

## Featured Essay

# Mahler's Sixth Symphony in Context: What the History of Minor-Key Symphonies Can Tell Us about Mahler's Decision about Movement Order

by Stephen D. Chakwin, Jr.

"How can an artist expect that what he has felt intuitively should be perfectly understood by other people, since he himself feels in the presence of his work, if it is genuine art, that he is faced by a riddle about which he too may have illusions, just as another person may?" Richard Wagner, letter dated 25 January 1854 to August Roeckel<sup>30</sup>

### Introduction

This article explores some aspects of the unusual form of Mahler's Sixth Symphony as a way of gaining insight into his decision to switch the order of the middle movements from Scherzo-Andante, the order he chose for the first published version of the score and that he seems to have envisioned during the composition process itself, to Andante-Scherzo, the order he adopted at the Symphony's first performance in Essen in 1906 and that he maintained for the handful of times that he conducted the piece during his lifetime. It postulates that the reason that Mahler changed the movement order may have been his realization of the structural problem he created for himself with the way he ended his first movement as well as the ongoing problem he had with critical opinion in his lifetime. What Mahler did by this expedient was conceal his Symphony's structural problem at the expense of undermining the greater coherence of the work and the carefully built transitions between the movements. It is, of course, impossible to know with absolute certainty why Mahler did this: he left no written explanation of his decision. In addition, it is impossible to know for sure whether he later changed his mind and decided that his original plan for the order of movements should be reinstated. We know that Alma sent a famous telegram to Willem Mengelberg stating that the Scherzo should be second and know of no reason why Alma would wish the movements to be played in an incorrect order or would lie about what the correct order should be. The question remains an open one, although musically Scherzo-first seems to present a much stronger piece.

### Background

The story of the Sixth leading up to the famous movement switch is a familiar one, but it's worth reexamining briefly. As far as can be told from the existing evidence, Mahler's composition scheme was originally for the movement order to have the first movement followed by the scherzo followed in turn by Andante followed by the Finale. This sequence with its resulting transitions is one that the Sixth's structure seems to dictate in many ways.

The loud A major ending of the first movement is followed by the loud A-minor opening of second, immediately contradicting the resolution and stability implied by the major key ending, carrying that movement's major-to-minor theme forward in a daring way (which composer before Mahler used the sheer tonality of two adjacent movements as either a reflection or an actual statement of a theme common to both of them; and, of course, taking the A-minor first theme, F-major second theme-world of the first movement and turning it upside down into a very different A minor first theme F major second-theme place.

The Scherzo is a kind of decompensation<sup>31</sup> of the first movement. The odd opening rhythm with accents on both the third and the first beats of the 3/8 rhythm suggests a mockery of the stride of the opening of first movement and the first theme itself seems to mock the F major second theme of the first movement (which was, of course, the basis for its joyful coda). The second theme also mocks elements of first

<sup>30</sup> Quoted in Robert Donington: *Wagner's Ring and Its Symbols: The Music and the Myth* (New York, St. Martin's Press, 1974), pp. 31-32.

<sup>31</sup> "Decompensation" in medicine and psychology means that a process or situation that was once stable has become unstable and non-functional.

movement, but these seem to be primarily elements of first movement's first theme<sup>32</sup>, the marching tread, garlanded with simpering interjections and measures of the falling fourths that powered the coda of first movement to its triumph, here pointlessly repeated like liquidations in a Baroque or Classical piece. The repetitions contribute to heightening tension of his structure, just as such figures function in a symphony work by Haydn or Beethoven.

The transition from the Scherzo to the Andante movement is equally well crafted. After the diabolical machine of the Scherzo has built itself up to a climax that is the last of Mahler's "shrieks of horror," the movement seems to run out of power. Its energy is dissipated into fragments of its themes. The 3/8 rhythm has lost its third beat accent and cannot even stay in a steady triple rhythm any more (it keeps straying into the quadruple rhythm of 2/4) and the melodic elements sink deeper and deeper into the bass register against a background of the major to minor "eclipse" until all energy is spent and only a quiet, sluggish evocation of the minor third that defines A minor is left.

