

The Tenth Symphony – A Continuing Study (Part I)

by Clinton A. Carpenter

This six-part essay was written in 1977 for the Dutch Mahler Society, and was published in 1978. It is reproduced here with the kind permission from Mr. Clinton Carpenter. Part II of this essay will be published in the next issue of *Naturlaut*.

Introduction

A few things should be mentioned immediately. First of all, I am not a professional writer. If you are expecting brilliantly written prose, you won't find it. Also I want to make clear that my articles are not designed as an attack on the Cooke version. However, the work that Cooke has done to further the cause of a complete Tenth Symphony, both in his score and his writings, is incalculable.

As will be explained shortly, there are several versions of the Tenth that can be performed. For an adequate comparison of the versions, there should be printed scores and recordings for all versions. I realize that, at the present time, this is completely visionary. (But so was a "complete" Tenth Symphony when I started work on it). The next best solution would be a comprehensive article of all versions with many musical examples showing the same passage in the various versions. Unfortunately, the article cannot be written by me since I do not have access to all versions. Therefore, I will have to content with a verbal description of Cooke's version and mine.

What versions of the Tenth are there? There are three – versions by Cooke, Wheeler and myself. Cooke's versions were written from 1959 to 1972. Joseph Wheeler of England started his version in 1948 or 1953 (depending on your source) and his final version was finished about 1965. My version was started in 1946 and the final version was finished in 1966. A review of these dates will show that the Wheeler version and mine (working independently) were started years ahead of Cooke's work and the AMP publication of the two movements by Krenek, *et al.* The Wheeler version has orchestral parts available and copyright clearance; my version has neither as yet. Since I do not have access to Wheeler's score, I cannot make any comparison with his score. I would find it very enlightening to have a similar article (or series of articles) written by Wheeler comparing his version with Cooke's.

The reader may have read of other versions besides these three¹. There was one by Hans Wollschläger of Germany, but he discontinued work on it and decided not to allow his version to be played. (Obviously this is ammunition for those who don't want a completed version at all!) There are also numerous references in articles to what I call "ghost versions" – reports concerning a certain version, but no verification can ever be obtained about it.

Besides the printed scores to all versions of the Tenth (idealistic as that is), there is also a need for a Critical Edition of the last four movements. By this I mean a score that would only indicate what Mahler wrote, similar to that appearing at the bottom of the Cooke score. You may ask why this is needed when the "Urtext" is already in the Cooke score. First of all, I do not feel that the original text should be appended to one of the versions – it should be printed separately. Also I have further objections to the manuscript as printed in the Cooke version. However, I should like to emphasize that this printing in the Cooke score is very beneficial, since the Internationale Gustav Mahler Gesellschaft (IGMG) never issued a second volume to follow up the *Adagio*. The second movement of the manuscript would be very much better if completely detached from the additions of the Cooke score. Since two versions of the original manuscript are published, I feel that the Critical Edition should be published on the following criteria. First of all, the score should not contain the lining out and alternate versions, but only the editor's best guess as to the correct notes. Any variants should be discussed in the Appendix. There should be no notes without stems and all time signatures should be put in and not left

blank. If there is any doubt, the best guess should be taken and an explanation given in the Appendix. All clefs should be noted and not left blank. The systems (there are four to six in a Mahler manuscript) should be clear in their voice leading and not necessarily the same as Mahler used in the manuscript. In other words, a score for musicians and not for musicologists.

One subject always coming up in a discussion of the Cooke version is his use of the term "Performing Version", instead of completion or finished. Let us set one point straight at once. Both Cooke and I (and all other people) agree that only Mahler could have completed the symphony as it should have been. But both of us feel that completion by someone else is better than nothing at all. The only real difference is that I have no objection to the word "completion" and Cooke did. When the term "performing version" was first used, it seemed to connote that no voices had been added by Cooke and that only "block" harmonies were used in the orchestration. A glance at Cooke score will show how wrong this view is. Cooke did add supplementary voices and the orchestration is not "block harmony" but in the Mahler style. For the amount of additions and changes each editor used, the reader will have to wait for later articles concerning the individual movements. Cooke and I agree that a completed score is unacceptable without additional filling out.

