethoven, in his last quartets, certainly did not think of the restricted little instruments ... He realised a mighty idea in four voices. This idea must be properly realized, be given its true significance. But the voice of one violin in a small room equals as much as twenty violins in a hall. And twenty violins in the large hall can produce a piano, a
It's very intimate with the violinists. I can't hear either not at all or too loud. Intimacy! What a misused word. The truly appreciative listener (der recht Genießende), who feels the music, is always in intimate contact with the music. For him the hall has no walls, he knows nothing of his neighbour. He is alone with the music even in a hall where a thousand people are sitting. We play for this music lover (Genießende). The twenty violins will sound to him like one violin, he will not think of the number of the performers, but listen to the singing of the four voices. ... All our chamber music suffers in the concert hall from the inappropriateness of the hall. If one wants to be successful with it, then one must certainly take account of the hall. Now, that is precisely what I am doing at present; and with the first two bars of the quartet I shall already have convinced the public as well. I know so. With our performance next Sunday a completely new era of concert literature begins. <9>

Bauer-Lechner, herself a quartet player of distinction, comments about Mahler's concert and the disturbance it created:

...everyone, critics and audience alike, was strongly opposed to Mahler's performing the Beethoven quartets with string orchestra. Taking the bull by the horns, Mahler had said to Hanslick beforehand: "Well, I'm ready for battle today! For you'll see - all the Philistines, to a man, will rise up against this treatment of the quartets, instead of having enough natural curiosity to sit back and enjoy a different kind of performance for once."

From the very first bars, the quartet sounded so tempestuous that one couldn't doubt that (the opening) could not be played by "four miserable fiddlers" ("von vier armeligen Manderln"), as Mahler put it. Then the tender cantilenas and solo parts were played so discreetly, softly, and with such magical sounds, that a single violinist could not have rendered them more beautifully. This finally refuted the opponents' fears that this important aspect of quartet-playing would suffer from the weight of numbers.

I have never heard, nor would I have thought it possible, such powerful tone, without any roughness or coarseness. Mahler commented later: "That's because I always have the leading upper voice played loudest. Bad instrumentation or performance can often obscure the line; when the middle voices are played too loudly, it sounds crude." <10>

After the treatment meted out by the Viennese critics Mahler never returned to this experiment.

Appendix Ten - String Quartet Arrangements -762-
Only those works which have a direct bearing on the subject of Mahler's Retuschen have been listed here. Other works which have been quoted once only are referred to fully in the notes. Some sources have been referred to frequently, and their names have been abbreviated:


DMM2 MITCHELL, Donald: Gustav Mahler, the Wunderhorn Years, Faber & Faber, 1975.


GMK MARTNER, Knud: Gustav Mahler im Konzertsaal - eine Dokumentation seiner Konzertätigkeit (1870-1911), KM-Privatdruck, Copenhagen, 1985, with addenda from June 1986.


HLG2 LA GRANGE Henry Louis de: Gustav Mahler, Vol II - L’âge d’or de Vienne (1900-1907), Fayard, 1983.


JFP FÖRSTER Joseph Bohuslav: Der Pilger (tr. from Czech by Pavel Eisner), Artia, 1955.


NBL BAUER-LECHNER, Natalie: Recollections of Gustav Mahler, tr Dika Newlin, Faber Music, 1980.

NYDT New York Daily Tribune.

OKG HEYWORTH Peter: Gespräche mit Klemperer, S.Fischer Verlag, 1974.


Other works referred to:


BLAUKOPF, Kurt: Mahler, Sein Leben, sein Werk und seine Welt in zeitgenössischen Bildern und Texten, Wien, 1976. (Orig. German of KBD.)


The Evening Post, a New York daily newspaper.

HEYWORTH Peter: Otto Klemperer - his Life and Times, Vol I, Cambridge


KREBS, Carl: Meister des Taktstocks, Schuster & Loeffler, Berlin 1919.


MALLOCK, William: I Remember Mahler - a 2 hour radio program broadcast on Station KPFK, Los Angeles, 15 July 1964. This seems to be the same as the programme referred to by La Grange as "Mahlerthon".


Musical America, a U.S. weekly journal.

The Musical Courier, a U.S. weekly journal.

REZNICEK, E. N. v: Erinnerungen an Gustav Mahler, Musikblätter des Anbruch, Heft 7/8, April 1920, p298-300.


SEIBERT, Donald C (ed.): The Hyde Timings - a Collection of Timings made at Concerts in New York City between 1894 and 1928, published by the Juilliard School of Music, New York, 1964.
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<thead>
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</tr>
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<td>Die Entführung</td>
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<tr>
<td>Zaide</td>
<td>Vol 43</td>
<td>May 1976</td>
<td>p.31-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosi fan tutte</td>
<td>Vol 45</td>
<td>May 1978</td>
<td>p.11-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Zauberflöte</td>
<td>Vol 46</td>
<td>May 1979</td>
<td>p.41-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zusammenfassung</td>
<td>Vol 46</td>
<td>Dec 1979</td>
<td>p.3-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WILLNAUER, Franz: Gustav Mahler und die Wiener Oper, Jugend und Volk Verlag, 1979.

1.1. See Appendix 9 for information about Bülow's interpretation of Beethoven IX.

1.2. The earlier one volume version in English has been completely superseded by the French edition and has been here ignored.

1.3. See Bibliography.


1.5. Ernst· J.M. Lert: The Conductor Gustav Mahler, Chord and Discord, Vol 1, No.9, New York, Jan 1938.

1.6. The individuals quoted here from this broadcast are: Herbert Borodkin, Viola, NYPO; Benjamin Kohon, 2nd Bassoon, NYPO; Herman Martonne, Violin, NYPO; and Alois Reiser, Cello, NYSO.

1.7. See HLG3, p.1280-9. In August 1986, in Toblach, I received from M. La Grange an honest response to my criticism: that he had found it impossible to deal with this area in more detail if his book were ever to be published.

