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This study explores Mahler’s incorporation of general or specific references to musical Classicism and early Romanticism in his symphonic works. It also establishes proper terminology for such references, which emerges as a problem in the research of this topic. The thesis articulates all types of conventions recognized in Mahler’s symphonies: the conventional symphonic cycle, traditional forms, periodic phrase structures, dance character with an intermezzo function in inner movements, diatonic harmony, simple homophonic texture, and reduction of the orchestral forces. It identifies the nature of Mahler’s references to the past as subtle or profound deformations of the conventions. It shows different combinations of tradition and modernity in several examples and reveals their possible functions. The conclusions are based not only on analytical observation, but also on the programmatic inspiration, biographical facts, ideas that the composer communicated with friends and colleagues, and on the comparison of Mahler’s symphonies to the related song cycles.

The thesis also shows a possible influence of Vienna’s cultural and political life on Mahler’s classicality. The most influential elements are the paradoxical conservatism of the Liberals’ cultural practices and nostalgia reflected in the architectural style of the Ringstrasse, a complex of buildings built around the city. The archaic nature of its style was a reflection of the cultural values that could influence Mahler’s development.
INTRODUCTION

The implication in some histories of music that a “revolutionary break” from tradition took place in Romanticism can be misleading. A simplistic view of this complex problem can be observed in statements such as Alfred Einstein’s: “Romanticism in music is, by its very nature, a revolutionary movement directed against the fathers and grandfathers of the revolutionary generation; accordingly, Romanticism hates Classicism – or what it considers to be Classical.”¹ This attitude has changed with modern musicology and historicism, and different approaches to the connection of Romanticism with the earlier styles have been developed in the last few decades.² Aidan Day’s recent study of Romanticism provides an example of its current position in the literature of the general history of the arts:

To characterize Romanticism as the revolutionary movement overturning Neoclassicism in general is to oversimplify what was happening in the late Enlightenment culture in Europe in the later eighteenth century.³ Although the position has changed and the complexity of the problem has been recognized by scholars, further research is still needed in order to understand fully the roles of different traditions in Romanticism.

At the fin de siècle, when art experienced the progressive development of the “modern era,” Gustav Mahler’s music was not understood properly. He was left on the list of the old-fashioned Romantic composers. On the other hand, Mahler is most often recognized today as a link between Romanticism and the “modern” era.⁴ Scholars of his music have been attracted more by the innovations of his symphonic expression than by the composer’s relation to tradition.⁵ However, numerous scholars have observed

⁴ Understanding of the role played by the New Viennese School led musicologists to recognize the innovative elements of Mahler’s music. I will mention here only a few of those scholars: Deryck Cooke, Carl Dahlhaus, Jim Samson, and Mirjana Veselinovic-Hofman.
⁵ I cannot account for all of the scholars here, but I can mention several of them: Theodor Adorno, Deryck Cooke, Constantin Floros, Henry-Louis de La Grange, and Donald Mitchell.
Mahler’s inspiration by the musical conventions of the past. Their comments have been directed primarily to underlining the composer’s conservatism, and they have not attempted to define this stylistic concept. Pierre Boulez warned that it would be wrong to relate Mahler to the progressive side that led to the Second Viennese School, because his music has too much nostalgia and attachment to the past to be called revolutionary. He also pointed out a tendency of music criticism to underestimate categories of the past in Mahler’s music. At the same time, Boulez characterized Mahler’s position in the symphonic world as “revolutionary” and emphasized his attack on the hierarchy of conventional symphonic forms.

Robert Morgan placed Mahler in the position of the last major link in the chain of Austro-German symphonic composers, pointing out Mahler’s roots in the tradition that he brought to its culmination.

Deryck Cooke, one of the most important critics responsible for the Mahler revival that began in the early 1960s, discussed traces of Classicism in the Fourth Symphony as a first reaction against Romanticism. He called this stylistic turn “neo-rococo” and defined it as “the tendency to revive the archaic Classical style of Haydn and Mozart as an alternative to the textural thickness and emotional intensity of the post-Wagnerian idiom.” Cooke identified as the most important elements of this “neo-rococo” trend the reduction of the orchestra, the relatively short duration of the composition, and the use of the “normal” four-movement form. Cooke did not apply his “neo-rococo” hypothesis to the composer’s other works, however, except in mentioning that the Sixth “embraced the normal symphonic conception.”

This example illustrates the terminological problem that can arise in discussing the relation of Mahler’s works to the symphonic tradition. If we were to take as “normal” the convention of the symphonic cycle established with Mozart’s middle and late symphonies, then it would not be accurate to identify that convention as rococo. In addition, the term rococo is, in modern musicology, understood as inappropriate to represent a certain music style.

The Classic four-movement symphonic concept and clear sonata form have been the stylistic elements most commonly recognized by scholars as reflections of the Classic past in Mahler’s works. Edward Murphy made a formal analysis of all the symphonies and drew attention to Mahler’s tendency to use sonata-rondo form. He pointed out that the composer “retained the important classical formal device.”

---

6 Pierre Boulez, Deryck Cooke, Constantin Floros, Henry-Louis de La Grange, David Matthews, Donald Mitchell, and Niall O’Loughlin.

7 Pierre Boulez, Orientations: Collected Writings (Boston: Faber, 1986), 303.

8 Boulez, Orientations, 298.


11 Cooke, Gustav Mahler, 84.

O’Loughlin defined Mahler’s form as “traditional,” with the Classic conventions as a starting point, but also as “intuitive, flexible, modern, and completely original.”\(^{13}\) David Matthews also observed Mahler’s references to Classicism in formal structure and identified the Sixth Symphony as “the most classical of all.”\(^{14}\)

Constantin Floros believes that the reduction of instrumental forces and simplicity of the thematic material in the Fourth Symphony are not results of Mahler’s intention to “render homage to Classicism.” He regarded “the highly individual structure of the Fourth, the economy of means, and the simplicity of the themes in the first movement” as “a condition of the work’s subject.” He also discussed other elements of the “classical” conventions and their deviations.\(^{15}\)

Not only Mahler’s method of using past conventions but also his quotations and reminiscences of pre-existing music and everyday music experience justify comparison of his treatment with the ideology of twentieth-century neo-classicism. The literature about the music of Gustav Mahler and neo-classicism offers just a few connections. Maureen Carr compares Mahler’s technique of overlapping materials and sections with Stravinsky’s neo-classical technique. In addition, both Carr and Theodor Adorno have discussed Mahler’s musical montage in the Ninth Symphony as an anticipation of Stravinsky’s use of montage.\(^{16}\)

The most significant work focusing on fin-de-siècle ties with tradition is Scott Messing’s *Neoclassicism in Music From the Genesis of the Concept through the Schoenberg/Stravinsky Polemic*.\(^{17}\) In this book Messing discusses neo-classicism in Europe from 1910 to 1925, employing an approach based on a historiographical survey. It provides an important discussion of the terminology used at this time, but it remains very general in regard to actual music.

Such a background of approaches supports the need for further work in order to understand the traces of the musical past in Mahler’s symphonies. This study explores Mahler’s incorporation of general or specific references to musical Classicism and early Romanticism in his symphonic works. It establishes proper terminology for such references, which emerges as a problem in the research of this topic. The study also examines Mahler’s technique of quotations and reminiscences of pre-existing music and sounds in order to identify possible similarities or dissimilarities between his works and the ideology of neo-classicism that arose in the twentieth century.

---


Research into Mahler’s references to conventions in the fin-de-siècle opens several problems and raises a variety of questions. One task of this thesis is to define the traditions to which Mahler returned and his use of the elements of those traditions. The conventions of the past that can be recognized in Mahler’s symphonies stem from Classic and early Romantic music. The traditional forms that Mahler used are sonata form, three-part form, variations, and rondo. In addition, a very strong implication of Classic conventions arises from Mahler’s occasional use of straightforward periodic phrase structures.

Another convention of the early Romantic tradition is the symphonic cycle, which is employed only in the First and Sixth Symphonies. The Romantic convention is also reflected in the number of movements, the order of fast-dance-slow-finale, the use of standard key structures, and the placement of weight on the finale. Use of a simple dance character with an intermezzo function in the inner movements, such as minuet, Ländler, and simple scherzo, also shows Mahler’s relation to the tradition of early Romanticism, especially after the Second Symphony, in which Mahler first used a transformed Scherzo of demonic type, far removed from a dance character. Mahler’s connection with the Classic and early Romantic traditions is also discussed in this thesis in relation to other elements of style, such as diatonic harmony, simple homophonic texture, and reduction of the orchestral forces.

Research on Mahler’s references to conventions from the past presents the challenge of choosing appropriate terminology. Scholars have mostly used the terms “classical,” “conventional,” or “neo-classical.” However, the terms “Classic models” or “Classic tradition” are not adequate, because this would refer to the specific time period of musical Classicism, which is not the intention of this work. Moreover, the broader term “convention” does not have the necessary degree of specificity. If the twentieth-century term “neo-classicism” were borrowed, it would raise a problem of historic inconsistency. Since “neo-classicism” also implies some other aesthetic issues, such as objective ideology, it could be confusing if the term “neo-classicism” were used in a definition of Mahler’s relation to tradition. One of the first connections between Mahler’s symphonies and neo-classicism was made by Donald Mitchell in 1975 in relation to the Fourth symphony as its “early manifestation.” Louis de la Grange also used the term neo-classicism to identify traditional concepts in Mahler’s work; however, he pointed out that Mahler’s treatments of traditions were quite different from those in twentieth-century neo-classical trends.

This problem provides an opportunity to identify more appropriate terminology for the present discussion. Instead of creating a new term, it is possible to adopt one used at the fin-de-siècle. Scott Messing discussed several German terms, and he found

---


that Neoklassizismus did not appear until between the wars, and that it was used for French art and architecture of the late eighteenth century. The terms Klassizismus and Klassik had emerged earlier in the German literature. However, Klassizismus was used with a meaning of “epigonism” or “pseudo-classicism,” applied to the imitation of conventions from the French Enlightenment or ancient Greek and Roman art, and Klassik was used to identify the Classicism of Haydn and Mozart. In 1911 Thomas Mann offered the term eine neue Klassizität for the art opposed to Wagnerism. He characterized this neue Klassizität as “something that appears logical, structural, and clear; something that is equally austere and serene.”

This description is similar to the characterization of nouveau classicisme, used in France for the music that rejected the aesthetic and style of Wagner. In order to arrive at a term roughly equivalent to Mann’s, this thesis therefore proposes the term “classicality” for the references to conventions from the past in music of Post-Romanticism.

The research methodology for investigating classicality in Mahler’s symphonies includes biographical, cultural, aesthetic, and analytical tools. Biographical elements have been useful in clarifying Mahler’s opinion about tradition and works of other composers. Mahler’s comments about his own music have been also very valuable in the understanding of his style. This kind of research into the composer’s approach was possible, since his letters were published, as well as reports by his friends. In addition, it was important to have in mind Mahler’s performance activity and his work on performance editions and arrangements, which revealed with what part of the tradition Mahler was especially familiar.

Cultural insight into the period has also been valuable in resolving the issues of Mahler’s relation to tradition, especially since the period of the fin-de-siècle in Europe was very interesting politically, culturally, and sociologically. Emphasis was placed on cultural conditions in Vienna, since this city had both direct and indirect influence on Mahler.

An important part of the thesis is style analysis of the symphonies and an identification of the elements of the conventions and their forms in the works at the end of the nineteenth and the first decade of the twentieth century. Analytical tools were applied to various elements of the works, such as symphonic cyclicism, use of genre, forms of movements, musical syntax, texture, harmonic language, melody, and instrumentation. Analytical presentation differs from example to example. The most extensive analysis is applied to the First Symphony, since it has an interesting combination of conventions and their transformations.


22 A more direct transliteration of the term neue Klassizität would be “new classicity,” but this would be too clumsy; therefore, a simpler term, “classicality,” will be used, as it carries the desired meaning but avoids any resemblance to the pejorative term “classicism.”

CHAPTER 1

CULTURAL AND SOCIAL DISCOURSE IN FIN-DE-SIÈCLE VIENNA

The artistic and sociopolitical situation of fin-de-siècle Vienna left its traces in the works of Mahler. Although he did not spend most of his life in this city, “Vienna functioned as the decisive cultural reference point for his creative life.”

Mahler lived in Vienna in two periods: during his adolescence and student years, from 1875 until 1883, and during his directorship at the Vienna Opera, from 1897 to 1907. He also paid visits to the city during his stay in New York as a conductor, from 1907 until 1911, and retained musically and culturally connected to Vienna. Mahler defined himself as triply homeless: “as a native of Bohemia in Austria, as an Austrian among Germans, and a Jew throughout all the world.” Although this statement can be understood as the expression of a common problem of identity and conformity for all Romantic artists, it has a strong bearing on Mahler’s case. He fought that feeling and tried to “offset this apparent sense of conventional ethnic and political homelessness through an intense psychological engagement with Vienna.”

This city “encompassed both past and future in a manner unequaled by any other European city of the period,” and these contradictory but mutually fulfilling elements found an artistic counterpart in Mahler’s music aesthetics. From 1857 Vienna had witnessed a strong social transformation by the Imperial project of redesigning and developing the city. The walls separating the city from the outlying districts were demolished, and the Ringstrasse was built, opening the door for urban renewal. These events, as well as major demographic changes, provoked a political and cultural reaction in Vienna, leaning toward nostalgia for the old city. “During the last thirty


25 Mahler was born in Bohemia, where he belonged to an unpopular Austrian minority among Bohemians. When he moved to Austria, Mahler was regarded as outsider because he was native of Bohemia, although Bohemia was part of Austrian Empire at that time.


28 Morgan, Twentieth-Century Music, 20.
years of the nineteenth century, new residents of Vienna not only willingly embraced sentimental prejudices that, in their evocation of a romanticized past and a vanished world, mirrored a construct of the quintessentially Viennese character, they also helped to generate a commercialized myth of an endangered pre-modern Viennese tradition.\textsuperscript{29} This mythic and superficial anti-modern character, together with very popular entertainment culture, including waltz, polka, and operetta, created the Viennese identity at this time.

The political situation also influenced the artistic world. The highly complex phenomenon of Austrian Liberalism affected the development of ideas and arts in the second part of the nineteenth century. The centralization of political authority and the strengthening of the position of the middle class in relation to the aristocracy were already prepared by Josephinism. However, because of Metternich’s influence, liberal movements were spread later in Austria than in other parts of Europe, and they were either short-lived or dominated by paradoxes.\textsuperscript{30} In 1867 “high Liberal” government brought changes in economic planning. Free-market capitalism and industrialism gained importance in Austrian society, where a new concern for the individual over social or communal matters found fertile ground. Liberalism in Austria was unstable in these years, reflecting several major crises, including the Franco-Prussian War, the economic crisis of 1873, and the intense conflicts between \textit{Gemeinschaft} and \textit{Gesellschaft}, a cohesive and rural society and the anonymous society of industrial capitalism, respectively.\textsuperscript{31} The result of the neglect of social and communal problems led to the formation of two movements, pan-German nationalism and Socialism, which were partly responsible for the end of Austrian Liberalism. As society experienced a crisis, university students took a leading role in the critique and the transformation of the social and political system. In 1867 students in Vienna formed the “Pernerstorfer Circle,” which combined aesthetic and political ideals based on the writings of Nietzsche, Wagner, and Schopenhauer. Mahler belonged to this group until the 1880s, when the Pernerstorfer Circle began to dissolve. It changed the perspective that he had had, coming from the Liberal culture of Iglau. The \textit{völkisch} movement played a leading role in the revolt of members of the group and their goal of unifying art and politics in the service of an ideal \textit{völkisch} community. They were inspired by Wagner’s theory of a nationalistic turn in which “the German musical tradition, of which Beethoven was the ideal representative, would provide the essential Dionysian force to arouse the dormant folk soul or will, while the medieval store of Teutonic myth and legend would perform the Apollonian role of sublimating this basically destructive force into the

\textsuperscript{29} Botstein, “Gustav Mahler’s Vienna,” 10.