After this, there is nothing more to say about – or in – A minor, at least for a while. So Mahler takes us to the remote key of E-flat and to the seemingly remote musical territory of an interlude based on "The Last Rose of Summer." Seemingly" is an important word here because much of this movement is actually based on material familiar from the first movement and Scherzo lightly disguised by inversion, transposition, or fragmentation. The dynamic transition from Scherzo to the Andante movement is perfect: the Andante movement's *pianissimo* opening is a soothing response to the grim *piano* of the Scherzo's ending and the remote key is a palpable relief after all that A minor/F major<sup>33</sup>. Unless you listen carefully, you may not be aware of the hint at the fourth full measure of a transition from E-flat minor to E-flat major, but it is an important (and, at least subliminally comforting) contradiction of the major-to-minor sequence that dominated both the first movement and the Scherzo and the transition between them.

The opening "puff of smoke"<sup>34</sup> of the final movement is again perfectly set up. The transition from the peaceful quiet of E flat major to the sinister quiet of C minor is not only dynamically convincing and harmonically coherent, but it is also carefully prepared. The notes of the opening chord of the fourth movement – C, E-flat, G-flat, and A-flat – are all prominent in the last eight measures or so of the Andante. Planted in the ear, as it were, for the quite different context in which they are about to emerge.

Mahler may very well not have been consciously aware of all of these links and transitions (see the incipit to this article), but he created them and, unless we are prepared to accept that artistic creation is more the product of chance than of craft, would have been aware of them on some level. How is it that he came to abandon the structure that made them all work and replace it with a very different and seemingly more random one?

We know that the Scherzo-first design was set forth in the first printed score and lasted through Mahler's reading of the Symphony with the Vienna Philharmonic. De La Grange reports that the Andante-first order was adopted by Mahler during the 1906 rehearsals for the Essen premiere. Or to be more specific, it occurred after ongoing uncertainty about the orchestration and, finally, the movement order of the work. According to Klaus Pringsheim, who was present in Essen:

<sup>32</sup> The reason that the qualifying language is necessary in the text above is that so many of the themes in this work are variants of one another. Any description of their relationship therefore has to be made with caution. Mahler's thematic unity in this symphony is remarkable and well worth an article in its own right.

<sup>33</sup> It's also a device common to Mahler. He did the same thing in each of his previous "shriek of disgust" symphonies. In his Second Symphony, the shriek was in the third movement (C minor) and was followed by a wind-down of energy in the movement and a quiet beginning of the next movement in a remote key (D-flat). In his Third Symphony, the shriek, also in the third movement (C major), is followed by a dissolving of the thematic elements into incoherent fragments, repeated chords, and finally a trill. Again, the next movement begins quietly in a remote key (nominally D major, but very chromatic).

<sup>34</sup> The metaphor is Joe Monzo's. It seems perfect to me, so I quote it here.

Those close to him were well aware of Mahler's "uncertainty". Even after the final rehearsal he was still not sure whether or not he had found the right tempo for the Scherzo, and he wondered whether he should invert the order of the second and third movements (which he subsequently did). He kept on making changes and improvements. After each rehearsal he asked everyone around him, musicians and friends, for their impressions, trying to determine down to the smallest technical detail, to what extent, in their impression on the listener, he had achieved what he intended.<sup>35</sup>

De La Grange suggests that Mahler's movement-order change in Essen may be attributed to his documented insecurity at the time, specifically to comments about the resemblance between the openings of the first and second movements<sup>36</sup>. My own suspicion is slightly different. It is a near certainty that Mahler was told by listeners that the openings of the first two movements were very, perhaps too, similar to each other, but I suspect that he realized a deeper weakness in his work, one that came from one of his most imaginative strokes. To understand this, we have to digress and take a look at the history of the classical minor-key symphony.