1.8. See bibliography for references to the articles cited here.

1.9. It may be that commercial reasons dictated Stein's emphasis on Schumann, since letters from U.E. to Alma Mahler make it clear that the company was not sanguine of doing much trade in renting out the "Mahler versions" and probably wished to concentrate on those works which might attract the most interest.


1.11. Robert Werba's eight articles in Der Wiener Figaro (see bibliography) give good background information for a study of Mahler's Mozart operatic interpretations, if the performance material can be found.


2.1. Published in Paris, 1843.

2.2. See bibliography.

2.3. Abbreviated here RWUD. See bibliography.

2.4. RWUD, p.57.
2.6. See Edition Eulenburg No.676.

2.7. The original was in French, but a German translation of the complete letter was published as Ferruccio Busoni: Brief an Marcel Remy, Zeitschrift für Musik, Vol 12, Dec 1932, p.1058. A comprehensive edition of Busoni's letters has not yet been published. I have quoted the first paragraph from E.J.Dent, Ferruccio Busoni, a biography, Oxford, 1933, reprinted by Ernst Eulenburg Ltd, 1974, p.110-1. The rest I have translated from the above-mentioned German version.


2.10. OKCE, p.34.


2.12. IMB3, Gloses, p.34.


2.14. Two pages of Beethoven IX, comprising the Coda of the Scherzo, were detached by Schindler and given to Moscheles in 1927, who in turn inscribed them From Beethoven's M.S. 9th Symphony presented to his friend H.Phillips Esq by I.Moscheles, June 14 1846. See facsimile m/s published by C.F.Peters, 1975.

2.15. Many of these are quoted later in this study.

2.16. See Ch.26.2 for the full text of this statement.

2.17. See App.10 for the full text of this statement.


2.19. Henry Edward Krehbiel (born Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1854; died, New York, 1923) was in his day one of the most respected and influential writers on music in America... Served (for some 40 years!) as music critic of the New York Tribune. Among his books on music perhaps the most valued was his edition (the first in English) of Thayer's Life of Beethoven... He was also editor, for American topics, of the second edition of Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians. And the program notes that he wrote for the concerts of the New York Philharmonic from 1896 to 1912 were considered models for that special branch of the art of writing about music... - Early Histories of the New York Philharmonic with new introduction and notes by Howard Shanet, Da Capo Press, New York, 1979, p.viii.

2.20. NYDT, 17 Dec 1909, p.7.


2.22. NYT, 17 Dec 1909, p.11.

Notes
2.24. Note should also be taken of The Musical Courier's antagonism towards the Damrosch brothers, who dominated the New York orchestral and choral scene during the first decade of this century. From the substantial, closely argued and derisory dismissal of a performance by Frank Damrosch of Beethoven's Missa Solemnis this antagonism appears to have a sound musical justification. The same article quotes reviews from the Tribune and the Sun, and accuses their authors of partiality in their criticisms, reflecting their employment by Damrosch as teachers in his Music School, and in direct contrast to their "tearing into fragments the usual musical performances here, led by Gustav Mahler and by Toscanini, both conductors with a mania for rehearsals and of vast experience and masters of their art..." - The Musical Courier, 8 December 1909, p.23-4.

2.25. This must be a specific reference, but I have been unable to trace its source.


2.27. NYP, 1 Apr 1909, p.10.

3.1. "Baton technique" is a term which is used here in its widest sense to mean the conductor's physical means of silently manifesting his intentions to the orchestra for the control of rhythm, tempo, rubato, balance and tone colour.

3.2. The story seems to have come from Hanslick. See HLG1, p.437, n.35, and KBD, p.188-9.


3.8. OKC, p.30-1, and OKG, p.42.


3.11. Hermann Wolff was the founder of an important concert agency based in Berlin which promoted Bülow's concerts with the Berlin and Hamburg Philharmonic Orchestras.


3.17. Joseph Hellmesberger, the younger, son of the celebrated violinist of the same name, was the ballet conductor at the Vienna Opera, and thus Mahler's subordinate.

3.18. See Musical America, 5 Dec, 1908, p.16.

3.19. According to The Evening Sun, 7 Apr 1909, p.10, Mahler received $3,000 per concert.

3.20. Mahler had only two rehearsals for this concert - see The Musical Courier, 6 Apr, 1910, p.47 - and the results which he obtained were astounding. See extracts from the review in Ch.26.


3.23. NYT, 5 Nov 1909, p.9.


3.25. Letter of 1 Jan 1910 to Guido Adler, quoted from RMA, p.110.

3.26. A list of the works which Mahler conducted most in his career is given in Appendix 1.

3.27. Ignoring extracts from Elijah and Paulus.

3.28. At this time Parsifal was not performed on the stage outside Bayreuth.

3.29. AMM3, p.108, has it that in his score of Bruckner's Te Deum Mahler crossed out the words For solo voices, chorus and orchestra, organ ad libitum, replacing them by For the tongues of angels, heaven-blest, chastened hearts, and souls purified in the fire. (Für Engelzungen, Gottselige, gequalte Herzen und feuergeläutete Seelen!), but I have never seen the original reproduced.

3.30. See Appendix 10.

3.31. AMM3, p.168.

3.32. See Ch.5 for listing.

3.33. See programme reprinted in GMK, p.114.

3.34. This was the first performance of Mahler's Bach Suite, taken from the second and third Orchestral Suites. Mahler directed from a specially modified Steinway piano, advertised as "the Bach Klavier", and this arrangement was so popular that Mahler gave twenty-two
3.35. First American performance.

3.36. NYDT, 31 Mar 1910, p.7. It should be mentioned that, at the Metropolitan Opera that night, Toscanini was conducting the second of his two performances of Die Meistersinger to a packed house.


3.40. AMM3, p.168. In the case of Tannhäuser Overture this assertion is not borne out by GMK.

3.41. Musical America, 21 Jan 1911, p.17.

3.42. NBL, p.166.

3.43. Malloch: I remember Mahler. From Kohon's singing, this passage can be identified as the section between bars 71 and 80.