\textsuperscript{30} Francesca Lurana Draughon, \textit{Mahler and the Music of Fin-de-siècle Identity} (Ph.D., dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 2002), 6.

concrete, life-affirming symbols of the German nation during its heroic age.”

Mahler and his friends took long hikes in the summers through the Bohemian forests, remote villages, and cities that they held as symbols of hope for a renaissance of the great culture of medieval Germany. They also had a strong desire for communal belonging to the German tradition. The principle of this völkisch mysticism was metamorphosis and rebirth. This rebirth could be translated in the music world as a belief in the rebirth of the symphony, the great form of German tradition.

The Pernerstorfer Circle developed a critique of materialist society, espousing “a combination of populist politics, social reformism, and antirationalistic philosophy.” In the formation of two sides of the Pernerstorfer Circle, Mahler’s inclination was to the one based on aesthetics, called the Saga Society, while in another direction the members chose political activism in the Linz Program. The Saga Society believed in the power of German musical nationalism and a religious-aesthetic-mystical remedy for the degeneration of Liberal culture. The role of Wagner’s music and thought in this society was very important. On the other side, in addition to pan-German nationalism, the focus of the Linz Program was on attention to the problems of the working class. This program fought for the rights of the peasants, workers, and lower-middle class. Anti-Semitism had its roots here, which were adopted and expanded by the Christian Socialist party. After 1889 the members of the Pan-German movement supported the Christian Social party and its leader Karl Lueger (1844-1910), which led to the collapse of Liberalism in Vienna. Lueger became a mayor of the city at the time when Mahler was appointed to the Opera.

Liberal ideals were not centered only on political, economic, and religious questions, but also on cultural issues. “Both Liberalism’s supporters and its critics acknowledged the paradoxical conservatism of the Liberals’ cultural practices.” In that light, Brahms’s references to the Classical past in instrumental music were not unusual, nor against the expectations of Vienna’s audience. Rudolf Louis wrote in 1905, “In peculiar contrast to its name and the political and economic views it advocated, Liberalism constantly declared its allegiance in aesthetic matters to an ungenerous, patronizing conservatism. The artistic expression of the ‘Liberal’ spirit was the academic-epigonous classicism that today appears to us so thoroughly done away with.”

A strong symbol of Liberal culture was the Ringstrasse, the focus of the urban reconstruction, which included a complex of public buildings and private apartments in a broad belt around the old city. It was based on a variety of historical styles. Carl

32 William McGrath, “‘Volksseelenpolitik’ and Psychological Rebirth: Mahler and Hofmannsthal,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 4 (Summer 1973), 56.


34 Margaret Notley, “Brahms as Liberal: Genre, Style, and Politics in Late Nineteenth-Century Vienna,” *19th-Century Music* 17 (1993), 112.

Schorske pointed out that the Ringstrasse was a visual expression of the values of the bourgeois, but at the same time, while it was assertive in its independence of the past in law and science, it expressed its values in architecture by retreating into history. The historical style of each building was chosen by association with its function. This historicism can be understood as Liberal conservatism, or, as Leon Botstein treated it, as a camouflage:

An imagined history was evoked in architecture and painting to camouflage the radical transformation that modernity brought about. Alternatively, in what to many appeared to be a gesture of essentially corrupt and eclectic historicism, Vienna, in its new architecture, had appropriated to itself the external styles of the past through which to display a confidence in progress. The post-1857 Viennese ambivalence about past and present, therefore, took the shape of modernity clothed as mythic history.

Other elements that Liberals valued highly were rationalism, reason, and individual intellect. In music they connected these qualities with tonality and the techniques of musical logic. “The full flowering of tonal and thematic-motivic logic in Classical music surely offers at least a partial explanation for the Liberals’ preference for that repertory over the Romantic music of the more recent past.”

As a reaction to the cult of rationalism among the Liberals, by the mid-1880s the anti-Liberal movement of emotion influenced Vienna’s musical and political life. Liberals no longer held any political power after 1897, but their perspective was still present in some levels of intellectualism. Even with the dominant taste inclining toward modernism at the turn of the century, the Viennese were aware of their past cultural values. In the period from the 1870s until the late 1890s they developed a cult of memory for Franz Schubert. His monument was built in 1872. Vienna also held the historical symbol of Ludwig van Beethoven in high regard. The famous Beethoven exhibition was held in 1902 including, among other features, a massive statue of the composer and a performance of an excerpt from the Ninth Symphony conducted by Mahler.

In this turbulent Vienna, Mahler reached his maturity and gained his place in the artistic world. When he returned from Hamburg in 1897, he experienced great success in his career, becoming director of the Vienna Opera and conductor of the Vienna Philharmonic, which were the most prestigious positions at that time. He won respect among Vienna’s opera elite as a proponent of their traditional art. However, because of the changed political situation and strong anti-Semitism, he had to pay a price by renouncing his Jewish heritage and becoming Catholic. At this time Mahler was no longer dedicated to modern literary trends, as he had been when he was a student; on

---

38 Notley, “Brahms as Liberal,” 113.
the contrary, he distanced himself from modernism and stayed attached to early nineteenth-century German romanticism. At the same time he also became interested in Viennese visual arts that rejected the historicism of architecture and painting of Ringstrasse era but developed a new kind of modernism. Mahler’s wife, Alma, daughter of a painter, introduced him to the powerful subculture of Vienna’s cultural elite. These artists, pioneers of Austrian modernism, developed the Secession, an artistic movement against tradition in the plastic arts. It emerged under the leadership of Gustav Klimt.

The decline of the Habsburg empire and the disintegration of its social and cultural institutions caused many contradictions and paradoxes that became a part of political, social, and cultural life in Vienna at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of twentieth century. One of the causes of these paradoxes, besides those mentioned as elements of Liberalism and its crises, lies in society’s inability to accept a rising modernity. Vienna’s art and public life were battlegrounds of numerous conflicting ideologies. They were also affected by moral duplicity and a crisis of identity. This was a time when a rash of suicides made Vienna the suicide capital of Europe. It was “the special genius of Mahler to take into himself and his own psyche the great polarities that Austrian culture generated, and to unify them in dynamic tension and dialectic interaction. In every major phase of his life he had integrated the dissociated, the contradictory or the contrasting.”40 Mahler’s works acknowledged the paradoxes and contradictions of the time. Reliance on and extreme deviation from Viennese classical models, organicism and heterogeneity, as well as tonal coherence in a multi-tonal work, are part of Mahler’s symphonic rhetoric, suggesting a kind of integration of cultural and social paradoxes.

Nineteenth-century musical culture was the first to accept historical continuity and to incorporate historically established works into a regular concert repertory. Historical concerts allowed the creation of a canon that included the great composers of the “Viennese Classical tradition”: Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven. Being surrounded by “music traditions,” Romantics experienced the opportunity to include any of them in their works, not only the tradition of Classicism from which their music was most directly derived, but also from the Baroque and Renaissance eras, as well as from different national cultures. The national traditions became apparent in Romanticism after a national awareness found its expression through art. The definition of the past had changed in the nineteenth century. Romanticists tended to look to the more distant past rather than to the one they directly inherited. In Schumann’s words, “the whole so-called Romantic school… is far nearer to Bach than Mozart ever was.”

A balance between preservational and progressive impulses in the nineteenth century shows an interesting connection to the past. “In no previous era did new composition claim so heavy a dependence on exemplary models from the past, as the polemics of the 1850s testify.” Leonard Meyer argues that the changes that this century brought in music development were “not decisive breaks on the level of rules, but rather general trends on the level of strategies.” He also discusses a conflict between the ideological rejection of conventions that happened in Romanticism and the practical need for them. Such conventions, as defined by Mirjana Veselinovic-Hofman, were used in Romanticism as “the representatives of a specific context (compositional

---


technique, form, harmony, etc.) taken from a certain style.” The elements of the past, such as polyphonic technique or sonata form, can be recognized by their historical roots, but their functions are defined by Romantic content; they therefore became elements of Romantic style and not elements merely attached from outside the style. In this way, they changed their stylistic content but retained their historical reference. The stylistic features, though modified to suit Romantic compositional needs, continued to evoke their original historical periods. In contrast to Romanticism, twentieth-century neoclassicism accepted traditional elements, retaining their musical content and stylistic characteristics.

Donald Mitchell adopts an interesting approach to the nature of classical references in Romanticism, which he called “neo-classicism”:

> We often discuss or think about Neo-Classicism as if it were wholly a matter of “style,” of explicit references to the manners of the past; and to be sure the “past” must be integral to any attempt at defining the concept of Neo-Classicism. There is, however, another approach, another perspective, which perhaps transcends the issue of style or manner as the prime means of “reviving” the past. It manifests itself, rather, as an awareness of the evolution of an established form to that critical point in time at which our hypothetical composer himself begins to work at extending the chosen form – the symphony, say – and, thereby, its pre-existing history. In short, the history of the form itself then becomes a subject of the composer’s discourse.

Form was also Leonard Ratner’s central concern. He asserted that “form in nineteenth-century music is based principally on eighteenth-century models, adapted to incorporate elements of sound and syntax evolved during the Romantic era.” He found evidence for this retrospective orientation in textbooks of the time, which show that traditional form and syntax were the bases for the education of composers in the nineteenth century. Ratner regarded the Romantic era with a broad perspective, noticing that it emerged as a dialect of the eighteenth-century musical language. He also observed that all typically Romantic elements “were prefigured in the later eighteenth century, then carried over and colored by the new climate of sound, with the result that all terms were modified, all affective stances altered.”

---


from Classicism throughout Romanticism was never understood and defined by nineteenth-century theorists, which led to the problem of a proper formulation of references to the past in Romanticism.

The terminology used in referring to the stylistic changes throughout the nineteenth century is not standardized. German music historians, for example, identify the second half of the nineteenth century as “the age of Wagner or of ‘neo-romanticism’.” The latter term comes from literary theory in the early nineteenth century, where it was used to distinguish all successive kinds of Romanticism one from another. This terminology may be justified when one considers the relation of music to other arts. At this time, music turned onto a different path from the other art forms. After music developed parallel with literature and painting early in the nineteenth century, in the second part of the century music remained in the Romantic sphere, while the other arts were dominated by positivistic and realistic trends; therefore music was “romantic in unromantic age.”

Music during Romanticism showed two inclinations: one toward progressivism and another toward following traditional lines. “While the conservative critic was at pains to stress, and deplore, the novelty of the new, the progressive composer was anxious to demonstrate his links with the old, his affinities with the great masters.” This pair of complementary impulses shaped a symphonic development that fell into a crisis at the mid-century. One of the problems was a dilemma about the possibility of symphonic development after Beethoven. The various resolutions that were proposed for this dilemma created a great pluralism in symphonic styles. On one side the programmatic symphonic poem was created, and on the other a great German symphonic tradition was continued under the umbrella of Beethovenian model, which divided into two different paths exemplified in the duality of Bruckner’s and Brahms’s aesthetics. This “anxiety of influence” was intensified by the growing importance of originality in the aesthetics of nineteenth-century music. The originality of musical material in Romanticism was treated as the most important characteristic of art music.

A duality between progressivism and conservatism was present all the way through Romanticism, although it became particularly intriguing at the fin de siècle and the beginning of the twentieth century. At this time, during the outburst of modernity, the use of past conventions was evidence of a specific attitude. An anti-Romantic

---


50 “At first the romanticism of circa 1800 from the literature of the Middle Ages and the early modern era; then French romanticism of 1830 onwards from the German romanticism of circa 1800; finally the revived romanticism of circa 1900 from the original, paradigmatic romanticism of a century earlier.” Dahlhaus, Between Romanticism and Modernism, 4.

51 Dahlhaus, Between Romanticism and Modernism, 5.


reaction could be responsible for this interest, because as much as it drove artists to step toward modernity, it also could lead them to the expression and formalism of the aesthetics that preceded late Romanticism. Max Reger’s slogan “return to Bach”⁵⁴ was intentionally directed against Wagnerian style. The need for a revival of tradition at this turbulent time could also indicate a need for stability.

After Mahler’s examples of classicality, Richard Strauss surprisingly turned away from his earlier, almost expressionistic language, which he had developed in Salome and Elektra, in the opera Der Rosenkavalier in 1911 and his following work Ariadne auf Naxos (1912). This change of direction was often understood to have resulted from his “recognizing the impossibility of continuing along the lines of the technical innovations in his two great operas.”⁵⁵

French composers and the public also confronted the musical tradition of Wagner’s operas and his massive instrumental edifices. “In seeking compelling alternative models, many French artists, fortified by a milieu of increasingly vociferous nationalism, were drawn to their preromantic past, which was construed to embody a purity inherent in their race.”⁵⁶ French literature fostered a self-conscious movement against the sterility and pessimism of symbolism and a renewal of order, clarity, and simplicity. Composers turned to the classical past of the French musical tradition and the works of Couperin and Rameau. As early as 1888 the first works of Eric Satie showed the French determination to eschew passionate intensity, chromaticism, and Wagnerian gigantism. Jean Cocteau later observed that “Satie teaches what, in our age, is the greatest audacity, simplicity.”⁵⁷ This French movement toward the classical elements of their culture can be seen even in the works of Debussy and Ravel. Their models were combined with modern musical language. Ravel composed the Menuet antique in 1895 and Debussy his suite Pour le piano in 1901.

Mahler’s dual role in the music world as a composer and conductor led to a tension in his artistic expression. Each of these roles required a different attitude of Mahler. The center of the duality was Mahler’s relation to the tradition, which had to be preserved and kept alive to parallel contemporary art. In his role as a performer, Mahler believed in this task; however, as composer, he expressed his progressive experience in relation to the tradition to which he belonged. Mahler established himself in European society first as a conductor. The repertoire he conducted centered mainly on Wagner’s and Mozart’s operas. His dedication to operatic works resulted also in the reconstruction of Carl Maria von Weber’s opera Die drei Pintos in 1887, which had great success. He faced controversial responses from the musicians of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, which he conducted, because of his editorial changes, especially in Beethoven’s works. Mahler experienced conflict with Vienna’s public and

---

⁵⁵ Morgan, Twentieth-Century Music, 33.
⁵⁶ Messing, Neoclassicism, 24.
critics because of his interpretative standpoints. He believed that by reorchestrating Beethoven’s scores he would achieve, with modern instruments and in a modern concert hall, what Beethoven had intended at his time. Mahler also created numerous published and unpublished performing editions and arrangements. His interest was mainly focused on the German music tradition, works of Bach, Mozart, Weber, Beethoven, Schubert, Schumann, and Bruckner. The appearance of classicality in Mahler’s symphonies must be understood in connection with this general and specifically personal relation to the music of the eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries.

Classicality was an element of Mahler’s expression that shaped all his symphonies, although in the later works the references to the conventions are transformed by Mahler’s radical rethinking of the symphonic concept. Only four of Mahler’s nine symphonies comprise four-movement cycles following the symphonic convention of the early Romantic period. The four-movement cycle, however, is not created in all of them by the traditionally expected order and function of movements. The First Symphony has four movements in the order fast-dance-slow-finale, while instead of a dramatic finale the Fourth has a vocal-instrumental song, which resembles the function of the resolution-finale. The lengths of these two works also reflect an early Romantic symphonic size. This changes in the Sixth Symphony, which consists of a traditional, four-movement cycle, including the first fast movement, two inner movements of intermezzo character (dance and lyrical slow movement), and a very dramatic finale. In spite of this classicality, the tonality of the slow movement is unusual. The first, second, and fourth movements are all in A minor, while the third is E flat major.