Page xiii of the Cooke score indicates some of the stages that Cooke went through in working with the manuscript of the Tenth Symphony. My progression was very similar. It would be interesting to know Wheeler's comments on this. As for me, I went through the following stages:

1. I couldn't touch anything in the manuscript; it would be a sacrilege
2. I made a piano version (4 hands), but couldn't touch the orchestration
3. I worked out the manuscript in orchestral dress, but added nothing and used only "block harmonies"
4. The orchestral version had additional voices and real orchestration
5. I allowed myself some variation in the notes that Mahler had written in the manuscript (variations based on other Mahler works)

While I progressed to No. 5, Cooke stopped at No. 4. Cooke never altered a note of the manuscript. I did so only if I thought Mahler would have done so in a later revision. I will admit that this opens the door to all sort of subjective guessing.

Now for some general comments comparing the Cooke version with mine. I am making the basic assumption that the reader will have access to the Cooke score and the Wyn Morris recording (This is quite an assumption considering the price of the score). There is an important difference between Cooke and myself regarding the general mood of the symphony. This is important not from a literary standpoint, but because it affects the way the music is orchestrated. Cooke sees this symphony as "a renewed belief in life and a calm acceptance of the end". I see the work as one of profound tragedy despite the second movement and the lyric sections of the Finale.

Cooke no longer divides the symphony into two large parts as he did in an earlier version. It is now just as the manuscript indicates – a five-movement symphony. So we agree on the structure of the symphony. However, I attach much more importance to the use of a five-note "motto" as a connecting link between the movements.

Turning to tempi and the duration of the entire symphony, there would obviously be some differences. In the overall timing there is only a difference of ¼ minute between the recording conducted by Morris and my timing. (Morris takes one hour nineteen and ¾ minutes, and my last timing was one hour and twenty minutes). I am assuming that the Morris is very close to what Cooke considered ideal, since Mr. Morris was given exclusive rights to the Cooke final version for two years. Despite the almost equal durations for the entire symphony, there are big differences in the individual movements, which equalize out over the entire whole. For example, my timing of the second movement is quite a bit longer than Cooke's which is balanced by the Finale being

¹ Refer to *Naturlaut* Vol.1 No. 2 pp. 8-11, 2002 for complete current listing.

much slower in the Morris record. As far as tempi are concerned, both Cooke and I agree that there are tempo changes that are not marked in the manuscript.

As far as dynamics (e.g. loudness) are concerned, there are many small differences between the two versions as one would expect in a work lasting an hour and twenty minutes since there are very few indications in the manuscript concerning dynamics.

It may be surprising to learn that there is a difference in the total number of measures in the symphony between the two versions. However, there is no point in mentioning the totals here as the various differences will be discussed in later articles involving the individual movements.

One of the biggest differences between the two versions is in the matter of authenticity (i.e. are the notes in the manuscript always used?). Cooke always uses the notes on the Mahler manuscript, both orchestral score and short score. I have used a freer approach. I have changed certain instruments in the first and second movements, where I feel that Mahler might have made the changes later. (Again, I realize the dangerous direction that this thinking leads to). Then there is the matter of additions to what Mahler actually wrote. Although both Cooke and I have made additions to the manuscript, I have added many more voices. This was done not just for the sake of adding something, but because I felt the score would be too bare without such additions. Both scores have a similar Mahler score look, with correct keys for brass instruments, German names for instruments and Mahler-like terms for tempo markings.