### Classical Minor-Key Symphonies

It seems best to leave aside the pre-Classical symphonies and sinfonias of Johan Sebastian Bach's children and their contemporaries, along with the works of composers such as the Stamitzes, Boccherini, Cherubini, and others, since Mahler in all probability did not know those works and hardly would have relied on them as models, Table 1 contains an overview of minor-key symphonies over the roughly 130 years preceding Mahler's Sixth. The Table lists 37 minor-key symphonies by the ten major symphonic composers before Mahler, ranging from Haydn to Bruckner. Of these symphonies, all but six have first movements ending in the minor key and each of these six is a kind of aberration. As we shall see, the closest thing to a structural antecedent to Mahler's work was actually none of these, but the 1887 version of Bruckner's Eighth Symphony, which was almost certainly unknown to Mahler and was rewritten by the composer after the conductor Hermann Levi refused to perform it.

The general model of a minor-key symphony was more or less established by Haydn with his Symphony no. 44 (1772): the first movement has a first theme in the minor and a contrasting second theme in a major key, with the movement ending in the minor; he follows with a minuet, usually minor with contrasting major key trio; slow movement; and Finale, in the tonic minor, which takes up the undischarged minor key discourse of the first movement (at least in tonality and sometimes in actual thematic material) and works it to a resolution<sup>37</sup>. Variants of that structure appear in all of the symphonies listed in the Table.

For a composer attempting to create a through-composed symphony, this is a useful plan. In Western "classical" music, at least from the recognition of tonality onward, the minor key has been traditionally perceived as unstable and implying a need for further resolution. The Picardy third probably developed in performance and composition as a result of perception: it was a way of allowing the listener to know that the piece had ended, despite the minor-key conclusion.

In the context of a symphony, the unresolved nature of a minor-key first-movement conclusion is a powerful unifying device. Nobody could listen to the ending of the first movements of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony or Schumann's Fourth – to take two obvious examples – and not know that there is more to come. Using the tonic minor for the dance movement, whether it is a minuet or a scherzo, reinforces that anticipation and the Finale, at least in a successful symphony, satisfies it.

<sup>35</sup> Quoted in Henry-Louis De La Grange, *Gustav Mahler: Vienna: Triumph and Disillusion (1904-1907)* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 408.

<sup>36</sup> De La Grange, *Ibid.*, fn. 5. (pp. 815-16).

<sup>37</sup> H. C. Robbins Landon, in his thorough study of Haydn's symphonies, referred to this as "the perfect form that [Haydn] had so long sought". H.C. Robbins Landon: *The Symphonies of Joseph Haydn* (London: Universal Edition and Rockliff, 1955), p. 337.

**Table 1. An Overview of Selected Minor-Key Symphonies from Haydn to Bruckner**

Composer	Symphony	Key	Ending of I
Haydn	no. 26	D minor	Major
	no. 34	D minor	Minor
	no. 39	G minor	Minor
	no. 44	E minor	Minor
	no. 45	F# minor	Minor
	no. 49	F minor	Minor
	no. 52	C minor	Minor
	no. 78	C minor	Minor
	no. 80	D minor	Major
	no. 83	G minor	Major
	no. 95	C minor	Major
Mozart	no. 25	G minor	Minor
	no. 40	G minor	Minor
Beethoven	no. 5	C minor	Minor
	no. 9	D minor	Minor
Schubert	no. 4	C minor	Major
	no. 8	B minor	Minor
Mendelssohn	no. 1	C minor	Minor
	no. 3	A minor	Minor
	no. 5	D minor	Minor
Schumann	no. 4	D minor	Minor
Brahms	no. 1	C minor	Minor
	no. 4	E minor	Minor
Dvorak	no. 1	C minor	Minor
	no. 4	D minor	Minor
	no. 7	D minor	Minor
	no. 9	E minor	Minor
Tchaikovsky	no. 1	G minor	Minor
	no. 2	C minor	Minor
	no. 4	F minor	Minor
	no. 5	E minor	Minor
	no. 6	B minor	Major
Bruckner	no. 1	C minor	Minor
	no. 2	C minor	Minor
	no. 3	D minor	Minor
	no. 8	C minor	Minor
	no. 9	D minor	Minor