The symphonic cycle of the Ninth Symphony is constructed as a self-conscious deviation from traditional concepts. Its first two movements are an Andante/Allegro followed by a Ländler; however, the third movement is headed Rondo-Burlesque, and the finale is a slow movement. Although the climax of the cycle is reached by the third movement, the fourth is conceived as a release. The key structure of this cycle is highly unusual: D major, C major, A minor, and D flat major. The other symphonies have extended numbers of movements or a completely different concept of the cycle, as in the example of the Eighth.

In a similar way, Mahler’s references to the formal conventions experienced less deformation in the first four symphonies compared to the later works, in which the composer developed a mature style. Even the most conventional forms, however, reflect Mahler’s constant variant treatment of materials and extension of form by additional returns of materials that produce a rondo effect. The following analytical
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58 J. S. Bach: Suite aus den Orchesterwerken, from Suite no. 2 and no. 3; W. A. Mozart: Die Hochzeit des Figaro; L. van Beethoven: String Quartet op. 95 and Symphony no. 9; F. Schubert: Symphony no. 9; C. M. von Weber: Die drei Pintos and Euryanthe; R. Schumann: Four Symphonies; A. Bruckner: Symphonies no. 3 and 5.

59 The most commonly used model in Classicism and Romanticism is the order fast-slow-dance-finale.
discussion will focus on the examples that most clearly show Mahler’s treatment of Classic and early Romantic conventions. It includes analyses of the entire First and Fourth symphonies and several movements of the other works that show specific characteristics of Mahler’s style. Examples of transformed classicality will be shown by extracts from the Sixth and Seventh symphonies. These examples will show Mahler’s belief that “‘symphony’ means constructing a world with all the technical means at one’s disposal” and that “the eternally new and changing content determines its own form.” The last example is related to the Eighth and a treatment of the fugue inserted into sonata form. The analytical approach differs from the example to example. The most detailed discussion is applied in the analysis of the First symphony, while in the other examples only important elements of Mahler’s classicality are surveyed.

---

60 Bauer-Lechner, Recollections, 40.
CHAPTER 3

CHARACTERISTICS OF CLASSICALITY IN GUSTAV MAHLER’S FIRST SYMPHONY

The First Symphony stands out as a good example of Mahler’s relation to the symphonic tradition at the early stage of his compositional development. The first version of the work was composed in 1889, when Mahler was twenty-nine years old. On one hand, it shows Mahler’s references to Classic and early Romantic conventions, but on the other hand, it shows his innovative treatment of the form. The symphony has four movements in a traditional key structure. The order of the movements is unusual for the Classic symphony but less unconventional for Romantic works after Beethoven’s Ninth.

I – fast – D major
II – dance – A major
III – slow – D minor
IV – finale – F minor → D major

The tonal designs of the second and fourth movements are not typical within the convention. Instead of the tonic major, the dance movement is in the dominant key and the finale is in the “wrong” key in most of its length and only the coda finally brings it to D major. The tonal scheme of the movement is directed by the programmatic idea of a hero’s journey from hell to heaven. The movements are not as long as Mahler’s tend to be in his later works; in its length, this symphony could be compared with Beethoven’s early Romantic symphonies. Although the length of the work is not a strong criterion for stylistic evaluation, the substantial growth in size of symphonic movements that took place in Romanticism provides us with an additional criterion for defining a stylistic picture of the work.

61 Most of Mozart’s four-movement symphonies have a second slow movement and a third Minuet with Trio. The second movement is also in slow tempo in Beethoven’s symphonies, with exception of the Ninth Symphony. Other examples of the change where a Scherzo is the second and an Adagio the third movement are Schumann’s Second Symphony, Mendelssohn’s Scottish Symphony, and Bruckner’s Eighth and Ninth Symphonies.

62 We can compare the length of Mahler’s First and Fourth Symphonies, and Bruckner’s Third. Mahler’s First is approximately 52 minutes long, Mahler’s Fourth is approximately 53 minutes long, while Bruckner’s Third lasts from 69 to 77 minutes, depending on the performance.
The finale of the First Symphony carries the greatest weight of the work, which is characteristic of the Romantic treatment of the symphonic cycle; however, the third movement is not, as expected in a conventional symphonic cycle, an intermezzo by character. Instead it is a grotesque funeral march interrupted by contrasting material, which leaves a strong impression on listeners due to its transformation of the widely known song “Bruder Martin” into an ominous variant, creating a grotesque parody of a funeral procession.

The symphony is cyclical in two ways. Most of its thematic materials are derived from the motives established in the first movement, where Mahler also prefigured the main theme of the finale. The most important motive of the symphony is the interval of the fourth, which stands as the basic melodic substance of the work. This thematic cyclicity provides the symphony with the quality of Romantic organicism. A close thematic connection among the movements, especially between the first and last, is established by reminiscences of thematic materials from the opening movement in the finale. This concept also has its predecessors in the music of Beethoven, Schumann, Mendelssohn, and Berlioz.

Thus the formal structures of the movements are traditional, but at the same time they include inner transformations, which are often related to programmatic inspiration, as in the third movement of the symphony. The first and last movements retain the traditional categories of sonata form, while the second and third are organized in three-part form. In the following analysis the sonata forms will be compared, in order to observe similarities and differences in their structural treatment. However, this approach would not be useful in the same way for the second and third movements, which will be analyzed separately. Form diagrams of all movements are presented in Appendix A.

**Sonata Forms**

Both sonata-form movements begin in conventional fashion, establishing in the introduction the motivic materials that are used further in the work. The opening part of the first movement is Arcadian in character. It evokes the coming spring and the Austrian landscape, which is extended in the rest of the movement. This section has an important function, since it brings several motives that serve as the essence of many materials established later. These are also spread over the whole work, especially in the first and last movements. The opening part of the fourth movement also introduces the material of the movement, but in its case an idea associated with the primary key is directly introduced in the opening material in mm. 7 and 20. Such a function and such substantial length of both opening sections bring Mahler’s First Symphony closer to the Romantic than the Classic treatment of introductions.

The use of mono-thematicism in the first part of the sonata form, in the tradition of Joseph Haydn, is an intriguing element of the first movement. Although it has two
distinct themes, it lacks thematic contrast. It is quite unusual to hear a modulation to the dominant area during the P material (mm. 63-83), especially with the primary key lasting only twelve measures. After a half cadence of the first phrase in D major (m. 71), the second phrase establishes the dominant, A major (mm. 75-83) (see Example 1). These two phrases relate as a period, and such a semantic device does not allow us to treat the second phrase as material associated with a tonal transition. If we were to do so, however, it would be a remarkably unusual example of T in such close relation to P. This thematic unit is followed up by another one (m. 84) that has lost the function of the transition to the secondary key, although it will be identified as T, since it functions as a transition from one thematic idea to the next. The opening P is repeated again in a shorter variant consisting of only one phrase (mm. 109-16) in A major and followed by a new version of T (mm.117-35).

Example 1. Mahler, Symphony no. 1, mvt. 1, mm. 57-83.
Example 1, continued.

Closing passage (mm. 135-62) combines the main motive of P and a new one, K, creating a local culmination in the first part of the sonata form. This emphasis on K sounds refreshing, since the whole first part has a strong expository character without any contrast or developmental fragmentary structure of the kind that would be expected from the Romantic sonata form.
Another peculiarity of this movement is the repetition of the first part, a practice that had been frequently abandoned in progressive Romanticism. Mahler here abides by Classic convention also in adopting the syntax of themes that consist of phrases and periods. The convention is also retrieved in other music elements. The entire first part of this sonata form is built within a homophonic texture based on melody with accompaniment, which is very often established by pedals and broken chords. The full orchestra is active, however, in creating a transparent musical tissue. The tonal language is diatonic.

The first section of the fourth movement is much longer and more intensely dramatized. The material associated with the establishment of the primary key is a broad thematic complex, which includes exposition of the material and its development. The main motivic material is brought by a phrase (mm. 54-74) that consists of four motives and closes with a half cadence. Until m. 166 Mahler works with all four motives, giving developmental character to this expository part of the sonata. Such a P theme that is driven by developmental treatment contrasts with the expository nature of the first part of the first movement and is a product of the dramatic Romantic type of sonata form.

The material associated with transition to a new key is very brief (mm. 167-74) and leads the movement from F minor to D flat major, the submediant major of the primary key. Although this is an unusual key structure for a sonata form, Mahler used the submediant area of S to underline the effect of the character difference between the two leading thematic ideas. S strongly contrasts with the previous, very dramatic theme by its lyricism, which is even greater than is expected from a secondary theme. The closing material of the first part (mm. 239-53) brings back the ominous material already heard in the opening section of the first movement (mvt. 1, mm. 47-58). In both places it leads into the beginning of the next section.

The third sections of both sonata forms are interesting structurally, thematically, dramatically, and tonally. Because of its nature, in the discussion of this part of the form, we cannot really observe traditional elements or innovations. The third section of the first movement begins with the opening material. This treatment and the similar length of the parts (I – 261 and II - 288) create an impression of two-part sonata form similar to the early examples of this form. The opening segment of the third section also brings a new motive that becomes a part of the further motivic palette. An expansion of the closing material appears there as well, which also gains independence as a “bird song” motive (mm. 165-75). Another interesting element of this formal section is the establishment of a new thematic idea derived from the motive of the fourth, which brings a structural stability in the development section (mm. 207-18). It is
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63 A repetition of the first part is omitted for the first time in the first movement of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony (1823).

64 Mahler worked with “a” and “b” motives until a permeable border in m. 85, after which he brought motive “c” and developed it together with the previous two motives until another permeable border in m. 135. The remaining “d” motive is further developed until the stable cadence in m. 166.
in D major and it has the effect of an additional thematic sphere in the primary key, which compensates for the abrupt change to the dominant major in the first section. It is interesting that Mahler chose to foreshadow, in this development section, the finale’s primary key and the theme that will be associated with it. The third section of the sonata form is rounded by the material of opening section (fanfare motive in m. 323 and mm. 352-37). This section has not only developmental character but expository character, as well. Besides the establishment of the new thematic material, it brings back materials of the previous sections in varied forms (especially from m. 257), but work with the material does not go much beyond the level of simple variations, and it therefore carries a lesser degree of dramatic tension despite modulations to distant keys. The only situation that disrupts the simplicity of the movement is from m. 257 to m. 268, where Mahler juxtaposes two thematic elements, one played by strings and another by winds. They sound in different keys, but do not produce chromatic clashes in verticalities (see Example 2).

In the third section of the finale the P theme maintains its importance, leaving aside any development of S, which could not attain the dramatic energy needed for this section. Instead, there is a reminiscence of the motivic material from the opening section of the first movement. This development section has more dramatic energy than that of the opening movement, bringing it into the pattern of Romantic sonata form examples.

The last sections of both movements are consistent with Mahler’s continuous variation treatment. In the opening movement the first thematic material introduced in this section is, quite unusually, the new material introduced in the third section, which is followed by the material that was slowly evolving through the third section and forms as thematic material in mm. 364-67, anticipating the P material of the finale. As expected, P is also a part of this section, but now it loses the dominant detour that it had taken in the first section. It is here also followed by T and K materials, as in the first section.

The last section of the fourth movement also differs slightly from traditional convention. It begins with the theme related to the establishment of the secondary key, which has gained more tension here. It retains its tonal color, since it is presented in F major (mm. 458-520), and its major-minor relation to the P theme, which follows after a short T and is still in F minor (mm. 533-87). The coda gives closure to the symphony by bringing back the materials from not only the finale but also from the first movement. These reminiscences produce a strong effect of the late-Romantic aesthetic of organicism.
The Second Movement

The second movement combines two dances, ländler and waltz. The choice of the ländler as the dominant character for a dance movement stems from the Romantic interest in old Austrian rustic dance with its slower tempo. The ländler as a dance movement in a symphonic cycle is closer to the Classic minuet, due to its intermezzo character, than it is to the later Romantic dramatic scherzo. The intermezzo character of this movement is even more emphasized by the Trio and its waltz material in slower tempo.

The form of the movement is the usual three-part form, A-Trio-A¹, and it incorporates many references to the conventions of Classicism. One such element is periodic structure, which could be recognized as the governing organizational force of
the form. The key relation between the parts is unusual, since after the A major of part A, Mahler used F major as the starting key for the Trio. However, the waltz-like material and the light, chamber orchestration at the beginning of the Trio require a subdominant tonal quality, which F major can satisfy because it is the flat submediant of A major.

The first part, A, consists of three sections, \( a \ b \ a^1 \), in which the middle section combines previous material with a new idea. The microstructure of \( a \) is an enlarged period (mm. 1-43). The first phrase of the period has eight measures of introduction, followed by the core of the phrase of nine measures, which is extended after a cadence, in measure 18, by five measures. In addition to the motivic material of the previous phrase, the next phrase of the period includes a new motive derived from the already familiar one, which later in the movement is treated as important material (see Example 3a and 3b). Section \( a \) has a repetition sign that is rooted in the Classic tradition. It modulates to the dominant major at the end, however, a move that cannot often be found in eighteenth-century works.

Example 3a. Mahler, Symphony no. 1, mvt. 2, mm. 1-22.
Example 3a, continued.

Example 3b. Mahler, Symphony no. 1, mvt. 2, new motive, mm. 32-37.
The next section, b (mm. 44-116), has a fragmentary structure. It is mostly based on the material of a, but it introduces two new ideas, one in mm. 54-57 and the other in mm. 68-91. This section is also tonally less stable than the a section, as would be expected. The following a\textsuperscript{1} section is just slightly altered, and it has an additional dramatic ending with \textit{accelerando} repeated ascending figures. This treatment of thematic material and an authentic tonal cadence creates a strong boundary between these formal parts.

Part A consists of cheerful dance melodies played by a reduced orchestra, usually in blocks of strings or wind instruments. The homophonic texture is simple, with the accompaniment taking the role of a pedal. The harmonic language is simple diatonic, fully contributing to the Classic impression of the dance movement.

As expected, the Trio has a loose form compared to part A. Its first section, c, has a periodic structure (mm. 175-218), with a longer opening phrase that consists of constant additions of new motives, all derived from one another. The following phrase varies the materials, gaining more dramatic weight compared to the previous phrase.

The rest of the Trio has a weaker structural organization. It brings in new expressive material (mm. 219-28) that interlocks with that from section a (mm. 237-50). The last part of this section (mm. 265-80) serves as the last reprise of c, but in the “wrong” key. Despite that, this “false reprise” provides the effect of a rounded form. The Trio also has a less stable tonal scheme compared with part A; however, changes in the keys here correlate with the blocks of material that possess lessened dramatic energy, as would be expected in conventional dance movement.

The third part of the form, A\textsuperscript{1}, is abbreviated. It includes only the a section, enriched by passages that press forward to culminate at the end with a big crescendo of all the music elements. A shortening of the third part is common for works from the Classical period, although its dramatization is more characteristic for early Romantic pieces.

\textbf{The Third Movement}

The third movement reflects a tradition transformed in a subtle way. Its three-part form is easily recognized at the global level, but the inner structure and relations of the thematic materials are designed in such a way as to evade traditional expectations. The global scheme is A (mm. 1-81), B (mm. 82-112), and A\textsuperscript{1} (mm. 113-68).