3.44. HLG3, p.633.

3.45. See HLG3, p.705-6 and n.338.

3.46. The Musical Courier of 23 Oct 1912 (p.27) reports that Mahler played Tchaikovsky VI at the express wish of the executive committee and appends an unattributed story of Mahler rehearsing the first two movements "lackadaisically", after which he is said to have laid down his baton and remarked to the orchestra, "You play this piece very well indeed, so well, in fact, that you could do it best without any leader at all. My directing in this piece is of no assistance to you whatsoever and may only serve to interfere with your conception."

3.47. See Musical America, 12 Mar 1910, p.34.

3.48. In his review, Krehbiehl states that Mahler had originally intended to conduct a symphony by Sgambatti; but that "a panic fear seized upon somebody in authority and Sgambatti's fine symphony was stricken out." See NYDT, 22 Feb 1911, p.7.


3.50. We know from witnesses of his Hamburg days that Mahler was always reading Bach's choral works; (See FPM, p.32 and JFP, p.354.) and that, according to Bauer-Lechner, he would like to have performed the St Matthew Passion in Vienna. (See NBL, p.123.) In the summer of 1901 Mahler had been reading Bach's "Third Motet" and said to Natalie: "...It's unbelievable, the extent to which the eight voices are carried through in a polyphony which he alone commands. I'm gradually learning to follow them with the eye (they literally can't be played on the piano!). But some day I should like to, I must perform this work - to the amazement of the world..." (NBL, p.169) Had the opportunity arisen
scores of these have survived with markings by Mahler, implying performances which are not listed in Martner’s book. See Ch.15, P.1-3.

3.51. In Vienna, Mahler conducted seven performances of Haydn’s Symphony No.104 as an overture to his opera Der Apotheker. He gave Symphony No.103 with the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, and also in St Petersburg in 1902.


3.56. Malloch: I remember Mahler.

3.57. Malloch: I remember Mahler.


3.60. In a draft of an article on the German Theatre in Prague, quoted in RMA, p.84, Adler wrote: "His ardour kindled exhaltation but also not infrequently smashed the conductor’s lamps."

3.61. RMA, p.46.


3.63. NBL, p.121.

3.64. Walter: Gustav Mahler, p.85-6. The only performance of Sinfonia Domestica recorded in GKM was in Vienna on 23 Nov 1904.

3.65. Malloch: I remember Mahler.


3.67. NBL, p.35-6.

3.68. NBL, p.49.

3.69. NBL, p.89.

3.70. NBL explains this as a "mid-bow crescendo" (Anschwellen des Tons in der Mitte des Bogens). See NBLG, p.97.

3.71. NBL, p.98.

3.72. NBL, p.136.

3.73. H. Kissenberth is listed in NYPO programmes as fifth double bass.
3.74. Malloch: I remember Mahler.

3.75. Malloch: I remember Mahler.


3.77. RMA, p.43-5.

3.78. OKC, p.32.

3.79. Uusi Suomi, 1 Nov 1907.

3.80. Hufvudstadsbladet, 2 Nov 1907.

4.1. Two scores have notes in them which were clearly not needed by Mahler, but which were indications to copyists or to other conductors. Beethoven IX, P.40, at b.412 of the Scherzo, has a note for the copyist preparing the parts to show that the doubling players play the notes omitted by Ob1/2 and Cl1/2. Beethoven VII, P.34, has a note at b.89 of the first movement to emphasise to the copyist that Mahler really did mean to interchange the horn and trumpet parts. The case of Mahler's note in b.132 of the finale of the same symphony is unique, since it is not an indication to the copyist, but a prescription to the conductor, such as are found in many of his own scores.

4.2. Beethoven Piano Concerto V, P.20, has some marks in the cadenza to enable Mahler to follow the soloist; Beethoven IX, P.40, has a few marks to remind Mahler of the entry of the choir; and Schumann I, P.53, has marks above the flute stave in b.123-4 of the Scherzo which reminded Mahler to beat two beats in each bar to take account of the fermata, and four beats indicated in b.100a of the finale.

4.3. Henry Wood had some very tall parts which enabled the violins to play b.38-53 of Tannhäuser Overture without turning over.

4.4. A good example is given by the orchestral parts for Schumann I. The Breitkopf material has the first Trio of the Scherzo written out in full in the wind parts but, with the exception of the viola part which has different notes, the string parts have a repeat indicating a return to b.80 after b.155. Mahler had all the string parts brought into line with the viola part so that there could be no confusion in rehearsal.

4.5. See Ch.26.7.3.

4.6. JFP, p.385.

4.7. AMM3, p.190.

4.8. OKC, p.34-6. See also Ernst Jokl's remarks in Ch.14.4.

4.9. The right hand column of this list represents the identifying numbers which I have assigned these sources in Chapter 15.

4.10. Presumably the Hamburg score of Schubert IX is referred to here, since the later one, P.48, must have already been a part of the estate of Spiering who died in 1925.

Notes
4.12. From correspondence between Alma Mahler and U.E. of 8 December 1928 we learn that Toscanini had an interest in Mahler's Schumann III Retuschen, and the score may have been lent to him, as requested by Alma in her letter. Toscanini performed Mahler's edition of Schumann IV with NYPSO on 26 Feb 1931 - see Musical America 10 Mar 1931, p.12. Attempts by the author to trace this score following this lead have so far been unsuccessful.

4.13. An unsigned copy of the contract, dated 23 June 1927, with Alma Mahler's amendments can be seen in the U.E. Archive.

4.14. It is not clear whether this means Leonore III or Egmont Overture!

4.15. This collection has been catalogued by Dr. Ernst Hilmar. Where there are discrepancies between his listing and mine, I am sure that my catalogue represents the facts. See Ernst Hilmar: Mahleriana in der Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek.

4.16. A new set of parts was made from this score for a performance in Munich in Nov 1978, it being stated in the programme notes that the original "orchestral parts are no longer preserved". This statement was also repeated in the programme of a later performance by the LPO in London.

4.17. See above.

4.18. GMK makes no mention of this work forming part of Mahler's repertoire; but The Musical Courier alludes to savage cuts in the work in a Mahler performance. See Ch.13.1.