The six symphonies, four of which are by Haydn<sup>38</sup>, with major-key first-movement endings fall outside this pattern. Haydn's Symphony no. 26, which dates from before 1770, is one of his earliest experiments with a minor-key symphony and is in three short movements. His Symphony no. 80 has an opening movement similar in structure and brevity to that of Symphony no. 26 and does not fall into the pattern: not only does the first movement end in the major key of the second subject, but the Finale doesn't attempt to pick up any minor key energy from the first movement or the minuet: it is in the tonic major. Haydn's Symphony no. 83 is also not a standard minor-key symphony: the stormy opening is a set-up promptly undercut by the clucking major-key theme that gives this work its nickname, "*The Hen*." Finally, the minor-key tonality of his Symphony no. 95 is only a gesture that appears only in the first movement's introduction (and its reappearance later in the movement) and functions more as a call to attention than as an anchor to the work's tonality. The work as a whole really much closer in spirit and form to the other London Symphonies that are in major keys with minor-key first movement introductions.

Schubert's "little" C-minor Symphony, subtitled, like Mahler's, "Tragic," has a first movement which resembles those of Haydn's Symphonies nos. 26 and 80: the minor tonality is most prominent in the exposition but even there is outweighed by the major-key second theme that sets the stage for the sunny conclusion of the movement.

Tchaikovsky's Symphony no. 6 in B-minor is yet another special case. We know from all but one of his other symphonies that he was fond of minor tonalities and had no hesitation about ending a first movement in

<sup>38</sup> Of whom it might fairly be said that he established every rule in classical form and explored every exception to each of them.

the tonic minor. In his Symphony no. 6, he chose to end the first movement with a kind of eulogy in B major. No triumph there.

None of these works appears to have been a candidate for a model of Mahler's Sixth Symphony. Would he have even known these half-dozen pieces? He could have known Schubert's Symphony in C minor, which was published in 1884-85 as part of the critical edition edited by Brahms, but there is no record that he ever performed it, let alone evidence to suggest that he studied it.<sup>39</sup> Mahler was familiar with the Tchaikovsky's Symphony as of at least 1901, when he dismissed it in a discussion with Guido Adler as empty and lacking inspiration.<sup>40</sup> There is no indication that this major-key first movement ending was an inspiration for the very different one in Mahler's Sixth (although the work itself was very likely an inspiration for the structure of Mahler's Ninth Symphony).

It is also unlikely that the failed first version of Bruckner's Eighth Symphony was a structural model for Mahler. Although Mahler knew Bruckner well from his studies in Vienna, we have no indication that he would have seen or even known about the Eighth when it was completed in 1887. (Mahler served as second conductor at the Neues Stadttheater, Leipzig, from July 1886, when his appointment took effect, until his resignation in May 1888.)

Bruckner's C-minor Symphony, though, is worth looking at a little more closely, if only as an example of parallel invention. We don't know details about why Levi rejected it, but it is hard to imagine that the tonal full-stop brought about by the triumphant C-major coda to the C-minor opening movement was not a major factor, if not the major factor, in this decision. With the tensions of the first movement gathered and resolved in this coda, the listener is in effect not invited to stay tuned to the Symphony, but to start all over again. Levi would likely have been as puzzled by this as anyone else steeped in the symphonic culture of the time and could well have thought the result structurally unworkable, like a tone poem followed by a three-movement symphony.

### Mahler's Sixth in Context

The coda of the first movement of Mahler's Sixth Symphony is one of those minor-to-major key trouble spots, akin to the corresponding sections in the Finales of Mozart's Piano Concerto in D minor, K. 466, and the Piano Quartet in G minor, K. 478, in which the major-key sections can all too easily sound "tacked on" and unconvincing. While some commentators have suggested that Mahler wanted his coda to sound unconvincing, the writing itself suggests otherwise: it is consistent with the triumphant codas in his other works and there is nothing in the 37 bars that it consists of that explicitly undercuts it.