The movement begins with a canonic section a (mm. 1-38) based on a transformed popular children’s melody, “Bruder Martin,” in a low register and in a minor key, combined with the motive of the fourth as a pedal layer. This is a surprising synthesis of the children’s song and the idea of a funeral march, presumably to be understood as intended for a fallen hero, a character of the symphony.

In conformity with the usual performance of the melody as a children’s round, this ominous variant is exposed in canon by different instrumental colors. After a muted double bass begins to play the melody in the minor key, other instruments enter.
canonically in their low registers, beginning at an interval of six measures, but reducing to four and two measures (see Example 4).

Example 4. Mahler, Symphony no. 1, mvt. 3, mm. 1-23.

This accelerated entry of instruments, together with the gradual increase in the number of instruments participating in the canon, leads to a need for an increase in dynamics. However, a footnote at the beginning of the movement, “pianissimo ohne crescendo” (see Example 4), restrains the crescendo. After four instruments have entered, an oboe enters with an angular counter-melody characterized by staccato notes and leaps of
fourths, creating a dual character within section a. The oboe melody enters two times above the dark canon (mm. 19-23 and 28-33) foreshadowing a future conflict.

The following section, b, introduces two contrasting thematic ideas that are repeated in variant versions: b (mm. 39-44), c (mm. 45-49), b¹ (mm. 50-56), c² (56-61). They contrast to the “Bruder Martin” theme in character and instrumentation, but they also differ among themselves, which is underlined by tonal difference between G minor and A major. The first of the themes, b, has a dance character, and the second, c, is noisy and wild in contrast with the ordered canon. This is an affective leap from a funeral march to popular dance music with the strategy of juxtaposing “high” elite and “low” proletarian music that further underlines the contrast. Despite the origin of the melodic material of the procession, it is experienced as “high art” music with its “learned” style of imitative counterpoint, which is a paradox in itself. Experience of “Bruder Martin” melody as “high art” music is especially strong when contrasted by “vulgar” carnivalesque, which then defines itself as “low” music.

These materials can be recognized as elements of one section within part A, even if we designate them separately as b c b¹ c¹. There are factors that force us to perceive them as connected in one whole. An argument for their connection can be found in the micro plan of this section; b (mm. 39-44) is an interrupted period, which is immediately followed by c (mm. 45-49). A latent cadence can be heard, but it appears that the linkage is made within the listener’s mind although it is not noted in the actual music score (see Example 5). These materials interrupt the funeral procession as a contrasting musical world, shock the listeners, and fade away, leaving the funeral march to resume. Because of that, we perceive them as a single formal unit.

Example 5. Mahler, Symphony no. 1, mvt. 3, mm. 39-50.
Example 5, continued.

There is also a connection between a and b materials. The boundary of the a section is transparent. While the tones of the fading theme are still droning, we hear a new motive, which at that moment does not illuminate the contrast. It is sentimental in character, and it begins with the tonic chord of D minor, the key of part A, which serves at this moment as the parallel minor of the dominant of G minor, the key of material b (m. 38).

As an element of the correlation among materials within part A, we can also discuss an extension of material c¹ that has a transitional function to the next appearance of a (mm. 71-82). We can recognize this extension as linkage of two thematic ideas, because elements of a¹ have been gradually involved. When a¹ actually begins, the separate canonic lines do not start with the melody from the beginning but as if their exposure had started in the previous extension of c¹. Several instrumental lines really have started before c concluded in m. 69, but again not from the beginning of the melody (see Example 6).
Example 6. Mahler, Symphony no. 1, mvt. 3, mm. 62-79. Note that Cl starts in m. 69, Ob in m. 70, Fag in m. 71, and that the accompaniment starts in Vc and Cb in 65.

This extension modulates to D minor, the key of a, and it brings back the pedal fourths in a low register; these are experienced as a preparation for a, although the pedal of fourths or fifths also formed part of b and c. The last a section is very short and sounds like the ending of the procession. A listener might have the impression that the funeral has been happening while this loud, carnivalesque music took over, and when the
carnival was past, what is left is only the sound of the funeral procession. This programmatic element can be taken as an argument to treat the few leftover measures of the theme (mm. 69-81) as a formal section, \(a_1\), even though it really does not satisfy the expectation of rounded form.

The next part, Trio (mm. 82-113), is in the subdominant, G major. The subdominant is not widely used as a key for the inner part of minor movements, but it is well chosen here for lyrical and optimistic material as a release from the tension, darkness, and grotesque collision of the previous part. It is not sectionalized but consists of one melodic thought rolling down constantly through different instrumental lines. As soon as the melody cadences in one line, another takes it over, as if it were continuing the thought. This is also a tonally stable part of the form. This lyricism creates the actual release that could be expected from the slow movement of the symphony, which is, in this case, introduced in the middle of the tension that governs the A and \(A_1\) sections.

The last part, \(A_1\) (mm. 113-68), is less conventional. It begins with E flat minor, instead of D minor. In this way the tension is elevated by one degree when compared with A. Tension is also established by involving more instrumental lines in the canonic melody, by introducing the voices only two measures apart, and by adding the oboe melody, now in clarinets, much sooner than before. In this part of the form Mahler also heightened the contrast of “high” and “low” music by direct collision of \(a\) and \(c\) material in m. 131. Another type of confrontation among the materials of A is the placement of \(c\) material above the canon in mm. 138-145, which sounds like double musical layers moving in parallel (see Example 7).

Example 7. Mahler, Symphony no. 1, mvt. 3, mm. 138-44.
At this point part A\textsuperscript{1} modulates to D minor, the primary key, in which the movement ends. Another peculiar element of non-traditional treatment in this movement is the introduction of the material of B in A\textsuperscript{1}. In this last part, in mm. 149-155, Mahler brought back material from mm. 91-93 in the Trio, giving the passage a character of reminiscence, which the fourth movement of the symphony establishes even more strikingly.

### Overview of Possible Meanings of the Uses of Convention in the First Symphony

This analysis of the form and treatment of the thematic materials in the First Symphony has provided an insight into one level of Mahler’s references to Classic and early Romantic conventions. This work itself is, of course, a post-Romantic programmatic symphony, which establishes its specific quality by reflecting stylistic elements from the past, a procedure that was often understood as “Romantic nostalgia” at the end of the era. The First Symphony is the closest of Mahler’s works to these conventions, which include formal treatments as old as Haydn’s mono-thematic sonata form and the simple ABA form of dance movements. However, those conventions are combined with post-Romantic aesthetics such as organicism or modes of discontinuity, irony, and the grotesque. To understand the nature and purpose of conventions used in this work, however, we have to go further by taking several directions. One of them is a musical connection with the song cycle *Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen* (Songs of a Wayfarer), several strophes from which Mahler used as thematic materials in the symphony. This recomposing of music materials was not unusual at the time.\textsuperscript{65} The song cycle is based on a tale of unrequited love, using dominant images of birds and flowers in contrast to grief. The Symphony’s first movement contains melodic material from the song “Ging heut Morgen über’s Feld” (“I went out this morning across the field”). The monothematic character of the first part of sonata form can be explained by the usage of the third and second strophes of the song, which are variationally related.\textsuperscript{66} The connection between the song cycle and the Symphony is obvious on the level of musical materials, although the evidence of the connection in content is complex and hardly conclusive.\textsuperscript{67}

Another perspective that can be considered in order to understand the meaning of the conventions used in the First Symphony is programmatic inspiration. The work

\textsuperscript{65} Berlioz’s early works, especially his *Messe solennelle*, provided musical ideas for several later works.

\textsuperscript{66} The remaining strophe is used in the third movement (mm. 82-112). It talks about a sleep of oblivion, in which the protagonist of the cycle forgets the pain of life.

was performed for the first time in Budapest at a Philharmonic concert on November 20, 1889. At that time Mahler had been appointed as Artistic Director of the Royal Hungarian Opera. The Symphony was designated as “A Symphonic Poem in Two Sections” without program notes. The only lead from Mahler was a hint of funeral march character in what was at the time the fourth movement. However, the audience was presented with the opposite of what they could expect as funeral march music. This was the first instance of Mahler’s shocking technique. After the strong negative reaction that the work received on this occasion, it was set aside until 1893. At that time Mahler made a revision of the work and performed it in Hamburg, where he worked at that time. He also provided an extensive program for this concert:

“Titan,” a Tone Poem in Symphonic Form

Part 1: *Aus den Tagen der Jugend, Blumen-, Frucht- und Dornstücke*  
(“From the Days of Youth,” Music of Flowers, Fruit, and Thorns)

I *Frühling und kein Ende* (“Spring and No End”) (Introduction and Allegro comodo) The introduction pictures the awakening of nature from a long winter’s sleep.

II “Blumine” (Andante)

III *Mit vollen Segeln* (“Under Full Sail”) (Scherzo)

Part 2: “Commedia humana”

IV *Gestrandet!* (“Stranded!”) *(Todtenmarch in Callots Manier)*. The following may serve as an explanation for it from *Des Jägers Leichenbegängnis* (*The Hunter’s Funeral Procession*), a parodistic picture that is well known to all Austrian children and is taken from an old book of children’s fairy tales. The animals of the forest escort the coffin of a deceased hunter to the gravesite. Rabbits carrying a banner follow a band of Bohemian musicians accompanied by music-making cats, toads, crows, and so on; stags, does, foxes, and other four-legged and feathered animals of the forest follow the procession in amusing poses. At that point the piece in some ways expresses an ironic, humorous mood and in other ways expresses an eerie, brooding mood, followed immediately by

V *Dall’ Inferno* (Allegro furioso) – as the sudden outburst of despair from a deeply wounded heart.

Constantin Floros pointed out that at this time Mahler was searching for an appropriate title for his symphony and *Titan* was the idea of one of his friends. He obviously accepted it, although according to Natalie Bauer-Lechner’s recollections

---


70 Floros, *Gustav Mahler*, 32.
Mahler was concerned about the possibility of an unintended association with Jean Paul’s *Titan*.  

The next performance of the First Symphony was in Weimar, in June 1894, conducted by Richard Strauss. For this occasion Mahler revised his program notes. The changes were applied to the introductory notes of the first movement: “the awakening of nature in the forest in the earliest morning.” The titles of the second, fourth, and fifth movements were changed to *Blumine-Capitel, Des Jägers Leichenbegängnis, ein Todtenmarch in Callots Manier*, and *Dall’ Inferno al Paradiso*. After this performance Mahler became convinced that it was necessary to withdraw the program titles and explanations. The final version of the First Symphony was premiered in Berlin on 16 March 1896 without program notes. Mahler discarded *Blumine* movement in this version, leaving the four-movement design as his final decision for this work.

Although the Symphony was performed for the first time without any explicit presentation of programmatic inspiration, I cannot conclude that it was really composed without one. In March 1896, in a letter to the critic Max Marchalik, Mahler revealed that verbal explanation of the program followed the composition of the work: “At the time my friends persuaded me to write some sort of programme notes to make the D major symphony easier to understand. So I worked out the title and these explanatory notes retrospectively.” However, Mahler himself explained that he had conceived a programmatic idea to present stages in life of a hero. In the same letter to Marchalik he also disclosed the source of the stimulus for the funeral march: “As regards the third movement (marcia funebre) it is certainly the case that I received the external stimulus for it from the well-known children’s picture” (“The Hunter’s Funeral Procession”). All of this shows that the creation of the Symphony relied on a programmatic idea, but that Mahler had a problem satisfactorily verbalizing the inner program explicitly to the audience.

Mahler’s programmatic inspiration obviously influenced the construction of the work. The influence is especially recognizable in specific characteristics and abnormalities of the forms in the third and fourth movements. In the second movement, Mahler’s choice of two dance types in their “old” styles can also be explained by his extra-musical idea that he shared with Bauer-Lechner: “the young lad still roaming around the world is much stronger, rougher, and more fit for life.” Mahler also explained why he excluded the program notes for the later performances and referred to Beethoven as a paradigm for his approach to the inner program:

> My reason for omitting them this time was not only that I thought them quite inadequate - in fact, not even accurate or relevant – but that I have experienced the way the audiences have been set on the wrong track by them.

---


72 Mahler, *Selected Letters*, 177.

Believe me, even Beethoven’s symphonies have their inner programmes, and closer acquaintance with such a work brings understanding of the development of feeling appropriate to the ideas. It will eventually be the same with my works.\footnote{Mahler, \textit{Selected Letters}, 177.}

In the case of the first movement, the questions of possible programmatic influence on the form cannot be definitively answered. The inspiration of nature in the early morning or in the spring could be connected with an evocation of “beginning.” Since Mahler constructed this movement as a monothematic sonata form, the oldest type of this formal model, we can assume that he deliberately made a connection between the formal construction and programmatic inspiration. The monothematism of the form can be also explained by the composer’s intention to keep the mood and musical flow from raising the contrasts usual for sonata form in Romanticism in order to express the idyllic picture of the awakening of nature. The repetition of the first part makes the movement more static, and this is enhanced by the prolongation of the introductory scene. The introduction might remind us of Bruckner’s slow openings in his sonata forms, but Mahler’s example is more a suspension of movement due to its length and inertness.
CHAPTER 4
THE FOURTH SYMPHONY

Analytical Approach

Another example of Mahler’s symphonic work that owes much to Classicism and early Romanticism is the Fourth Symphony. Mahler composed this work from 1899 to 1901, during his directorship of the Vienna Opera. This demanding engagement kept him from working actively on the Symphony. The first performance of the Fourth was not well received by the public and the press, possibly because it disappointed public expectation by not developing further the stylistic concept of Mahler’s two previous symphonies. This sudden return to the references of a classical past may have sounded “artificial and lacking in authenticity.”

Louis de La Grange calls the Fourth a “Classical symphony.” It is a four-movement symphony, with a surprising finale. The first three movements are traditional in form, character, and function, but they are followed by vocal-instrumental song as the last movement of the cycle. Although this final part of the Symphony does not establish the resolution through a dramatic finale, it does offer a clarification of the preceding movements and ties everything up. The whole symphony relies heavily on the finale’s narration. The explanation is offered on both programmatic and musical levels. Mahler did not verbalize his program idea for this work, but allowed the song-finale to provide an explanation. The Fourth Symphony was for Mahler a “certificate of immunity against total immersion in the aesthetic of the symphonic poem,” which was an important gain, since the First Symphony had showed Mahler’s uncertainty between the aesthetics of symphony and symphonic poem.

The first three movements of the Fourth Symphony are perfectly articulated and constructed sonata, scherzo, and variation forms. The first movement adheres closely to the traditional criteria of sonata form, although with strong traces of Mahler’s individual post-Romantic music language (see Structural diagram in Appendix B). The

La Grange, Gustav Mahler, 2: 755.
La Grange, Gustav Mahler, 2: 762.
Mitchell, “‘Swallowing the Programme’: Mahler’s Fourth Symphony,” 197.
sonata form begins with a short opening passage that plays a substantial role in the rest of the movement and the Symphony as whole. The tonal center of this material is not defined by any cadence. The material associated with the primary key, G major (mm. 4-31), brings strong references to Classic style (see Example 8). The main melody is mostly played by the first violins. The instrumental color of the strings dominates, with occasional harmonic enrichment and melodic answer by the wind instruments. The texture is mostly homophonic with characteristic harmonic accompaniment, the form is periodic, and the harmony is simple diatonic.

Example 8.  Mahler, Symphony no. 4, mvt. 1, mm. 1-10.
Example 8, continued.

The transition material (mm. 32-37) modulates to the dominant major, as expected. The material associated with the secondary key (mm. 38-57) brings the expected lyrical tone to the form; however, it is “an instrumental song far too self-sufficient for a sonata as such”\(^78\) (see Example 9). It is constructed in two periods that create a double period, because they contain related materials; the second period creates more tension, bringing a final conclusion to the double period. Like P, it also has a predominantly string color. If we wanted to find an example of what Donald Mitchell defines as “a conscious reference to past practice, past styles even,”\(^79\) we could easily point to these thematic materials.