4.19. See Beethoven II, Ch.21.1.

4.20. See 1st mvt, b.152-63, and 3rd mvt, b.389-401.

4.21. See Ch.7.1.

4.22. Mahler also uses the cross to indicate the end of reinforcement of Fgl/2 by Hr3/4 in Coriolan, P.4.

4.23. In Beethoven III, P.25, it seems that this is indicated by means of underlining the notes to be doubled.

4.24. The set of parts of Beethoven V, which has Hr3/4 in the hand of a copyist different from the one who prepared the extra brass parts for Beethoven III & VII, was used by Mahler in Budapest in March 1897, shortly before he moved to Vienna.

5.1. See Appendix 1 for a fuller list. The first column here represents an order based on the number of performances of all the works in Mahler's repertoire.

5.2. Mahler substituted at short notice for Muck, who had travelled from Graz for a performance with the same forces a week earlier, and it is unlikely therefore that he had the opportunity to introduce any of his Retuschen.

Notes -774-
5.4. OKC, p.111 & p.121.

5.5. See IMB3, IMB5, IMB7 and IMB9.

5.6. Despite some obvious problems with the Markevitch edition, his is the first attempt at bringing together a compendium of useful historical information, analytical discussion and practical advice of relevance to conductors.

5.7. Ernst Hilmar: Mahlers Beethoven-Interpretation, in Mahler Interpretation.

5.8. See Ch.7.1.

5.9. See Ch.25.


5.11. The Berg Schoenberg Correspondence, ed Brand et al, Norton, 1987, p.120-21, 230-2, 236.

5.12. See Ch.26.2

5.13. NBL, p.140.


5.15. See quotation from Karpath in Ch.2.6.

5.16. See Ch.26.2.

5.17. There are significant differences between the first edition of 1906 and the revised version of 1928.


5.19. FPM, p.40. A "Quartaner" is a 13 year old schoolboy.

5.20. FTRS, p.259.

5.21. FWRB, p.123.

5.22. Weingartner, Ueber das Dirigiren, p.28, repeated in FWRB, p.166.


5.24. OKC, p.34, supplemented by OKG where there is a line missing in the English version.

5.25. OKC, p.35.

5.26. OKC. p.35.

Notes -775-
5.27. See Ch.7.7.1.
5.28. Ibid, p.35.
5.30. Walter rehearsal disc: D99893L.
6.1. See Ch.30.2.3.
6.3. See Ernst Decsey, Stunden mit Mahler, Die Musik, X, 18, p.354
6.4. Some of these comparisons and others have also been independently made by Reinhard Kapp. See Reinhard Kapp, Schumann-Reminiszenzen bei Mahler, ÖMZ, 1982, vol 5, p.241-8.
6.5. Mahler's originals are missing.
6.8. Schumann IV was not among the material sent by Alma Mahler to U.E. in June 1927.
6.10. Wellesz, op.cit, p.28.
6.11. Published in "Of Men and Music", p.115-128.
7.1. See page of concert programme reproduced on p.138 of GMK.
7.2. These are given in the normal order of Vn1, Vn2, Va, Vc, Cb.
7.3. See transcription of interview in Appendix 10.
7.4. The Evening Post, 2 Apr 1910, p.4, reports that Mahler used 10 double basses for Beethoven IX.
7.7. Ernst Hilmar, Mahlers Beethoven-Interpretation, p.31.

7.8. See NBL, p.92, where we learn that Mahler was the first conductor at the Vienna Court Opera to perform Mozart's operas with reduced strings.


7.10. See Ch.27.

7.11. See Ch.28.

7.12. We cannot discount the possibility that some of these passages were played more accurately with reduced sections.

7.13. Vn2.7 of Beethoven V, P.31, has 3 Pulte in b.6 of the first movement, and Alle in bar 15, but there is no more information of what Mahler might have done at one time.


7.15. But see the well-known story of Mahler rehearsing Rachmaninov's Third Piano Concerto and proposing a more difficult bowing than the one printed in the violin parts, reproduced in MRL, p.237-9.


7.18. HLG1, p.801. I have been unable to discover an earlier source for this statement.


7.22. On and off the string styles of staccato are not mentioned at all by Berlioz or Strauss - see Berlioz/Strauss Instrumentationslehre.

7.23. See IMBl, p.54 et seq.


7.25. This is an effect not unknown to Mozart, see K.504/2, 23 where Mozart has b-flat and f' in Vn2, or K.550/2, b.20.

7.26. See also Schumann III/3 for other examples of pizzicato substituted for arco.

7.27. NBL, p.142

7.28. See KBD, plate 325, which shows a rehearsal for the first
7.29. In P.50, only as far as b.179.

8.1. See Ch.4.

8.2. See also Ch.27.

8.3. See reviews in NYT and NYDT of 17 Dec 1909.

8.4. See Ch.30.1.4 for discussion of this special case.

8.5. Cl1-4 also added.

8.6. Fll is also doubled in the preceding bar.

8.7. First note omitted in all Ww.

8.8. Hr removed also. Tr removed too, except for crotchets.

8.9. RWB9, p.110.

8.10. Additional effect is caused by the fact that the whole woodwind section is doubled for bars 83-86 only.

9.1. Despite attempts to translate this description, the original is far more pungent: La petite clarinette en Mi bémol a des sons perçants qu'il est très aisé de rendre ignobles, à partir du La au-dessus des portées. Aussi l'a-t-on employée, dans une symphonie moderne, pour parodier, dégrader, encanailler (qu'on me passe le mot) une mélodie; le sens dramatique de l'oeuvre exigeant cette étrange transformation.

9.2. See Fig 63.

9.3. Instrumentationslehre von Hector Berlioz / Ergänzt und revidiert von Richard Strauss

9.4. Malloch: I Remember Mahler

9.5. It is difficult to understand why these parts were not handed over by Alma Mahler to U.E. in 1927 in the folders with the rest of the material. One possible explanation is that they were removed by Mahler, implying that he had abandoned using them. We do not know; but the fact that the presently known E-flat clarinet parts were at one time in unknown private hands suggests that Alma either gave them away, or sold them, and makes it possible that others will turn up.