So what was Mahler trying to do in the coda? I suggest that he was attempting several things: first, to bring contrast in the form of a triumphant major-key movement ending into a symphony that he already knew was going to end in the minor; second to expand on his dramatic innovation in the first movement by using tonality itself as a theme by using this "tonality theme" to link movements in a way that had never been done before – with a theme actually spanning the break between them;<sup>41</sup> and finally, to use whatever unarticulated program he may have had for the piece as a guide to its structure. In doing this, Mahler must have realized the trap he was setting himself. Unlike virtually all the previous minor-key symphonies he would have known, his would resolve the first movement in the tonic

<sup>39</sup> There is no reference to Schubert's Fourth Symphony in de La Grange's volumes but an extensive quote by Mahler on Schubert that suggests that this is the last composer to whom he would look for a structural model: "...his technical ability falls a long way short of his sensitivity and inventiveness. How facile his approach to composition is! Six sequences in a row and then another in a different key. No development, no artistically perfected shaping of his original theme. Instead, he simply repeats himself so that one could cut out half of it without damaging the whole." Henry-Louis de La Grange, *Gustav Mahler: Vienna: The Years of Challenge* (New York: Oxford University Press 1995), p. 270.

<sup>40</sup> De La Grange, *Ibid.*, fn 3 above (p. 339).

<sup>41</sup> Schumann's Fourth Symphony, with its movements starting on chords that resolved the unresolved ending of the previous movement, was as far as had been gone to date in that direction.

major. How would he get out of Bruckner's "full stop" trap? Very simply, the thematic relationship between the first and second movements would propel the listener forward. The eclipse theme would span the movements and pull the listener into the Scherzo. Once into the Scherzo, the listener would be drawn forward by its energy and the resolution of the first movement would be no problem.

What went wrong? My speculation is that Mahler did not make the change because of the resemblance between the opening material of his first two movements. As Brahms would have observed "any ass could see that". That Mahler would have realized this only in the dress rehearsals in Essen after writing the music, proofing it for publication, and reading through it with the Vienna Philharmonic strains credibility.

I suggest that Mahler realized more and more clearly, perhaps with the aid of feedback from the Essen listeners that his first-movement coda was going to seem, not like a triumphant though temporary, conclusion, like a journey to nowhere, placed gratuitously at the end of his first movement and undercut by the second<sup>42</sup>. This was undoubtedly the reason for his great concern for the tempo of the Scherzo: How could he pace the music so that its parody of the first movement was clear, but it didn't seem to be simply a return to the world of first movement after a pointless digression? We know from de La Grange's account of the Sixth's Vienna performances that the critics there were perceptive and merciless. Could Mahler get his coda past their scrutiny? I suggest that he reluctantly decided that he could not.

Faced with that decision, what was he to do? A longer, more worked-out coda could have anchored the end of the first movement more firmly in A major, but there was no time to write one and no assurance that moving from such an ending to the scherzo would be any more convincing. Reworking the Scherzo was similarly impracticable.

Mahler's solution was to conceal the problem by moving the components of it away from each other. With the Andante thrust between the opening movement and the Scherzo, the A major coda became a journey to somewhere, even if a somewhere that makes much less dramatic sense in context<sup>43</sup>. And the immediate problem was solved, at least for the time being. Unfortunately, the time being was all the time that Mahler had. He never had the chance in the five eventful years of life that remained to him to do more structural work on the Sixth. So the interim solution was what was left. Or was it?

### Where Are We Now?

The story of the confusion involving movement order in the preparation for the 1920 Mahler Festival in Amsterdam and Alma's telegram is too well-known to require retelling here. While it is impossible to know for sure where Alma got her information<sup>44</sup>, it is beyond dispute that she had no motive to intentionally misrepresent or second-guess Mahler's wishes for the final order of the movements in the work and equally

<sup>42</sup> This is the kind of insight that serious rehearsal, as distinguished from a simple read-through with who knows what kind of breaks between movements, would bring to the fore. It is all too easy to imagine Mahler, in the heightened state of anxiety and insecurity described by Pringsheim and addressed at length by de La Grange's (*op. cit.*).