The following material (mm. 58-71) can be defined as closing; however, it serves as a second transition, leading to the false repetition in m. 72. At the repetition of O and the beginning of P in the primary key the listener might well believe that Mahler was again using a repetition of the first part of the sonata form, as in the First Symphony. The developmental variant of P material that follows, with its freely organized structure, however, reveals that this is instead a deception on the composer’s part. Another unusual element of the first part of the sonata form is its closing in the primary key. The false repetition at the end of the first part also provides the impression of sonata-rondo form.

\(^78\) Adorno, *Mahler*, 95.

\(^79\) Mitchell, “‘Swallowing the Programme’: Mahler’s Fourth Symphony,” 202.
Example 9. Mahler, Symphony no. 4, mvt. 1, mm. 37-49.

The third section brings an intense motivic development and harmonic richness beyond the tradition of the Classic symphony. It begins with O in the same “uncertain” key (another rondo element) and soon establishes E minor, in which it also ends. E minor retroactively becomes significant as a “second” key of the symphony, since the work finishes in that key. As we already expect from Mahler, the fourth section of the movement establishes variants of the thematic materials, but in their expected order and in the primary key, which gives a sense of a traditional recapitulation.

This is one of the shortest among Mahler’s first movements. The economy of Mahler’s language is also a type of reference to Classic style and form. Its symmetry and proportion shows the early Romantic balance of a three-part sonata form (part I – 101 measures, and part II – 137 [sec. 3] + 110 [sec. 4] measures). This quite traditional sonata form nevertheless sounds somehow like a school exercise. The listener can feel
the composer standing outside of it. Adorno hears it as “composed within quotation marks” and understands its message as “once upon a time there was a sonata.”

The second movement is a Scherzo/ländler. It does not show internal contrast, as do the Scherzos of the two previous symphonies, because of the lower dramatic sphere of the first and last movements, its virtual intermezzo character, and a specifically non-intermezzo slow third movement. The form is A Trio A\(^1\) Trio\(^1\) A\(^2\), which can be treated either as a prolonged three-part form enriched with variant technique that provides an additional Trio and the final main section or as a rondo (ABABA). An element of constant change or development is present not only in the additional sections but in every step of this movement. It begins with a four-measure opening idea that is also used later as a transition between materials and as a reminder of the predominantly “dark” color. The micro structure does not seem to be intended to create simple structures such as phrases, except in the in material (mm. 7-33), where it is, however, more a chain of very small units (five of them).

A version of the Fourth Symphony, performed in Amsterdam in 1904, had an added title for the second movement, “Todtentanz,” which explains the grotesque and eerie quality of the in materials. This is certainly a Romantic type of Scherzo. It is contrasted by slow ländler Trio sections, whose lyrical character brings something of the quality of a slow movement. The tonal relationships among the sections are traditional. The large-scale key structure of the movement is alteration of c-minor/ C-major in the A sections with F-major in the B sections.

Beside all the elements that connect this movement to the Scherzo tradition, it also contains traces of the aesthetics of late Romanticism. This “dance of death” is reserved and quiet. The harmony is mostly simple and tonal; however, it also surprises with the harshness of certain harmonic combinations, such as augmented triads (mm. 3, 30, 43), unstable tonal centers in A\(^2\) (280-313), or bitonality (mm. 332-35). The solo violin that presents the Scherzo’s main material is tuned one tone higher in order to sound rough.

The third movement is in the form of variations on two contrasting themes, with a global form A B A\(^1\) B\(^1\) A\(^2\). The type of variations is based less on the character variation approach than ornamental variation treatment, which has a strong background in Classicism. Double variations had been used as a form for slow movements in the Classic period, as in Haydn’s Symphony no. 70 in D major (1779). Beethoven also used this form in his Fifth and Ninth Symphonies. Mahler’s treatment of the double variation form can be compared with Haydn’s in two elements. Haydn often made a strong contrast between two themes by assigning major to the one theme, while the other is in minor. In addition, he underlined their contrast by means of texture, creating one theme
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80 Adorno, Mahler, 96.

81 Floros, Gustav Mahler, 122.

82 According the recollections of Natalie Bauer-Lechner, Mahler was not satisfied by the violin sound after the reading rehearsal, because “the solo violin passage still did not sound sharp enough for him, even though the instrument had been tuned a step higher.” Bauer-Lechner, Recollections, 178.
in polyphonic texture and another one in strictly homophonic style. Mahler’s two variations have corresponding characteristics. The first theme is in G major and employs stronger polyphonic language, while the second theme is in E minor and is characterized by homophonic texture, although the contrast in texture between Mahler’s themes is considerably weaker than Haydn’s.

There are several unusual elements of this movement in Mahler’s Fourth Symphony. One is the number of variations of the B theme. There are only three variations, one included in the section B together with the first appearance of the theme, and two additional variants in section B[^1]. Another peculiar feature is the character of the first theme, which brings an unusual passacaglia feeling with its ostinato bass motive, later used as an additional element for the variation technique.

The first theme (mm. 1-16) is a period based on two eight-bar phrases, which recalls the periodic structures in Classicism (see Example 10).

Example 10. Mahler, Symphony no. 4, mvt. 3, mm. 1-20.

The periodic design is maintained in the first two variations, which are followed by a transpositional section. The second theme is less structurally defined. It is much slower than the first theme and mournful, which brings contrast to the movement. After only one variation of the second theme and transitional material, another section of three
variations on the first theme follows. They do not provide substantial changes of the theme, but they move further and further away, growing logically one from another. The furthest variants of the theme are developed in A\textsuperscript{2}, where the composer even surprises the listener by a sudden change of tempo from Adagio to Andante (in m. 222), and then to Allegretto subito (in m. 238). The theme here develops into a dance and is enriched by a harmonic development to surprising modulations.

This slow movement is in the main key of the symphony, which is unconventional in the Classic symphony design. The key of the inner sections (second theme) is, not unusually, the relative minor. Despite this traditional treatment, the movement does not end in the expected way, with an authentic cadence; instead, it concludes on a dominant chord, leading directly to the vocal-instrumental finale.

Another non-traditional element that this movement contributes to the symphonic cycle of the Fourth Symphony is the elimination of the intermezzo character in the slow movement. The last section, which brings the final variations of the first theme and Coda, is experienced as an intensification not expected from the slow movement, especially when it comes after two non-dramatic movements.

The first three movements of the Fourth Symphony have a chamber sound compared with the type of orchestration of the previous symphonies. Although the strings are carriers of the important thematic materials in the first movement, there is a significant amount of scoring with wind instruments predominating. This orientation can be understood as an element of orchestration developed in Romanticism, and also as looking back to Haydn’s emancipated approach to the wind section in the orchestra.

Possible Meanings of the Conventions in the Fourth Symphony

The Fourth Symphony provoked many discussions of Mahler’s new classicality. They all reveal important aspects of this aesthetics and should be reviewed. Louis de La Grange called it “neo-classicism avant la lettre,” but he explained that it is not “nostalgic for the past nor willful parody, such as some neo-classical composers were to practice later in the twentieth century.”\textsuperscript{83} He understood the Fourth Symphony as a bold, avant-garde work in the context of its time and as an important step forward in Mahler’s development as a composer, because it reveals a stricter, more disciplined style, a tighter polyphonic web, a new economy of means, a more concentrated musical language, an unprecedented complexity of expression. In the “alleged ‘return to Haydn’, to music’s ‘age of innocence’, i.e., the golden age of Viennese classicism, Mahler borrows classical ‘clichés’ from traditional figures, but enriches and transforms them endlessly, gives them an harmonic context. In fact, he gives this inherited material the same freedom and the same artistic refinements as he gives to the folk idiom of the earlier Wunderhorn-Lieder.”\textsuperscript{84}

\textsuperscript{83} La Grange, Gustav Mahler, 2: 771.

\textsuperscript{84} La Grange, Gustav Mahler, 2: 771.
Deryck Cook observed that Mahler’s real intention in this “neo-rococo” symphony was not to archaize. Although actual materials of the work recall the past, Cook heard them as “developed in an entirely late romantic way in the interest of expressing a personal vision.”

Theodor Adorno identifies the Fourth as “the extreme example of the character symphony,” whose image-world is that of childhood. Adorno regarded the Fourth Symphony as a source of simplification in all levels of this work. Donald Mitchell does not agree with Adorno. He questions the simplicity that is attributed to childhood and suggests that it is instead “a remarkable anticipation of an aesthetic that in the history of music in the twentieth century was eventually to be known as Neo-Classicism.” We can, however, assume that Mahler’s vision of “childhood innocence” could be translated into a traditional symphonic concept. The contrasting elements of this work come from Mahler’s dark vision of childhood innocence and mortal vulnerability.

The Fourth Symphony shows also that historical models cannot be copied in another era without consequences. The Symphony is “saying to us in fact that there can not be a return to the ‘simplicities’ of the past at a level, formal, thematic or tonal, while at the same time saluting the certainties, the symmetries, the proportions – though none of these was invariably so – of Classicism.” Mahler’s treatment of the past is simultaneously mixed with invention. “Typical of Mahler that his gesture to the past should simultaneously incorporate patent and elaborate innovations that, so to speak, turn the past on its head, in order to make the very point that at this critical juncture in the history of the symphony, innovations were obligatory if the form – and its future – were to remain alive and kicking. In the first movement of the Fourth, then, Mahler was in a sense bidding farewell to the ideals of Classicism, rather than reasserting them as models that might service the future of the form.” The Fourth Symphony can also be seen as developing “a Biedermeier utopia in music, where folk fantasy proclaims the victory of the pleasure principle and the affirmation of the gratified life in a kind of infantile regression.”

Another relation of the Fourth Symphony with the early Romantic symphonic tradition is its similarity with Beethoven’s Ninth. Although it represents Mahler’s step away from the monumental Romantic symphony, the Fourth has also three instrumental movements and a vocal finale. Both Beethoven’s and Mahler’s first movements begin with harmonic uncertainty, created by open fifths, which becomes important material later in the movement. The ambiguity of Beethoven’s opening receives its clarity within the opening material, while in Mahler’s work the clarification comes with the
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89 Mitchell, ”’Swallowing the Programme’: Mahler’s Fourth Symphony,” 204.
introduction of new material. The third movement of each symphony is in the form of double variations with contrasting themes, where the key of the second theme is related to the Finale. In addition, both Finales bring back materials from the previous movements. Mark Evan Bonds sees these parallels as Mahler’s intentional misreading of Beethoven’s model in order to overcome its influence by a direct confrontation.\textsuperscript{91} One of his arguments is that in his Fourth Symphony Mahler was denying the idea of grand victory in the Finale. Its mixture of genres, a vocal song and symphony of chamber music dimensions, also separates it from the Romantic tradition.

\textsuperscript{91} Bonds, \textit{After Beethoven}, 177.
CHAPTER 5
THE OTHER EXAMPLES OF MAHLER’S CLASSICALITY

The Second Symphony – movement II

We can observe a very interesting combination of symphonic conventions and their transformations in the second movement of the Second Symphony. This movement creates a strong contrast to the adjacent movements with its simplicity and relaxed, optimistic mood. Mahler suggested a longer pause after a performance of the first movement “because the second movement does not have the effect of a contrast, but simply of a discrepancy after the first.” He explained the nature of this difference: “The andante was composed as a kind of intermezzo (as the echo of long past days in the life of the man borne to his grave in the first movement – ‘when the sun still smiled on him’).”

The form is A B A₁ B₁ A₂ Coda (see Structural diagram in Appendix C). The first section (mm. 1-38) is a period including a very classical, eight-measure phrase followed by an extended variant. It consists of idyllic ländler material presented by strings only in homophonic texture (see Example 11). Although the wind instruments are introduced with other materials in this movement, a general reduction of the instrumental forces creates a connection to the orchestral color of classical dance movements. The second section, B (mm. 39-85), differs by its use of a minor key, imitative texture, and irregular phrasing. It consists of two ideas; one introduced by strings, staccato and ppp, and another, song-like, played by the woodwinds espressivo.

All the other sections are variants of these two. The third section, A₁ (mm. 86-132), resembles the form and the content of the main material, which is combined with a new lyrical melody in the violoncello from m. 93. This new melody does not sound, however, like a constitutive element of the material but as completely independent in the multi-layered structure (see Example 12).

---

92 Mahler, Selected Letters, 269.
93 Mahler, Selected Letters, 269.
Example 11. Mahler, Symphony no. 2, mvt. 2, mm. 1-16.

Example 12. Mahler, Symphony no. 2, mvt. 2, mm. 90-100.

The following B\textsuperscript{1} section (mm. 133-209) is a further step in the material’s transformation, forming the climax of the movement, which ends with the last variant of A (mm. 210-99). This last A brings back a phrase structure that is doubled here. The
harmonic language is tonal and simple. The excerpt from A is shown in Example 11 and it illustrates the degree of simplicity.

Mahler’s programmatic inspiration of the nostalgic echo of long past days found its musical fulfillment in the traditional dance movement. The contrast to the drama reflected by the post-Romantic symphonic language of the surrounding movements was created by a “classical” dance. In the creation of this intermezzo Mahler used all the possible tools of his new classicality: form, harmony, texture, and instrumentation.

The Sixth Symphony – movement I

Although the Sixth Symphony seems to represent Mahler’s taking a step back to the traditional four-movement symphony, it is “a work that fully belongs to the twentieth century.” Its concept is original and complex. Mahler called this work a “Tragic” Symphony. Its romantic concept of the hero’s struggle against his fate is rooted in Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony. This work, however, has a tragic outcome, like Brahms’s Fourth and Tchaikovsky’s Pathétique Symphonies. Mahler’s Sixth differs from these works with its concept of a “symphonic hero” and his struggle. There is not an individual destiny, nor even an individual as a metaphor, but instead openly collective suffering. This idea could have derived from the notion of the tragic Weltschmerz that was a part of the aesthetic of the day.

The status of Mahler’s classicality can be easily observed through the example of some aspects of the first movement. It is a sonata form with an interesting balance between traditional elements and those that deform its convention. Clarity and conciseness are not dominant principles, but they are substantial elements in that balance. The movement begins with opening material that plays an important role in both parts of the form (mm. 1-5). The P material is a thematic complex that eludes any structural definition (mm. 6-60). The material associated with a transition to the secondary key does not function as transition (mm. 61-76), but rather it is static and appears to be an entity unto itself. Since it does not tonally prepare S, the structure and progression of the whole part is changed. T is also structured in a surprising way, created as a period of two eight-measure phrases. It has a half cadence, however, and ends on the dominant of the primary key, D minor (see Example 13). The beginning of S on an F major chord produces an emphatic effect of surprise, despite the fact that this key is conventionally expected. S is not consistently exposed but is interrupted by P material.

---

In this sonata form Mahler used Classical repetition signs for the first part. In this way he created a better balance between the parts, since part I is very short, compared with part II, and even with only section 3 of the form (Part I – 129 mm., Part II – 357 mm.). It was already observed that Mahler intentionally created short expositions in the sonata forms that refer to the tradition. Since in this work the whole second part is driven by developmental forces, this sonata form needed a
complementary, longer, expositional basis. In the fourth section the recapitulation of
the main materials does not bring back stability but continues the same expansive
power of the development. A listener cannot even be sure when the fourth section of
the sonata begins, because of its many modulations, the “wrong tonalities” in which the
themes appear, their deformed occurrence, or their fleeting reappearance. The Coda
continues to carry that effect, being as long, almost, as the whole first part.