9.6. It is possible that the part for Beethoven V may have been written before Mahler went to Vienna and used for performances of the work in Moscow, Munich and Budapest in March 1897.

9.7. HLG1, p 747 et seq.


9.9. HLG1, p 314.

9.10. Klemperer, in his recording on SAX2354, raised Fll an octave here with curious results.
10.2. RWB9, p.100-3.
10.3. RWB9, p.103-4.
10.4. RWB9, p.104-7.
10.5. RW/B9, p.107-8.
10.6. See FWBR and FTRS.
10.7. See Ch.2.5.
10.8. RWB9, p.100-3.
10.9. See Hilmar, Mahlers Beethoven-Interpretation.
10.10. See Mahler VII/2, 259-65.
10.11. FPM, p.49.

11.3. NYT, 12 Dec 1909, p.9.
11.5. Review of Beethoven IX - NYT 2 Apr 1910, p.11.
11.6. NBL, p.125
11.7. Malloch: I remember Mahler.
11.8. Information from Professor George Gaber, former timpanist of Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra and experienced New York freelance musician.
11.9. Information from an undated letter from Mahler to Felix Leifels, Manager of the NYPO - quoted in KBD, p.259.
11.10. For some reason Mahler elects to leave b.101 empty.
11.11. In b.190-2, P.47/8 have E-flat, but P.49 has D.
11.12. P.48 has demi-semiquavers instead of semiquavers. See Ch.29.4.5.
11.13. NYDT, 21 May 1911, p.2. Also in DMM2, p.413.
11.14. Trombones also removed.

12.1. Malloch: I remember Mahler

Notes
12.3. Hufvudstadsbladet, 2 Nov 1907.


12.5. Malloch: I remember Mahler.


12.7. Letter of 1 Jan 1910 to Guido Adler, quoted in RMA, p.110.


12.9. See Ch.10.2.1.

12.10. There are many other cases of this in the same movement. See Ch.24.


12.12. OKC, p.34.

12.13. NBL, p.78.

12.14. Weingartner and other conductors make this change also. See FWRB, p.86.

12.15. The same treatment of this passage is found in Walter's recording, from his very last recording session - Walter/CSO, 1961, MS6487.


13.2. No score or parts of Schumann II in Mahler's hand have been discovered by the author to confirm these cuts.


13.6. NBL, p.46.


13.9. "Quite a large addition near the end - not in this copy." (Breitkopf, preface dated 1856, Plate No.9137, 124pp).

13.10. We also have a timing of 11 minutes for a much cut performance of Tchaikovsky's Francesca da Rimini, given in The Musical Courier of 23 Oct 1912, p.27.


13.15. See Appendix 9 for a description of some of Bülow's Luftpausen in Beethoven IX.


13.18. Polydor 66072.


14.1. See Ch.22.2.

14.2. See, for example, Ch.28.2.3 & Ch.28.2.4.

14.3. See Ch.26.2.

14.4. Extracts reproduced in Zlotnik.


14.6. See bars 301-37.

14.7. NBL, p.31.


14.9. See Ch.2.3.

14.10. See the postscript of Mahler's letter of 15 Oct 1906, in which he asks if Mengelberg still has his score of Manfred - GMB, p.317.

14.11. See Appendix 7.


14.15. See Beethoven V/1, 439-55; Mozart K551/4, 389-99; Leonore II, 294 et seq.


14.17. OKC, p.35.

14.18. Research is needed to identify the copyists who worked for Mahler in preparing scores and parts of his own works. I believe that
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that a knowledge of
more accurately.


14.20. NBL, p.178.


14.22. OKC, p.34.


14.24. To an examination of the posthumous works should also be added a comparison of Todtenfeier with the first movement of Mahler II.


14.27. RMA, p.31/2.

15.1. See Ludvova: Gustav Mahler in Prag im Mai 1908.

15.2. Ibid.

15.3. NYT, 14 Dec 1910, p.13

15.4. NYDT, 14 Dec 1910, p.7


15.6. Information from Herta Blaukopf, letter of 20 Nov 86.

15.7. Information from Herta Blaukopf, letter of 20 Nov 86.

15.8. Information from Herta Blaukopf, letter of 20 Nov 86.

15.9. La Grange gives the date as 18 Mar 1902, which would imply that Niehoff's reckoning was "old style". See HLG2, p.231.

15.10. After Mahler's last concert!

15.11. See Ludvova, op.cit.

15.12. See Ludvova, op.cit.


15.14. For example, on page 24.

15.15. See Willnauer, Franz: Gustav Mahler und die Wiener Oper.
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15.17. The parts are printed with Ww1/2 together.

15.18. GMK records 38 performances.

16.1. NBL, p.120-1.

16.2. NBL, p.121.

16.3. HLG2, p.45.

16.4. NYT, 1 Jan 1910, p.9.

16.5. NBL, p.120-1. Franklin, editor of the English version of NBL, agrees that this is a mistake for "quavers".

16.6. See later for details of the dynamics in this passage in P.4.

16.7. In b.240, Hrl jumps up an octave: Hr2 is not clear.

17.1. Date from GMK. HLG1, p.132, gives 24 Sep 1881. La Grange also implies that Mahler conducted the incidental music with Goethe's play regularly in Laibach. See HLG1, p.132/4.

17.2. See GMK, June 1986 supplement.

17.3. See HLG2, p.233, n.66.


18.1. See Walter/C.S.O. MS6487.

19.1. Between 1904 and 1907, Mahler conducted Fidelio 19 times at the Vienna Court Opera. See Franz Willnauer: Gustav Mahler und die Wiener Oper.

19.2. See handbill/poster for Mahler's benefit performance in Hamburg on 1 March 1985, reproduced in Csampari/Holland: Fidelio - Texte, Materialien, Kommentare, Pub Ricordi 1981, p.161. La Grange gives the first occasion of Mahler's inserting the Overture here as 1891: HLG1, p.353. Although Mahler was the first to do this in Vienna, according to Irving Kolodin, quoted in HLG2, p.471, other conductors did this as early as 1849.