<sup>43</sup> The bittersweet tone of the Andante and its passionate climax seem so much more powerful and appropriate after the grim struggles of the first movement and the nihilistic mocking of the Scherzo. With only the first movement behind it, the huge emotion of the Andante – if it is allowed to speak – seems overblown: What in the first movement led to this? On the other hand, if the emotion is toned down and the movement played as a kind of light interlude – perhaps like the second *Nachmusik* movement in Symphony no. 7 – it seems pointless and even vapid and Mahler's great climax at the end, with the huge buildup and soaring descants of his most earnest lyrical moments, provokes only puzzlement instead of the deep emotion he usually meant such moments to convey. Perhaps under Mahler's own baton the circle was somehow squared, but I doubt it.

<sup>44</sup> It is generally known that Alma was devoted to Gustav in his final illness and that they spent much time together. It is not beyond possibility that movement order in the Sixth was a topic they discussed. There is no evidence that Alma was consulted on this topic before the question that produced the telegram to Mengelberg or that she attended or paid particular attention to any performance of the Sixth up until that time.

beyond dispute that both Mengelbergs, Willem, the conductor, and Rudolf, the musicologist, found the solution she suggested convincing.

So have most of the conductors who have performed the work since the publication of the 1963 critical edition. We are now left with two plausible performing options for this symphony. One being the product of careful planning and deep structural thinking, the other, I suggest, the product of fear under pressure.<sup>45</sup> The strongest argument in favor of Scherzo-first is that of the music itself. The strongest in favor of Andante-first is that Mahler chose it. Neither is a negligible argument, but in my view, ultimately the music speaks louder than its creator on this subject.

Stephen D. Chakwin, Jr., was born in New York City. He studied many different instruments, as well as musical analysis and theory, under various distinguished teachers. He has written about music for American Record Guide since 1980.

## Of Note

*Of Note* is a column dedicated to listing selected recent publications and recordings of interest to readers of *Naturlaut*. We appreciate the assistance of Eduardo Ramirez, who works at Tower Records in Lincoln Park (Chicago). If you know of other recordings or publications to include in future issues, please contact Teng-Leong Chew and James L. Zychowicz.

### NEW AND FORTHCOMING RECORDINGS

#### **Gustav Mahler**

##### **Gustav Mahler: Symphony no. 1**

Rafael Kubelik, conductor, Italian Radio Symphony Orchestra Turin  
Urania CD 55220

##### **Gustav Mahler: Symphony no. 1 and *Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen***

Eugene Ormany, conductor, Frederica von Stade, Philadelphia  
Sony/BMG CD 76233

##### **Gustav Mahler: Symphony no. 2**

Simon Rattle, conductor, City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra.  
EMI Great Recordings of the Century CD 45802 (reissue in this series)

##### **Gustav Mahler: Symphony no. 3**

Carl Schuricht, conductor, Stuttgart Radio Symphonie Orchestra.  
Hänssler Classics CD 93.151 (2-CD set)  
Volume 11 of the Schuricht Collection; includes Strauss's  
*Alpensinfonie*

##### **Gustav Mahler: Symphony no. 4**

Renee Fleming, soprano, Claudio Abbado, conductor, Berlin  
Philharmonic Orchestra.  
Deutsche Grammophon CD 005759  
In addition to Mahler's Fourth Symphony, this CD includes Alban  
Berg's *7 Early Songs* for voice and orchestra.