The harmonic language of the whole symphony is late Romantic, and the
orchestration fully employs the whole orchestra. Adorno comments that Mahler “used
the traditional sonata form to discipline himself. In straining to meet its demands, he
gained mastery of open-work thematic procedure, the fine-spun texture. The craft of the
mature works helped to spiritualize them.”95 It is possible that Mahler found a degree of
stability in the convention at this time. His mature language, however, could no longer
be subdued by convention but only directed by it, which resulted in late Romantic
music presented in a structural deformation of the conventional form.

The Seventh Symphony – movement II

The Seventh Symphony is saturated with contradictions between tradition and
modernity. The first movement especially reflects a variety of techniques often
understood as reflections of modern aesthetics. After such a movement, the second is
experienced as the composer’s return to the tradition of the Romantic symphony,
although conventions are here a cover for the same modernistic language that preceded
the second movement. In that way Mahler maintained aesthetic consistency through the
entire symphony.

Nachtmusiken 1, the second movement, is often recognized as a night patrol
with a narrative quality. The one and only remark about its meaning comes from Alma
Mahler: “As he wrote the serenade he was beset by Eichendorff-ish visions –
murmuring springs and German romanticism.”96 Mahler used Romantic topos but
worked with them by using the montage technique. The Night-time characterized by
ambivalence was one of the topos of German literary Romanticism. This theme was
explored by Eichendorff, one of Mahler’s favorite authors. We can easily compare his
fairy tale Die Zauberei im Herbste with Mahler’s opening material of this movement:

Then, suddenly I heard several forest horns which some distance away
from the mountains seemed to answer each other. Several voices
accompanied them even in song. Never before had music filled
me with such wondrous longing as these tones did and still today
I remember several verses of the song as the wind carried them across
to me between the sounds of the forest horns:

95 Adorno, Mahler, 96.
96 Alma Mahler, Gustav Mahler, 89.
Beyond streaks of gold and red birds migrate in the sky above,
Wandering lost, thoughts vanish, ah they find no secure resting place,
And the lament of horns penetrates deep into your heart. 97

The second movement is constructed as a rondo with three themes, ABACABA, which can also be experienced as a march with two trios (see Structural Diagram in Appendix E). Although it looks simple, it goes beyond the traditional structure of early Romanticism. The movement’s opening material begins with the call-and-response material in horns (mm. 1-9), which is combined in the following measures with bird-call material. Mahler gradually thickens the texture from measure 19, making that culminate and disintegrate in mm. 28-29. This calm beginning followed by increasing tension reflects a dichotomy in the concept of night, which includes its redemptive and sinister stages.

The horn calls and bird songs are usually associated with nature; however, we can also consider an urban environment as the setting for this narrative. On several occasions, Mahler suggested a connection between his second movement and Rembrandt’s painting “Night Watch.” 98 This connection enables us to recognize Mahler’s setting as urban, since Rembrandt’s night march parade is placed in an Amsterdam street. We can also compare Mahler’s extensive use of the contrast between C minor and C major and the sharp contrast of light and darkness of the painting.

The main section of the form, A, introduces the March material a (mm. 30-47); the following examples show the composer’s intention to deform the conventions of the Classic rondo. The main melodic line and its counterpoint are played in piano or pianissimo dynamics, as expected for a night march; however, they are interrupted by a march rhythm in the second violin played forte (see Example 14). This march rhythm, played col legno the first time, is not spread through the movement. It gives the flavor of the march in four short occurrences, which do not sound as an integral part of the music, but as insertions of a separate musical experience. The ambivalence of the march is also expressed by major/minor shifts, which might represent the conflicts between dream and reality.

The next material, b (mm. 48-61), establishes the dark, mysterious appearance of night, which is followed by a\textsuperscript{1} (mm. 62-82). The contrapuntal texture at the beginning of a\textsuperscript{1} grows into a polyphony of materials not quite related to each other (see Example 15). An additional idea is derived from the birdcall motif from the introduction.


98 Mahler suggested this correlation to the conductor Willem Mengelberg during his visit to the Netherlands in October 1909, as mentioned in La Grange, Gustav Mahler, 3: 852. Mahler also mentioned the painting to his friend Alphons Diepenbrock after the first performance of the Seventh Symphony in the Hague, as quoted in Gordon, Mahler’s Seventh Symphony, Modernism, and the Crisis of Austrian Liberalism, 127.
Example 14. Mahler, Symphony no. 7, mvt. 2, mm. 30-45.

The first Trio, or B part of the rondo, is lyrical, but it maintains the character of a march. This treatment of the Trio is part of the convention of this genre. It is not, however, only a march. At its beginning the lyrical melody has a waltz accompaniment in the first phrase of c (mm. 83-95) (see Example 16), which is replaced by a march character in the second phrase (mm. 95-105).

The following material, d (mm. 106-21), also receives unusual treatment. It has surprisingly simple structure, comprising four four-measure phrases, and interesting instrumentation in the second phrase, including wind instruments accompanied by timpani and triangle (mm. 110-3). This suggests the childish imagination of a soldier. The opening material is used several more times in the movement (mm. 122-26, 179-88, 318-43), underlining the effect of the rondo repetitions. It is sometimes combined with elements of the march material, as in measures 62, 141, and 245. Section C is also interrupted by the appearance of O (mm. 179-88). This variety of materials and the qualities of a night march, used until the end of section C, give the effect of a linear collage. The following section, A², includes an effect of synchronous collage, as well. It brings the various elements together by a technique of montage. The elements of collage are not, however, only already exposed materials, but also all varieties of night march presented at once. Unexpected harmonic shifts underline this unsettling quality. Another example of the movement’s montage is the return of the B section (mm. 262-93), where a waltz rhythm and military march sound simultaneously, creating an effect of multiple pieces (see Example 17).

This movement is different from the types of classicality represented in the examples from the previous works. Its model is not the Classic or early Romantic symphonic tradition. At the beginning of the twentieth century, this movement brought back the popular topic of Romantic poetry. It also revived the long-forgotten topos of march music. The form is that of a rondo with the traditional key structure: A is always in C minor/major, B occurs both times in A flat major, and C is in C minor. Despite that, the ambiguity of harmonic language and lack of a dominant sphere, as well as the montage effects of different topoi and materials, keep this movement within the stylistic range of the Seventh’s outer movements.
Mahler’s polyphony in the Eighth Symphony

The Eighth Symphony is a unique work in Mahler’s opus and indeed in all opera of Romanticism. It combines two very different texts: the medieval Catholic hymn *Veni Creator* in the first part, and a section of Goethe’s *Faust* in the second part of the Symphony. It is a synthesis of different forms: symphony, cantata, oratorio,
motet, and lied. Its first part also integrates a sonata form with strict counterpoint and fugue.

In this work Mahler abandoned the progressive characteristics of his compositional style in favor of new elements. The whole work is mainly centered in E-flat major, and the harmonic language is strongly tonal, but it is often enriched by dissonant chords. The modulatory plane is stable, with E-flat major recurring throughout the whole work. Several Renaissance and Baroque characteristics can be observed in the first part of the work. Mahler used a double mixed chorus with alternating segments of music, referring to the tradition of Venetian antiphonal music, popular in Austria in the Baroque. The first example of such an antiphonal effect is at the very beginning of the work in mm. 8-21 (see Example 18). Stricter polyphony, specifically the fugue in the middle of the first part, provides another, stronger connection with the past. La Grange would rather connect Mahler’s polyphonic technique with the Flemish polyphonists than with Bach. Another characteristic that can be observed as a reflection of the past, specifically Baroque, is related to the mutual connection of all the themes, which are derived from several rhythmic and melodic cells.

Example 18. Mahler, Symphony no. 8, part 1, mm. 8-17.
The Eighth Symphony does not contain explicit examples of direct reflection of the text’s meaning in the music. Such word-painting is not characteristic of other late-Romantic composers as well. The only example is the “Ewigkeit” rising motive in mm. 366-68 on the text “Accende lumen” (Kindle a light). Wagner also used this “eternity” motive in Siegfried (act III, scene 3, Brünnhilde). Its main melodic trait is rising motion (see Example 19). Mahler’s usage of this motive is mostly connected with the meaning of the theme as a symbol for “resurrection” or “heavenly life,” as La Grange showed. He also pointed out, however, that a rising motive used to symbolize transcendence is traditional.

Example 19a. Wagner, Siegfried, act II, scene 3, Brünnhilde.


100 La Grange, “Music about Music in Mahler,” 143-44.
Example 19b. Mahler, Symphony no. 8, part I, mm. 366-69.

An exceptionally large performance apparatus is called for here, with the addition of a double mixed chorus, boys’ chorus, and vocal soloists to Mahler’s standard orchestration. This ensemble is further enriched by the inclusion of the organ. The organ provides a sustaining tone color and offers a tool for the Mahlerian “mode of attack,” even though it is mostly used in the background. The use of the organ gives a quality of the tradition of sacred music to this symphonic part. The chorus in the Symphony is not only an addition to the orchestral apparatus but also a vital role in the exposition and development of the themes.

The polyphonic compositional technique in the first part and the fugue that takes place in the third section of the sonata form continue the path of strict counterpoint that Mozart and Beethoven used in their works. In Mahler’s case, however, they are no longer under the umbrella of the old, “learned” style. Mahler had already developed his own polyphonic style, applied in his works subsequent to the Fourth. In addition to its pervasive use of linear writing, the finale of the Fifth Symphony has five fugal sections. In the Eighth, the whole first part is dominated by the polyphonic technique. The culmination comes in the double fugue at the end of the developmental section of the sonata form, which combines two main subjects of the theme associated with the primary key in sonata form (see Example 20). This is a double fugue of type 1, in which both themes are presented at the same time (see Example 21).

The first theme of the fugue in Choir 1 has a real answer in the dominant (mm. 320-25), while the second theme in Choir 2 has a tonal answer, also in the dominant (mm. 320-25). The following exposition of the themes again in the tonic makes the form a three-part fugue. It is not, however, a complete fugue by orthodox Baroque convention. It has a developmental section where both themes appear in other keys, in augmentation and inversion; however, after one occurrence of the themes in the primary key, E-flat major (mm. 349-52), signaling the reprise of the fugue, it modulates

---

to E major (m. 355), A-flat major (m. 360), and back to E major (m. 366), the key of the last section of the sonata’s development.

Example 20a. Mahler, Symphony no. 8, part 1, mm. 5-10.

Example 20b. Mahler, Symphony no. 8, part 1, mm. 18-28.
Example 20b, continued.

Example 21. Mahler, Symphony no. 8, part 1, mm. 314-19.

The fugue can be interpreted without the reprise or as having a recapitulation that corresponds to the fourth section of the sonata form;\(^{103}\) in either case, however, it would

\(^{103}\) La Grange interprets the fugue as lasting only until the recapitulation of the sonata form (mm. 312-412) in *Gustav Mahler*, 3: 914; John Williamson identifies the recapitulation of the sonata form as the reprise of the fugue in “Mahler and Veni Creator Spiritus,” 33.
constitute an even greater deformation of the regular fugal form. The convention here is, in any case, transformed by the nature of the form into which it was inserted, similar to other examples of fugues in Classicism and Romanticism. Although there are many instances of fugal elements in symphonies since Haydn, there are not many examples of fugues as parts of symphonic movements.\textsuperscript{104} In the Eighth Symphony, Mahler’s polyphonic technique incorporates more Baroque polyphony than did the finales of the Fifth and Seventh.

Scholars have interpreted Mahler’s “Veni Creator” in various ways,\textsuperscript{105} whose range points out the complexity of the meaning that this combination of Mahler’s music and the liturgical hymn affirms. At the same time, its range suggests the complexity of the meaning of its connection with Goethe’s \textit{Faust}.

The hymn “Veni Creator” is the Office Hymn for Second Vespers of Pentecost; however, Mahler’s treatment of the hymn text is quite different from any theologically orthodox liturgical interpretation. Mahler’s musical response is a march character, which confers a humanistic meaning on the religious text. The hymn “becomes, in Mahler’s thunderous military-march setting, a great confident shout by humanity to the skies for the creative vision that the modern world so desperately needs.”\textsuperscript{106} This work was often compared with Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony, which also has a humanistic message. Although Beethoven’s message was created during the optimistic, “godless,” humanistic period, Mahler’s voice came from his own time in human history, which can be contrasted with Beethoven’s as a “disillusioned humanistic period.” In the Eighth Symphony, Mahler combined march character and sonata form, which belonged to the period of a humanistic change, with religious text, polyphonic language, and fugue. He humanized religion and spiritualized humanism. Cooke explains that “the God the symphony addresses is not the static God ‘out there’, but the dynamic God ‘in here’ – in man’s inner being: but it addresses this God, not as man’s projection of his own ideal self – the purely human God of Feuerbach – but as the immaterial and intangible Creator Spirit which inspires and impels man’s questing aspiration.”\textsuperscript{107} After the doubts and anxieties that had dominated Mahler’s earlier works, this faith in eternal values and the transcendental resulted in a remarkably optimistic and objective work.

\textsuperscript{104} Among them are the finales of Mozart’s \textit{Jupiter} Symphony, Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony, and Bruckner’s Fifth Symphony.

\textsuperscript{105} Surveyed in La Grange, \textit{Gustav Mahler}, 3: 927-29.

\textsuperscript{106} Cooke, \textit{Gustav Mahler}, 92.

CHAPTER 6
MUSIC ABOUT MUSIC IN MAHLER’S SYMPHONIES

The practice of musical borrowing, which became a characteristic of Mahler’s compositional style, was widely and differently used throughout various epochs. It was established in the Middle Ages and spread through the Renaissance and Baroque, but in Classicism musical borrowing declined, with exceptions such as Mozart’s transcriptions of Bach’s music. The early nineteenth century also resisted explicit borrowing for the most part, though there were exceptions to this general rule, such as Beethoven’s ‘Razumovsky’ Quartets with Russian tunes and Schubert’s self-quotations. As Jim Samson demonstrates, the nature of borrowings changed later in the nineteenth century. The imperative of originality influenced its shape. The forms of borrowing were transcription, arrangement, paraphrase, fantasy, and variations. Transcriptions were the most common form of usage of pre-existing models. Liszt’s transcriptions show the conflict between fidelity to the model and the Romantic need to reshape and comment, as well as all other forms of intervention. Recomposition was also common in the nineteenth century. This included a recomposition of a style, as in Edvard Grieg’s neo-Baroque suite From Holberg’s Time, composed in 1884, or Max Reger’s Suite im alten Stil, from 1916. Another example of similar stylistic modeling is Tchaikovsky’s Mozartiana from 1890. La Grange gives an example of imitation of the “scholarly style attributed to the eponymous Masters” in Wagner’s Die Meistersinger. Self-quotations, also, were not strange to the late Romantics. The last example, which includes a quotation from Tristan, is one among many, as is Richard Strauss’s Ariadne auf Naxos. Inspiration by folk melodies in Romanticism opened a new space for quotations or adaptations of pre-existing materials.

Mahler’s borrowings and reminiscences were highly criticized by music critics in Austria, because they were understood as contrary to the unique and the personal, values that were accepted as ideals for the artwork. For this reason Mahler was accused of plagiarism. As Adorno explains, this misunderstanding occurred because

---

“unmistakable and individual though his manner is, he has absolutely nothing in common with the idea of originality as this has been formulated ever since the early Romantics, if not earlier.”