19.3. Trl/2 also tell us actual clock times for the beginning and ending of the piece in the opera house.


19.5. Max Steinitzer, in Gustav Mahler - ein Bild seiner Persönlichkeit in Widmungen, p.12, quoted from MRL, p.42.

19.6. See above.

19.7. HLG1, p.246.

19.10. Additions to Va & Fgl-4 made by Boewig.

19.11. HLG1, p.495, n.99.

19.12. This Retusche has been torn out of Va5/6 parts.


20.1. Before its discovery, the existence of P.16 had been postulated from a study of this score.

20.2. Klemperer, in his recording on SAX2354, raised F11 an octave here with curious results.

20.3. Mahler originally wrote g''' in the E-flat clarinet part in the second half of b.33, but replaced this by g'".

21.1. There are no markings in the 3rd movement.

22.1. This and the 1897 performance took place on Mahler's benefit nights at the Hamburg Municipal Theatre.

22.2. Memorial concert for Bülow.


22.5. See HLG1, p.381. The calculations here are intended as an attempt to explain the timing, even though this timing was certainly not recorded in 1892.

22.6. See HLG1, p.450, n.69.

22.7. See HLG2, p 43/4.


22.9. Gustave Robert: La Musique à Paris 1898-1900, quoted from HLG1, p.887 n.80. The quotation continues: "and then played the following staccato notes a little dryly". La Grange is mistaken when he identifies this passage as "the beginning of the development section", as it is more likely to be the passage beginning in b.98.

22.10. FWRB, p.42.

22.11. NYDT, 5 Nov 1909, p.7.


22.13. NBL, p.112.

23.1. Mahler's benefit night.
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23.3. The Nikisch and Walter timings have been adjusted to incorporate the repeat in the first movement.

23.4. HLG1, p.315.

23.5. HLG1, p.400.

23.6. Quoted in HLG1, p.614.


23.8. NYT, 14 Dec 1908, p.9.


23.11. See HLG1, p.315.


23.15. NYDT, 5 Nov 1909, p.7.


23.17. NBL, p.139.


23.19. The horn parts were also adopted by Walter and may be heard in both his recordings. The Hr3/4 additions noted in this passage and elsewhere in this work differ from those recorded by Marklevitch, in IMB5, Closes, p.31 & p.34.

23.20. See HLG1, p.400.

23.21. RWB9, p.100-3.


23.25. This Retusche was written into the parts by Boewig. The numbers "3" above and "4" below the stave, both here and in b.211, are a puzzle to me.

23.26. See Ch.2.5, and Karpath, op.cit, p.131/2.

23.27. HLG1, p.314.

24.1. Mahler's benefit night.
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24.4. NBL, p.45.

24.5. Heyworth: Otto Klemperer - his Life and Times, p.48. According to Heyworth this score has disappeared.

24.6. The only extant score and set of parts for works performed by Mahler in his twenty concerts of 1911 is of Beethoven VII.

24.7. NBL, p.113.

24.8. The confusion may have arisen due to a mistake in editing the original manuscript which has still not been published in its entirety.

24.9. NBL, p.143.

24.10. See HLG1, p.488.

24.11. See HLG3, p.871/2.


25.1. Musical America, 18 Feb 1911, p.15.

25.2. La Grange, HLG3 p.1280, refers to a score of Beethoven VII with Mahler's Retuschen in the archive of the New York Philharmonic. I have not seen this score.

25.3. In P.34, at Trio II, is written: N.B. Wie der Erstesmal indicating Mahler's early intentions. In P.37 the cut has been made by players, implying that it was not at that time a part of the source used to make P.36.

25.4. HLG1, p.485, n.60.

25.5. See below for details of the Budapest score, P.33, and Appendix 7 for the Prague material, P.36/7.


25.7. See HLG1, p.455, n.77.

25.8. NBL, p.124.

25.9. It is likewise not in the Prague m/s part, P.37.
25.11. Originally, Hr3/4 played with Vc from b.388, the parts having been changed later by Mahler himself. In the Prague parts, P.37, Hr3/4 are exactly as Beethoven's original Fgl/2 parts; i.e. with an octave leap in b.397 and without the quaver rest Mahler inserts in P.35 after the first notes of b.371, 373, 379 and 383.

25.12. Rests are indicated in b.409-12.


26.2. NBL, p.63.

26.3. See HLG1, p.858, and Blaukopf: Gustav Mahler, p.154.


26.5. The Evening Post, 2 Apr 1910, p.4.

26.6. It is mentioned in AMM3 p.36-7 and HLG2, p.251.

26.7. The original is reproduced in Blaukopf: Mahler, sein Leben, sein Werk und seine Welt in zeitgenössischen Bildern und Texten (orig. German of KBD), p.224.


26.9. See Ch.2.6.

26.10. See Bibliography - RWB9.

26.11. See Ch.10.


26.15. See below for details.

26.16. This is the score now in the Arnold Schoenberg Institute at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles. I have examined this copy briefly. The handwriting is not Mahler's, though I believe that it may be Schoenberg's but have not been able to confirm this. A handbill of Schoenberg's performance of 26 Apr 1915 is reproduced in "Alban Berg, Leben und Werk in Daten und Bildern", ed E.A.Berg, Insel Verlag, 1976, p.154.

26.17. In the archive of the IGMG, there is a card index reference to a score of Beethoven IX, at one time in the possession of the Neuer Deutscher Theater in Prague: Eintragung von Alex. von Zemlinsky, daß die Aufführung nur mit Bewilligung der Witwe Mahlers erfolgen darf.

Note 48 on p.218/9 of HLG1 may be interpreted as indicating that this score, which was sold at auction in 1960 or 1961, includes Retuschen in Mahler's hand dating from his Prague performance in 1892; but I consider it more likely to be a copy of P.40 made by Zemlinsky.
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26.25. NYT, p.11, 7 Apr 1909.

26.26. Mahler is already employing Fg1-4 for the same purpose, continuing their initial participation in the bass line from the middle of bars 316-28, and replacing the demisemiquavers by solid notes.