##### **Gustav Mahler: Symphony no. 6**

Ivan Fischer, conductor, Budapest Festival Orchestra  
Channel Classics CD CCS 22998

##### **Gustav Mahler: Symphony no. 7**

Daniel Barenboim, conductor, Staatskapelle Berlin  
Warner Classics CD 62963

##### **Gustav Mahler: Symphony no. 10 (Cooke version)**

Michael Gielen, conductor, Southwest German Radio Symphony  
Orchestra  
Hänssler Classics CD 93.124

<sup>45</sup> The ridicule that Mahler experienced, for example, at the hands of the Viennese critic Reinhardt, for having made the movement switch, suggests that it would have been almost impossible for him to have undone this decision, at least at any time close to the 1906 premiere. Henry-Louis de La Grange, *Gustav Mahler: Vienna: Triumph and Disillusion* (New York: Oxford University Press 1999), p. 537.

### **Gustav Mahler: Symphonies 1-10**

Gary Bertini, conductor, Kölner Rundfunk (Cologne West German  
Radio Symphony Orchestra)  
EMI Classics CD 40238 (11-CD set)  
This set reissues in a single box Bertini's EMI recordings of all ten of  
Mahler's numbered symphonies and also *Das Lied von der Erde*.  
Among the soloists are Lucia Popp (Symphony no. 4), Marjana  
Lipovšek and Ben Heppner (*Das Lied von der Erde*), Florence Quivar  
(Symphonies no. 2 and 8), and others.

### **Schubert & Mahler Lieder**

Jessye Norman, soprano, Philip Moll, piano, Irwin Gage, piano  
Philips CD 0005510 (2-CD set)  
This reissue includes three selections from *Des Knaben Wunderhorn*  
and two of Mahler's *Rückert-Lieder*.

### **Of Related Interest**

#### **Anton Bruckner**

##### **Bruckner: Symphonie no. 3**

Rafael Kubelik, conductor, Bavarian Radio Symphonie Orchestra  
Audite CD 92534 (Hybrid SACD)

##### **Bruckner: Symphonie no. 6.**

Kent Nagano, conductor, Deutsches Symphonie-Orchester Berlin.  
Harmonic Mundi CD HMC 901901

##### **Bruckner: Nine Symphonies and *Helgoland***

Daniel Barenboim, conductor, Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra  
Warner Classics CD 61891 (9-CD set)  
This set includes Bruckner's *Helgoland* (1893), for orchestra and  
chorus

### **Other Composers**

#### **Franz Schreker: Lieder**

Noemi Nadelmann and Andreas Schmidt, with Adrian Baianu, piano  
Arte Nova CD 721260

#### **Ludwig Thuille (1861-1907)**

##### **Symphony • Piano Concerto**

Oliver Triendl, piano, Alun Francis, conductor, Haydn Orchester von  
Bozen und Trient.  
CPO CD 777 008-2

### **Richard Wagner**

#### **Wagnerian Songs**

Patrick Delcour, baritone, Diane Anderson, piano.  
Includes songs by Emile Mathieu, Sylvain Dupuis, Richard Wagner,  
and Adolphe Biarent. The selections by Wagner involve song  
fragments completed by Berthe di Vito-Delvaux  
Etcetera CD KTC 1276

### **NEW AND FORTHCOMING DVDS**

Uri Caine/ Franz Winter: *Detaching from the World*  
Winter & Winter DVD 915003. *Forthcoming*

### **NEW AND FORTHCOMING PUBLICATIONS**

#### **In English**

Stephen McClatchie. *The Mahler Family Letters*. Oxford University  
Press. November, 2005

Donald Mitchell. *Gustav Mahler: The Wunderhorn Years, Chronicles  
and Commentaries*. 3rd ed. Boydell Press. *Forthcoming*.

### **Of Related Interest**

Raymond Holden. *The Virtuoso Conductors: The Central European  
Tradition from Wagner to Karajan*. New Haven: Yale University Press,  
2005.

In discussing his ideas about a Central-European conducting style,  
Holden devotes chapters to individual conductors, including such  
figures as von Bülow, Nikisch, Mahler, Weingartner, Strauss, Walter,  
Klemperer, Furtwängler, and Karajan.