Because he himself used pre-composed material so openly, Mahler’s accusations of other composers’ reminiscences can be surprising. During the preparation of Alexander von Zemlinsky’s opera Es war einmal for performance, Mahler critiqued its lack of originality. He accused Zemlinsky of having “a very bad memory to have failed to avoid reminiscences.” Although Mahler used reminiscences deliberately, he was sometimes unaware of doing so. He noticed after completing the Fourth Symphony that it included reminiscences of Brahms’s First Symphony and Beethoven’s piano concertos. It should not be surprising if the elements of a rich musical memory leak into a compositional process unintentionally. After all, as Mahler was a very active conductor and he was familiar with many works of his predecessors and contemporaries.

Henry-Louis de La Grange distinguished two main categories of Mahler’s usage of pre-existing materials: reminiscences, and allusions or quotations. He describes the first category as unintentional and the second as intentional. Mahler was inspired by different kinds of pre-existing materials, from extramusical elements to folk or popular melodies, specific character genres (march, ländler, minuet, etc.), his own motives and melodies from his other works, and other composers’ material.

Mahler imitates extramusical material by motivic content and reflects its color by his choices of instruments. He imitates the acoustic elements of nature by following the convention by which listeners can recognize a specific motive as an imitation of a natural phenomenon. In almost all his works we hear the music of birds. Mahler often followed specific conventions for the imitation of birds, which include motives of small range, movement in seconds, trills, staccato articulation, and the color of wind instruments. This convention also experienced its metamorphosis in Mahler’s works, as in the First Symphony, where the cuckoo call, usually identified by a minor third, was musically expressed by fourths.

These allusions represent only a part of Mahler’s environmental memories. Knowing that “Mahler’s music was Mahler’s life” and that all his works are very autobiographical, we are not surprised by his reminiscences of and allusions to military signals and popular melodies. Mahler kept an open door for popular music in his works. This tone often imparted a characteristic sound to his works, different from the character of “high” art music of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The elements of popular and folk music are undisguised in Mahler’s music.

110 Adorno, Quasi una Fantasia, 84.
111 La Grange, Gustav Mahler, 2: 221.
112 La Grange, Gustav Mahler, 2: 276.
Although many composers in Romanticism drew from folk idioms, they did not generally introduce them in symphonic textures and sonata forms. The main exceptions are scherzos, which, however, were highly stylized. Mahler interpolated folk elements into the great symphonic tradition, creating heterogeneity of style and opening himself up to accusations of having violated the symphonic genre. Adorno reflects that “Mahler inferred the revolt against bourgeois music from that very music.” Symphonies had incorporated a plebeian element since Haydn, “but Mahler’s time no longer knew a common people that could be seen as bucolic.” Mahler’s folklore was more a simulation than quotation of the particular melody. Material c from the third movement of the First Symphony was often recognized as Jewish klezmer music. This material stands out as specific and very different from the surrounding context mainly because of its specific instrumentation. Its main melody is sounded by the E-flat clarinet and bassoon, accompanied by the bass drum and cymbals. The choice of this type of clarinet, which is unusual for standard symphonic orchestration, together with the characteristic rhythmic accompaniment, recall the character of the klezmer tradition.

Mahler used music materials by placing them in new perspectives. He expected the music to be recognizable as a representative of its original. However, “borrowed material is fragmented and juxtaposed against other kinds of music, combined simultaneously with different music, distorted through the appearance of unexpected intervals and through complex and ambiguous phrase relationships, or distanced by means of elaborate orchestrations that contradict the material’s true heritage.” Mahler’s simulated materials sometimes have an apparent independence and self-sufficiency. Materials b (mm. 39-44) and c (mm. 45-49) of the First Symphony’s third movement are good examples of that independence. Their relationship with the preceding canon was already defined in Chapter 4 as a contrast between “high” and “low” music. Material b first interrupts a funeral procession with its highly sentimental melody, which itself becomes interrupted by satirical material c, marked “Mit Parodie” (see Example 5). These two controversial materials sound as intruders and completely self-sufficient elements of the movement.

Mahler did not juxtapose materials only sequentially but also simultaneously. A multi-leveled structure is made up of two independent but interconnected textural strands in the Finale of the Second Symphony in mm. 343-80. Mahler here combines a

---

114 Adorno, Mahler, 37.
115 Adorno, Mahler, 37.
cantabile melody in the cellos and bassoons, which is later placed in the violins, with the material in trumpets, triangle, cymbals, and bass drum that seems to be played from behind the scene. Each of these two materials has its own rhythmic structure, tempo, instrumentation, and general character (see Example 22). This situation might have a possible narrative explanation. Floros treated the fanfare material as the announcement of the arriving Apocalypse,\textsuperscript{118} which disturbs the main flow of the music.

Mahler played with allusions and quotations, but he never composed based on a certain model, as Stravinsky did in \textit{Pulcinella}. His music includes many reminiscences of Schubert’s themes, which is not surprising since Mahler was a student at the Vienna Conservatory of Julius Epstein, who worked on the complete Schubert edition. There is also evidence that Mahler performed Schubert’s piano sonatas in his youth. He also used allusions to Mozart, Beethoven, Weber, Schumann, Chopin, Liszt, Bizet, Smetana, Wagner, Bruckner, and Brahms (see Appendix F). Their motives or themes function either as important or background materials.

Example 22. Mahler, Symphony no. 2, mvt. 5, mm. 343-53.

\textsuperscript{118} Floros, \textit{Gustav Mahler}, 75.
Self-quotations were also an important part of Mahler’s borrowing procedure. He especially liked to transform or to quote his preexistent lieder as material for symphonic movements. Such quotation contributes to the meaning of the symphonic narrative. In the fourth movement of the Second Symphony “Urlicht” announces the meaning of the finale, and the finale of the Fourth Symphony retroactively gives the explanation of the whole work. The use of the preexistent lied as thematic material in the First Symphony’s first movement was already mentioned in Chapter 4. A stronger connection can be found in the transposition of a song’s meaning into the Symphony’s third movement. Mahler here quoted the last stanza from “Die zwei blauen Augen von meinem Schatz,” the final song of the Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen. The quotation is the basis of the B part (mm. 83-112), and it seems to form a moment of relief or escape from the grotesque play with death in part A. Since the vocal line and accompaniment were quoted almost unchanged, it is possible that Mahler intended “to impart the full poetic meaning of … the song to the symphonic movement.”

Deryck Cooke finds that this “trio offers the romantic ‘consoling’ view of death, to the closing strains of the Fahrenden Gesellen cycle.” Mahler’s usage of this song, however, might have an even deeper meaning than that. The whole cycle speaks about a protagonist who has lost his love and is left in loneliness and anguish. In the last stanza, which Mahler quotes in the movement, the protagonist finally rests and joins

---


120 Cooke, Gustav Mahler, 35.
nature, but that scene has a dark shading. When we apply the Romantic metaphor of death as sleep, it becomes clear that the singer finds resolution of his loneliness through death.\(^{121}\) If we understand the funeral march as the cortège for this subject, it should not be surprising that the subject was treated as grotesque, since suicide is a mortal sin in the Catholic religion. Reading of the meaning on this level can clarify the nature of and the reason for Mahler’s self-quotation in this movement.

Mahler treated reminiscences in two different ways by adding them ironic connotation or using them without irony. La Grange understands those that are free of irony as expressing “instead a poignant nostalgia for an earlier epoch.”\(^{122}\) Mahler did not always keep these treatments separate. In the second Serenade of the Seventh Symphony, he combines nostalgia with mockery. In both cases Mahler treated the borrowed material from a distanced position, which is why he was able to assimilate them into his own language. Even when the model is a sonata form or an overall style, Mahler sometimes treats them within imaginary “quotation marks.” This defamiliarization connects him with the neo-classical tendencies of later composers.

121 Auf der Strasse stand ein Lindenbaum,
Da hab’ ich zum ersten Mal im Schlaf geruht!
Unter dem Lindenbaum,
Der hat seine Blüten über mich geschneit,
Da wusst’ ich nicht, wie das Leben tut,
War alles, alles wieder gut!
Alles! Alles!
Lieb’ und Leid, und Welt und Traum!

By the road stands a linden tree,
There for the first time I have rested in sleep!
Under the linden tree,
Which snowed its blossoms over me,
I was not conscious of what life brings,
Everything, everything turned to good again!
Everything! Everything!
Love and grief, and world and dream!

CHAPTER 7
RELATIONSHIPS OF MAHLER’S PRINCIPLE TO OTHER NEO-CLASSICAL TRENDS IN THE TWENTIETH-CENTURY

Interestingly, almost all composers of the first several decades of the twentieth century needed to turn to tradition at some point in their careers. This arose from different ideologies and with different results. Composers shared the same reaction to Romanticism as the other artists at this time, a reaction principally of detachment and objectivism. Very often composers turned from expression to formal organization. The same happened within the other arts with constructivists and cubists.

Mahler’s classicality and his treatment of borrowed material must be compared with the neo-classicism between the two World Wars and other neo-classical trends in the twentieth century. French neo-classicism was born from a negative reaction toward Romanticism, Expressionism, and Impressionism. It drew its reactive energy also from the French inclination toward classical culture and from Gallic rationality and anti-sentimentalism. Not only can the neo-classicists’ simplicity of form and thematic material be compared with Mahler, but also their borrowing of popular melodies and ambient sounds. “Les Six” were, however, proclaiming the beauty of banality, in contrast to Mahler, who did not accept that his music was in any way banal, due to his use of preexisting materials. French neo-classicism often has a satiric message, also present in Mahler’s ironic treatments. Their forms were not typically sonata forms or complex three-part and rondo forms, but mostly simple three-part forms without involvement of a development process in the treatment of the materials. This type of form is combined with the language of contemporary music.

The predecessor of the aesthetic of Les Six, Erik Satie, combined the simplicity of melodic thinking, inspiration of music of past styles, and modern harmony. In the prelude for a play, Les Fils des étoiles, he simulated medieval organum, and in Sonatine bureau-critique, created “a satiric paraphrase of music by the eighteenth-century composer Muzio Clementi.” His experience as a cabaret pianist and composer of music-hall songs found its way into his music.

Similar to Satie in employing the “music of the present” is Darius Milhaud. He used polytonality to create an effect of modernity by simultaneously combining two or

123 Morgan, Twentieth-Century Music, 160.
more harmonically traditional layers. He simulated even the classical symphony by adopting the structure of a symphonic cycle, limited instrumentation, simplicity of melodies, and conventional forms, in works such as his *Symphonie de chambre* no.1 *Le printemps*, op. 43, from 1917. Milhaud’s neo-classicism includes simulations of the music of Corrette (*Suite d’après Corrette*), François Couperin (*Introduction et allegro*), and the little-known eighteenth-century composer Baptiste Anet (Viola Sonata no.1, *L’apothéose de Molière*). Milhaud also used quotations of musical materials, but, unlike Mahler, he divorced them from their context.

A return to more conservative language is characteristic of Francis Poulenc. His models were tonality and traditional forms. His direct connection with Satie and Milhaud is the sound of the circus and the music-hall.

Artur Honegger, by contrast, differed from them by his intention to make more communicative music by choosing models from Baroque and Classic music rather than from popular music. The result is expressionistic musical language in the conventional forms. He differed from other members of Les Six because of his Swiss origin. He spent two years at the Zürich Conservatory, where he discovered the music of Wagner and Strauss, which influenced the development of his musical language. Another strong influence on his style was his experience as a student at the Paris Conservatoire, where he became involved with the other members of Les Six. One of the common compositional elements with them was eclecticism, which resulted in the appearance of stylistic allusions from Middle Ages in *Judith* and *Le roi David*, including Gregorian chant and hymns, as well as jazz. His operetta *Les aventures du roi Pausole* incorporates stylistic allusions to Chabrier, Gounod, and Offenbach.

Satie and all members of Les Six maintained a certain objectivity in their neo-classical works. This objectivity helped them to create a strongly satirical approach to borrowing. Mahler lacks that kind of objectivity. Only his picture of the grotesque funeral and montage treatment of b and c materials in the First Symphony’s funeral march could be compared with the grotesque and the principles of Les Six.

At around 1910, when Richard Strauss began to refer explicitly to the Romantic tradition, Ferruccio Busoni’s aesthetic was fully formulated. He presented his ideas in 1907 in his *Entwurf einer neuen Ästhetik*, “a comprehensive philosophical statement of the technical and esthetic foundations of a new twentieth-century music.”

This treatise expressed Busoni’s reaction toward late Romanticism. In a letter published in 1920, Busoni invented a new term, *junge Klassizität*, signifying not a return to Classicism but a union of tradition and new trends. He did not accept Mann’s term *neue Klassizität*, because he felt that it carried a strong implication of an imitation of the past. Busoni chose “Young Classicism,” because “it suggested that musical evolution embodied an ongoing, rejuvenative process, which he likened to organic growth in nature.”

The following excerpt from this open letter to Paul Bekker, music critic of

---


the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, dated 20 January 1920, reveals some of the major points of his aesthetic:

By “Young Classicism” I mean the mastering, sifting and turning to account of all the gains of previous experiments and their inclusion in strong and beautiful forms. … I mean the Idea that music is music, in and for itself, and nothing else, and that it is not split up into different classes: apart from cases where word, title, situations, and meanings which are brought in entirely from outside, obviously put it into different categories. … With “Young Classicism” I include the definite departure from what is thematic and the return to melody. … A third point not less important, is the casting off of what is “sensuous” and the renunciation of subjectivity (the road to objectivity, which means the author standing back from his work, a purifying road, a hard way, a trial of fire and water) and the reconquest of serenity … Not profundity, and personal feeling and metaphysics, but Music which is absolute, distilled, and never under a mask of figures and ideas which are borrowed from other spheres. Human sentiment, but not human affairs, and this, too, expressed within the limits of what is artistic.¹²⁷

Busoni recognized Bach as a musical “archetype.” He worked on editions and transcriptions of Bach’s music. In the latter he not only translated music into a new medium but reworked the material as well. In his compositions Busoni combined Bach’s contrapuntal texture with harmonic bitonality, new scales, and unmetered rhythm. He also used pre-composed musical segments, modeling them with contrasting results, and mixing recognizable quotations with complete transformations.

Comparison between Mahler’s classicality and Busoni’s theory and works does not yield many common points. Mahler combined Classic and early Romantic conventions with late Romantic stylistic elements, resulting sometimes in domination of conventions and sometimes in usage of conventions in mere traces. Since Busoni witnessed the development of expressionism, his combination of past and present included modern elements and very often the more distant past than Classicism. His combination is created from an objective standpoint, while Mahler’s classicality is predominantly subjective.

Neo-classicism was Stravinsky’s way of escaping from the “pagan” expressionism of his Russian phase. He developed his unique relation to tradition after he moved to Paris. Stravinsky’s approach to the past had an objectivity and distance in common with Les Six. Mahler worked with musical types, such as certain dances, with personal detachment, treating them as foreign objects, as in the Scherzo of his Ninth Symphony. In this way, the level of distortion in Mahler’s works was higher than that in works of Les Six. Stravinsky worked with pre-existing material, as in *Pulcinella* (1920), but also with stylistic, genre, or formal simulation. The closest stylistic

---
simulation to the model, in this case the eighteenth century, was accomplished in *Pulcinella*. Stravinsky’s other neo-classic works have more evident Stravinskian flavor, which produces a more contemporary final result. Stravinsky’s models came not only from Classicism but also from the Baroque period. He explained his neo-classical turn as the “need for restriction, for deliberately submitting to a style” and that “it is more detached and stands out better when it moves within the definite limits of a convention.”

He wanted his model to be recognized, but also a degree of its transformation. Stravinsky used convention as the mask for his depersonalization.