26.27. NYDT, 7 Apr 1909, p.7.


26.29. NYT, 2 Apr 1910, p.11.

26.30. RWB9, p.120 et seq.

26.31. Beethoven introduces it first in b.27.

26.32. It should be remembered that Mahler would have had Vn2 and Va on his right.

26.33. Markevitch, IMB9, Gloses, p.44, draws attention to the remarkable harmonic 'chafings' which Mahler forgoes by his Retusche in Vn2.

26.34. A footnote on p.96 of McKinney's thesis, referring to Mahler's substitution of Ob2 for C11 in b.181-3 states: This is one of the strangest changes in the score. What reason could there be for removing these notes from the clarinet part and giving them to the oboe? The reason is clear: Mahler wished to unify the tone colour of this unusual three part statement of the first phrase of the main theme and reserve the clarinet for the following entry, and accordingly employed in b.181-3 two oboes and two flutes which has the advantage over the original that a balance of the three parts is more readily assured.

26.35. Markevitch, IMB9, Gloses, p.47, quotes his own teacher, Hermann Scherchen, as the authority for this assertion.

26.36. Markevitch, IMB9, p.47.

26.37. In b.333 this involves C11 in a top written G.

26.38. This is only pencilled into P.41, in a hand which could be

26.40. Tr & Pk removed last.

26.41. With all the horns at his disposal, it is strange that Mahler did not have Hr5-8 take over at least part of the long notes here to help Hr1-4; but it may be that he considered the extra horns not generally good enough players to be trusted to do this.

26.42. This high note is rather exposed in piano.


26.45. FWBR, p.158.

26.46. The lack of space probably gave rise to Mahler writing a middle C (concert F) for Tr4 at the end of bar 538.

26.47. The omission of this change in Cll is undoubtedly an oversight on Mahler's part.

26.48. First notes of b.57 as second notes.

26.49. Referring to the substitution of Cll/2 for Ob/2, Mahler writes in P.40: N.B. Verstärkung mit den ausgestrichenen Noten. In P.40 a copyist has written: N.B. Eingeklammerte Noten nur (eventuel) zur Verstärkung. This has been corrected, to read: Eingeklammerte Noten nur von der Verstärkung zu spielen.

26.50. NYT, 7 Apr 1909, p.11.

26.51. NYT, 2 Apr 1910, p.11.

26.52. Mahler's 8va alto (sic) is patently in error here.

26.53. Again Mahler writes for Fg1 8va alta in b.20 and b.22.

26.54. FWRB, p.186.

26.55. C12 originally reinforced Ob2 from b.325, as in P.39.

26.56. NYT, 2 Apr 1910, p.11.

26.57. This note was wanting on the bassoon of Beethoven's day.

26.58. Beethoven here allows plenty of time for Cll/2 to change back to the A instrument.

26.59. The additions to Tr1/2 are in red ink and the removal of Ps1 in black ink, indicating that Mahler retained Ps1 until late in the process of deciding the Retuschen.


26.61. This change essentially as P.39.
26.63. This change essentially as P.39.

26.64. This change as in P.39, except for the absence of Tr4.

26.65. Same changes to Vn/Va in b.865-8 of P.39.

26.66. He later reinstated it with black ink.

26.67. See NBL, p.70.

26.68. Walter: Thema und Variationen, 1950, p.128. This paragraph, which was omitted from the English version of Walter's autobiography, is quoted here from Blaukopf: Gustav Mahler, p.249.


26.71. RWB9, p.127.

26.72. Many of Mahler's Retuschen in the choral fugue were retained in P.40. They have been identified in the notes to the section dealing with P.40 and those notes should be read in conjunction with the following.

26.73. RWB9, p.127.


27.2. NYT, 30 November 1910, p.11.

27.3. NYT, 30 November 1910, p.11.

27.4. NYDT, 30 Nov 1910, p.7. Bruno Walter relates that he found a string complement of 14,10,8,6,4 to give good results in Carnegie Hall - Bruno Walter: Of Music and Music-Making, p.142.

27.5. See NYDT 21 May 1911, p.2.

27.6. RWUD, p.84.


27.8. RWUD, p.84.

27.9. Maybe none of the woodwind played here, but Fl1 and Flg1 did not bother to cross it out.

27.10. The bare two part string writing presages Mahler's own counterpoint in his Fifth and Ninth Symphonies.

27.11. Bruno Walter/CSO: MS6494.

28.1. NYT, 9 Dec 1909, p.11.


29.2. In passing, Andraschke gives a list of scores, not all of them holographic, in the U.E. Archive, without mentioning the sets of orchestral parts.

29.3. See Ch.13.3.

29.4. Walter/CSO, studio recording, 1959, MS6219.

29.5. Furtwängler/BPO, studio performance 1951, DG2535 808.

29.6. Walter omits all the repeats in the Scherzo and Trio.

29.7. NBL, p.147.


29.9. Originally b.182-209.

29.10. This is the same as cutting b.178-205, differing only in detail of voice leading.

29.11. For the purpose of this description, the form is taken to be Sonata Form in its normal slow movement guise without a development section. There is no larger significance in the letters or numbers here used to identify sections.


29.13. NYDT, 21 May 1911, p.2.


29.15. Walter/CSO, 1959: MS6219.


29.18. This is not a feature of P.47 but according to Norman Del Mar: Orchestral Variations, it is a change introduced by many other conductors.

29.19. Originally Tr3/4 also reinforced Obl/2.

29.20. Earlier Tr3 had also reinforced Obl.

29.21. Earlier Tr3/4 had also reinforced Obl in b.75.
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29.23. Originally C11/2 were 8va in b.92-4 only, agreeing with their reinforcement by Tr1/2 in P.47.

29.24. In P.48, but not in P.49, Pk have E-flats in b.190 & 192 to match the basses.


29.26. Hr3/4 & Tr3/4 are essentially as in P.47.

29.27. See Schubert VIII, 2nd mvt, b.33-44.

29.28. Tovey: Essays on Musical Analysis, Vol I, p.207. Tovey recommends modifying the trombone parts and adopting Schubert's original string parts as a means of making the woodwind audible.

29.29. This change as P.47, except that Vn have crotchet rests.

29.30. This is a refinement of the earlier version of P.47.

29.31. Cl3 and Fg3 have the version with two staccato quavers.

29.32. N.B. The Eulenburg score lacks the F-flats of the Breitkopf Edition in b.87-8.


29.34. Confirmed by Mahler's marks in P.47, see below.

29.35. Poco rit in P.47, with a tempo in b.343.

29.36. See P.49, Vn2.1.

29.37. P.47 also ff in b.53.

29.38. P.47 shows an early version of this.

29.39. Dynamics as P.47.

29.40. See discussion below for Tr parts in P.47.

29.41. In P.47, only in b.647, b.663, and b.667.

29.42. Removed from P.47 in b.889-92 only.

29.43. Hr/Tr rhythm as original.

29.44. Hr3/4 as P.47.

29.45. Conjectural endings are marked with "?"

29.46. There are brackets in the Trio, but these are associated with the alternation of arco and pizz.

29.47. Originally Mahler indicated all strings reduced from b.327. There is also a finishing bracket at the end of b.423.

29.48. Mahler's intentions are not quite clear between b.157 and 216.
b.179. Alle is written in pencil for Vc in b.177 and for Vl in b.178. From these marks it would appear that Mahler initially intended to reduce to half for b.169-176 only; though the addition of the marks in b.157 may indicate only an initial oversight on his part. Later he added brackets and 1/2 in blue pencil, indicating a reduction from b.157 to b.193 for Vn/Va, and b.195 for Vc/Cb.

29.49. Mahler's indications were changed here. Originally all strings appear to have been reduced though the whole passage, but then Mahler revised this to apply to Vn1/2 only. Supplementary marks in Vn1/2 found after the first notes of b.985, b.993, b.1005, b.1013 & b.1025 may indicate an intermediate idea; but I have not been able to interpret these.

29.50. See above.

29.51. Not clear in P.47.

29.52. This could refer to Tr3/4, leaving the original Tr1/2 parts intact.


30.2. These dynamic changes are common to both scores, differing only in minor detail.

30.3. The function of Vn1 and Va in the following bars, although perhaps at first sight analogous, is different and contributes more.

30.4. Originally VaI took over Vn2 original, but this is well enough covered in the woodwind.

31.1. See HLG1, p.763.

31.2. See HLG2, p.1025.


31.4. NYT, 30 Nov 1908, p.9.

31.5. Metronome figures for the crotchet in b.481 have been compared with the end of the movement from three recordings. Furtwängler: M.M.76/160 (ECM684); Karajan M.M.108/144 (DG 2563 458); Bernstein: M.M.100/160 (MS6753).

31.6. Felix von Weingartner: Ratschläge fur Aufführungen klassischer Symphonien, Band II, p.34.

31.7. In P.53, Obl/2 are removed in brown pencil, and the rest in red ink, most likely indicating that Mahler's initial intention was to remove the oboes only.


32.2. The woodwind are deleted from b.423-5.
32.4. See below.

32.5. See note 32.8, below.

32.6. Curiously, this addition was not noticed by the critics.

32.7. Here and in b.366-81, it would be advantageous to be able to see Mahler's own score to verify this detail.

32.8. NYDT, 23 Nov 1910, p.7. As there has been some controversy about this statement, and as the matter is not clear in HLG3, p.865-6, it is worth discussing the sequel. In an attempt to defend Mahler against this criticism, Max Smith, in The New York Press of 28 Nov 1910, p.4, asserted that this "interpolation" came about as the result of a 24 bar cut on p.210-1 of an unspecified edition of the score. This must be b.399-422. Smith claims that: Hearing this motif in the orchestra and failing to see it on the printed page naturally led persons not perfectly familiar with Schumann's symphony to believe that Mahler had tampered with the music, whereas in reality he had only jumped ahead twenty-four bars in the score... As far as b.399-422 are concerned, this is true; but the NYDT critic was right in identifying a spot in the finale where Mahler did interpolate the motto-motif. This is in bars 356-9.

33.1. Stein: Mahler's Re-scoring, p.27.

33.2. There are enough discrepancies on this page of the IGMG score to make one suspicious that the copyist snoozed on the job.

34.1. Va4 was bought at Scharfenberg & Luis, New York.

34.2. HLG1, p.851.

34.3. See NYT, 4 Feb 1910, p.2.

34.4. See HLG1, p.851.

34.5. NYT, 30 Dec 1909, p.9.

34.6. There are discrepancies between score and parts here, and indications that the details were settled in rehearsal.

35.1. See Ludvova, op.cit.

35.2. NYT, 30 Nov 1908, p.9.

35.3. See HLG3, p.446.

35.4. From b.73, where Vc are divisi and Cb enter, the proportions are not clear.

35.5. Cl reinforcement in P.59 only.

36.1. See GMK for details.

36.2. NYT, 30 Nov 1908, p.9.

Notes
Second review, which does not make sense in the context, is a misprint for as!

36.4. Hufvudstadsbladet, 2 Nov 1907.

36.5. See Ch.13.3 for details of the provenance of this timing.

36.6. These letters do not agree with the Breitkopf Edition.

36.7. See Ludvova, op cit.

36.8. The notation used here reflects the actual doublings marked in the parts, and the fact that Mahler only had three oboes and three B-flat clarinet players. In this case the effect is to convert a due into a tre in both the Ob1 and Cl1 parts.

A.1. At beginning and end in the same hand as Vn2.3.

A.2. GMK does not list this work as part of the all-Beethoven programme, but it is definitely mentioned in reviews on 14 Dec 1910. See NYT, p.13, and NYDT, p.7.

A.3. In the same archive there are also a score and set of parts for The Coriolan Overture with Mahler's Retuschen.

A.4. HLG3, p.316.

A.5. See Jitka Ludvova: Gustav Mahler in Prag im Mai 1908.

A.6. There are no additions in the 2nd or 3rd movements.
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