Bartók and Schoenberg took a different neo-classical direction. They both returned, after establishing an expressionistic peak, to conventional formal models and stronger tonal implications in their serialism. Their neo-classicism lacks the detachment of the styles of Stravinsky and Les Six, as well as their substance of circus, jazz, or any other urban music element. Both composers, Bartók and Schoenberg, kept their relation to tradition and subjective expressions hidden underneath the surface level. They simulated conventional forms but did so with unconventional material and musical language. They also simulated polyphonic treatment, although it is hidden under materials that sound expressionistic. Only this turn to the conventional forms is a connecting point with Mahler’s classicality, but other elements of Bartók’s or Schoenberg’s musical language cannot be compared with Mahler’s style.

Similarly to Bartók and Schoenberg, Paul Hindemith expressed reaction, not necessarily negative, toward late Romanticism and expressionism. His early works followed the path of Brahms, Strauss, and Franck, but in the early 1920s Hindemith became more radical. His radicalism grew from an anti-Romantic sentiment full of parodistic attitude. Hindemith also established a neo-classical mix of traditional and modern elements. His models were Baroque concerto forms and polyphonic techniques. He wanted to create music for practical use to be performed by students, amateurs, and professionals. With *Gebrauchsmusik*, Hindemith wanted to achieve music for the present. Mahler’s and Hindemith’s aesthetics differ in several basic elements. Their interests are directed toward different musical pasts. Their presents are also very different. In addition, Hindemith developed his neo-classicism based on negative reaction toward the aesthetic from which Mahler’s style derived.

Neo-classicism was for Sergey Prokofiev not a backward motion but a starting point. It arose from his opposition to Romantic emotionalism and from his natural inclination toward simplicity, melodiousness, and conventional forms. Prokofiev made the most explicit references to eighteenth-century style in the “Classical” Symphony (1917). His model was Haydn. Prokofiev himself explained his starting point, that he composed this work as Haydn would have done, if he had “lived to our own day (and) retained his own style while accepting something of the new at the same time.”

Prokofiev simulated the Classic symphonic cycle, orchestration, forms of movements,
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tonal organization, and micro-structure. His neo-classical treatment, however, has occasional sudden shifts of harmony, oscillation between two keys in one thematic section, and large leaps in melodies. His harmonic language was tonal, built on triads, which were, however, used without the expected traditional functional roles.

Prokofiev tried to assimilate his two musical natures, expressionistic and classical, resulting either in domination of one or another stylistic concepts. His return to the past in the “Classical” Symphony was more distinct from his musical present, in contrast to Mahler’s classicality, which very often carried imaginative deformations of conventions.

Shostakovich was younger, and because of that he had a different reaction to expressionism. His compositional accomplishment was highly influenced by politics and the ideological expectations of socialist realism in Russia. The stylistic range of Shostakovich’s works extends from experimental to late Romantic. His works that simulate the narrative Romantic principle of Mahler’s type have something of an expressionistic spirit, which can be accepted as simulation on another level. His Ninth Symphony mixes Classic (elements of sonata form), Baroque (second movement), late Romantic, and expressionist simulations.

It is difficult to draw direct lines among all these neo-classical variants. They all stemmed from a negative reaction to Romanticism, while Mahler composed within the late Romantic aesthetic. Baroque and older styles had a significant influence on neo-classicism in the twentieth century, because neo-classicism associated Bach with an idealized image of aesthetic purity, cleansing music of late Romantic excesses. Mahler referred to the Baroque by the development of highly polyphonic language, by the creation of many thematic materials from one cell, and the genre simulation in the first part of the Eighth Symphony. Neo-classicists between the wars did not accept organic evolution in art. They believed that each composition has its own logic unrelated to every other work. This theory differs from Mahler’s deep ideological or musical connections among his works.
CONCLUSION

This thesis has attempted to elucidate the nature of classicality in Mahler’s symphonic works. It attempts to understand the music of Gustav Mahler as grounded in musical and cultural history. Mahler’s symphonies articulate a dialogue with traditions and show the vitality of conventions at the fin de siècle, when the very basis of tradition was under a strong attack. The main methodology applied in this work is analytical observation; however, since his music language consisted of more than what can be understood through analysis, the conclusions also draw on other facts, such as programmatic inspiration, biographical facts, or the ideas that the composer communicated with friends and colleagues.

The analysis of each example has consisted of recognizing the formal characteristics that represent reflection of the conventions. In addition to explaining the conventional elements, I have tried to show where the conventions were deconstructed and how this was done. The investigation of Mahler’s classicality does not reveal a unifying principle applied in the all works. Every work was created with its own individual impulse, resulting in a distinct union of tradition and modernity, although we can recognize some similar patterns in this union. For example, the common deformation of the sonata form that resulted from Mahler’s interpretation of ready-made designs is strikingly brief in the first part of the form, as in the First, Third, Fourth, Sixth, and Seventh Symphonies. Another deformation is seen in the withdrawal of the recapitulation from the surface of perception. The complement to these characteristics is the expansion of the development, similar to the sonata form of Beethoven’s Eroica. Such lengthy development, enriched with the principle of constant variation, gains supremacy, but it no longer functions as a dynamic antithesis to the static parts. In this way, the important principle of the sonata form is modified.

Since Mahler’s classicality belongs to the widely felt need to rely on tradition or to comment on it, I have made an effort to compare his style with other neo-classical trends. It was then necessary to define Mahler’s treatment of pre-existing music, since the ideology of “music about music” was a part of neo-classical reaction. This comparison has been, however, intentionally restricted to a digression in this work.

After identifying the constructive elements of Mahler’s classicality, we can observe them through the lenses of two methodologies applied to similar subjects. Starting from the idea that all stylistic periods were related to the past models, Leonard Meyer defined four ways of possible usage of the past in art works: paraphrase,
borrowing, simulation, and modeling. He describes *paraphrase* as a treatment in which “very nearly all the essential formative features of an existing work – its subject matter, themes, structures, and stylistic procedures – are used in a relatively sustained and rigorous way as the basis for all or part of a new work whose spirit and significance are clearly contemporary. Through a reordering of parts or materials, a modification of syntax, a change of inflection or vocabulary, an alternation in manner of representation – or some combination of these – a stylistic modification takes place.” The best example of this procedure is Stravinsky’s *Pulcinella Suite*. Meyer’s *borrowing* of pre-existing music models can include also a quotation of material. He makes a distinction between *borrowing* and *allusion*, in which pre-existing material does not have a significant syntactic or structural function in the work but only a passing role as a reminiscence. A different treatment from these two that involve literal or varied use of materials is *simulation*, which includes a melodic-rhythmic idiom, harmonic processes, or formal structuring of a past style modified by new standards. The last category of possible treatment of the past, in Meyer’s perspective, is *modeling*, through which, “following the basic structure and process of a particular work, yet at the same time reshaping its manifest content and its significance, the new work is constructed as a fairly rigorous analogue of the old.”

In her discussion of post-modernism in music, Mirjana Veselinovic-Hofman similarly defines three categories of past models: *sample*, *model*, and *paradigm*. A *sample* is actually a quotation, even if it is not a literal quotation. The criterion that should be satisfied in a sample is that we should recognize the original context. A *model* is a sample that becomes the basis for development that changes the context of the original. The last category, *paradigm*, Veselinovic-Hofman defines as a model in which only constitutive principles are used for a creation of a new work. “The *paradigm* is therefore a model which is treated not as material; however, its elements are recognized (structures, texture, color, etc) that are used or opposed by the composer’s individual expression.” The *paradigm* is a basis for a process of Meyer’s *simulation*.

Using these descriptions of models, we can conclude that the strongest elements of Mahler’s classicality are based on paradigms of the past. His paradigms are the symphony as a genre, its conventions, and its usual forms, such as the Classic monothematic sonata form, early Romantic sonata form, three-part form, and rondo. The symphonic paradigm is enriched by Baroque fugue as well, which is another paradigm.
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133 Meyer, *Music, the Arts, and Ideas*, 205.
135 Veselinovic-Hofman, *Fragmenti o muzickoj postmoderni*, 27.
Different genres, such as minuet, ländler, scherzo, and waltz functioned also as paradigms for Mahler in his simulation process. Mahler did not simulate melodic structures, harmonic simplicity, and orchestration of a particular model but of the earlier style itself. The previous examples similarly do not use paradigm in its narrow meaning, but rather a general model that was characteristic for the stylistic trend. Therefore, in such cases it is probably more appropriate to use Meyer’s methodology of treatments and to define simulation of the conventions as the most common treatment of the past in Mahler’s new classicality.

We can also recognize a category of model (not the principle of modeling) as one element of Mahler’s inspiration. The children’s song, “Bruder Martin,” that became the main material of the third movement of the First Symphony, is an example of model. It serves as important material for the movement, and its origin is recognizable, but its context and other characteristics are changed. The treatment of the pre-existing material would be, in this example, borrowing. There are other kinds of borrowings and allusions in Mahler’s symphonies, as mentioned before. Their pre-existing materials exist as samples and models. The examples of borrowing are Mahler’s quotation of his songs in the First Symphony, while the examples of allusions would include the motives and themes presented in Appendix F.

Mahler’s music was created in a very complex and contradictory political and cultural time. His works reveal much about the intellectual and artistic thinking at the fin de siècle. Mahler integrated what history kept separated: tradition and modernity, vernacular and elite culture, and all lights and shadows of art in Vienna’s culture. At a time when the struggle over identity distinguished the political and cultural life of individuals and nations, it should not be surprising that composers reached back toward established tradition. Such a reference to the past, like that of Mozart’s String Quartet no. 15, K. 421, at the beginning of Schoenberg’s Fourth Quartet is not surprising. Mahler’s references had different results. He incorporated them into his musical thinking and proved that past and present cannot interact without modifying one another. Even when Mahler revived an “innocent” age in the history of the symphony in the Sixth, he showed that any kind of literal return to the past is no longer possible and that every renewal is combined with innovation.

After every saturation the arts turn back to simplicity and order. This is a natural need, confirmed through the centuries in the alteration of Dionysian and Apollonian principles. The Apollonian turn has usually happened abruptly, as in the Renaissance and Classic periods, as well as with twentieth-century neo-classicism, but the classicality in Romanticism is not a complete stylistic turn that appeared in this way. An evolution of artistic principles always occurs as a reaction to historical events and sociological change. The political happenings in Austria in the last decades of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, and the fear of “the end of the world,” also influenced musical development. The references to tradition at this time constituted an intuitive transition to the next phase. They made possible this natural transformation.
APPENDIX A

STRUCTURAL DIAGRAMS

The First Symphony

I movement

Sonata form

II part

3. sec.

O + K  chrom. m.  m. of O + P/IV m.  N  K + P/IV m.  T^1
from O and IV m.

F: ped.  D:
II movement

Three part form
Trio

c  d  c^1  T


F:  D:  F#:  D:  C:  E♭:  C:

A

a  a^1

285  303  304  318  321  325 – 58

A:  E:  A:

III movement
Three part form

A  B

a  b  c  b^1  c^1  t  a^1  d  t


d:  g:  A:  g:  B:  d:  G:  g:

A^1

a^2  c^2  a^3 + b^2 + c

113 – 131  132 – 137  138 – 168

e♭:  c:  d:
IV movement

Sonata form

I part

1. sec.  2. sec.
O  P  T brief  S  K
1 – 54  54  73  74  166  167 – 174  175 – 221 – 228  239 – 253

II part

3. sec.

P + O  P  Breakthrough  P  Br. m.  Chorale m.  M. of 4s/ I mov.  O/I mov.
253  266  290  297  317  370  375  378  388  428

g:  e:  C:  c:  D:  d:

4. sec.


V/F ped…………………………. F:  f:  D:

Ped……..
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STRUCTURAL DIAGRAMS

The Fourth Symphony

I movement

Sonata form

I part

1. sec.                  2. sec.
O   P       1T   S       2T   O   P   K
1 – 3  4  17  18  31  32 – 37  38  41  46  47  52  57  58 – 71  72 – 76  77 – 90  91 – 101

b:   G:   D:   b:   G:

II part

3. sec.
O + P   N¹   O + P   N²   O + P
102  115  119  125  155  163  167  185  187  204  209  230  232


G ped.
II movement

Extended three-part form

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
O & A & O & B & O & A^1 \\
a & b & a^1 & c & a \\
1 & 6 & 7 & 10 & 14 & 22 & 26 & 33 & 34 & 46 & 47 & 63 & 64 & 68 & 69 & 109 & 110 & 114 & 115 & 121 & 125 & 133 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
O & B^1 & A^2 \\
b & a & b & c^1 & a & b \\
\end{array}
\]

Coda (O+a)

330 - 364

c:
### III movement

**Double variations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a$^1$</td>
<td>a$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T$^1$</th>
<th>A$^1$</th>
<th>T$^3$</th>
<th>B$^1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a$^3$</td>
<td>a$^4$</td>
<td>a$^5$</td>
<td>b$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T$^4$</th>
<th>A$^2$</th>
<th>Coda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b$^3$</td>
<td>a$^6$ a$^7$ a$^8$ a$^9$ a$^{10}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F#:</td>
<td>G:</td>
<td>E:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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STRUCTURAL DIAGRAM

The Second Symphony

II movement

Extended three-part form

\[ \begin{array}{ccccccccc}
a & b & a^1 & b^1 \\
\end{array} \]

A♭: g#: d#: A♭: g#

\[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
a^2 & \text{Coda} \\
210 - 217 & 229 & 230 & 244 & 245 & 258 & 259 & 285 & 286 - 299 \\
\end{array} \]

A♭:
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STRUCTURAL DIAGRAM

The Sixth Symphony

I movement
Sonata form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I part</th>
<th>1. sec.</th>
<th>2. sec.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorale th.</td>
<td>of P mat.</td>
<td>(cont.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a:</td>
<td>F:</td>
<td>a:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II part
3. sec.
from O  from P from O new mat. from S new mat. + T

F: e: a: B♭: g: d:

N from T from P T

G: E♭: B♭: B: tonally unstable d:
4. sec.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P from O</th>
<th>P from O</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>T (dim)</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>Coda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


434 – 448 – 486

C: A:
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STRUCTURAL DIAGRAM

The Seventh Symphony

II movement

Three-part form with two trios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Trio 1</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 48 – 61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>121 122 – 140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>d:</td>
<td>C/c:</td>
<td>A♭:</td>
<td>E♭:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A♭:</td>
<td>A♭:</td>
<td>A♭:</td>
<td>A♭:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>A♭</th>
<th>Trio 2</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Trio 2</th>
<th>O + b + a♭</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>c (lyrical) + from Intr.</td>
<td>(cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 – 155</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>c:</td>
<td></td>
<td>f:</td>
<td>c:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>A♭</th>
<th>Trio 1</th>
<th>A♭</th>
<th>Coda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c:</td>
<td>A♭:</td>
<td>c:</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

EXAMPLES OF MAHLER’S SIMULATIONS AND QUOTATIONS,
TAKEN FROM LA GRANGE, “Music About Music in Mahler: Reminiscences,
Allusions, or Quotations?” 149-68.

• (a) Beethoven, Symphony no. 4, mvt. 1

(b) Mahler, Symphony no. 1, mvt. 1

• (a) Schubert, Piano Sonata D. 850, mvt. 4
(b) Mahler, Symphony no. 4, mvt. 4

(a) Schumann, Symphony no. 2, mvt. 4

(b) Mahler, Symphony no. 7, mvt. 5

(a) Liszt, *Rhapsodie espagnole*

(b) Mahler, Symphony no. 3, mvt. 3
• (a) Wagner, *Die Walküre*, act I, scene 2

(b) Mahler, Symphony no. 2, mvt. 1

• (a) Brahms, Symphony no. 2, mvt. 4

(b) Mahler, Symphony no. 1, mvt. 1
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