In regard to the instruments used, information on the Wheeler version would be very interesting since I don't have it. Therefore, this comparison is strictly between Cooke's score and my version. In the woodwinds Cooke uses a 4-4-5-4 combination and I used a 5-4-5-4. In other words, both of us used the same woodwinds except for flutes and piccolo where I used one more instrument. The oboes and English Horn, clarinets (E♭, B♭, and bass) and bassoons with contra-bassoons all have the same total. In the brass Cooke uses one more instrument. Cooke uses 4-4-4-1 and I use 4-4-3-1. Thus Cooke uses an extra trombone. The following percussions are called for by Mahler in the score and manuscript: kettledrums, bass drum, bass drum and cymbals combined, and gong. However, both Cooke and I use cymbals, triangle and Glockenspiel. In addition to these, Cooke also uses a snare drum, rute, xylophone and a military drum (for the *Gedämfte Trommel* in the fourth and fifth movements). Besides the usual strings, Cooke requires one harp while I use two harps.

First Movement

This is the second in a series of articles comparing the Cooke edition of the Mahler Tenth Symphony with my version. If you only remember one thing from this article, I hope it will be the thought that the *Adagio* as printed in the Critical Edition does not indicate Mahler's final ideas concerning this movement. Although the first movement is by far the most complete of the five movements, the music that exists in the manuscript is not what it would have been had Mahler lived to complete the symphony. As Cooke so well pointed out in the Introduction to his score, Mahler did not live to start the final version of this symphony.

Unfortunately, the publishing of this Critical Edition by the official Mahler Society has seemed to convince many conductors and music lovers that the first movement is exactly as Mahler would have left it in the final version, and therefore only the *Adagio* should be played. Obviously, the *Adagio* should have been printed in the Critical Edition to show the musical world the exact state of the manuscript and to indicate the variations with the "Krenek" published version. However, the remaining four movements should also have been published in the Critical Edition. It is unfortunate that so many feel that the *Adagio* is perfectly completed and everything else in the symphony is better left unplayed. The fact is that the entire symphony is incomplete and that the first movement is merely more complete than the others. I refer the reader to two sections of the Critical Edition where Mahler could not possibly have left the music as it now stands if he had lived: measures

137-140 and 178-183. There is just no way that this is the final orchestration.

Now to some other matters. The timing of the first movement is 21 ¾ minutes in the recording of Wyn Morris and 24 minutes in my timing. The difference is mainly one of performance rather than one of concepts. I prefer parts of the opening *Adagio* very slow. This balances the first movement with the Finale much more than in the Morris recording, in which the *Adagio* is shorter than mine and the Finale is much longer. There are quite a few places where Mahler has not indicated any tempo change, but both Cooke and I are often similar in these places even though we may not use the same German words. As one might expect, there are a few places where there are some differences in tempi between our two versions.

In comparing either of our versions with the Critical Edition, there are a number of comments that can be made. First of all, both Cooke and I have the same number of measures as the Critical Edition. Cooke has always kept the notes that Mahler wrote (i.e. the Critical Edition) and has changed nothing. On the other hand, I have sometimes changed an instrument, on the theory that Mahler might have changed it in a later revision. Both Cooke and I have added doublings that are not in the original manuscript. I have doubled more than Cooke did, but my doublings are by and large, not as "complete" as Cooke's. In other words, I might double just a few notes in an instrument, instead of the whole melodic phrase. Both Cooke and I have added some additional voices. The interesting thing is that they are mainly in different places, showing that what appeared incomplete to one editor was not considered so by the other. In the Cooke score (Faber/AMP), his additions appear twice on page 10 and then the famous Bassoon addition of page 17. Two of my additions appear in measures 76-8 and 137 and following (I added a horn part in the latter).

For a comparison of the orchestration, let us start with the Woodwinds. Cooke uses four flutes with an alternate piccolo. I used four flutes plus a separate piccolo part. Cooke use four oboes and no English horn; I used three oboes and a separate English horn. Both of us use 5 clarinets but differ in which ones. Cooke uses four B♭/A clarinets with a separate Bass clarinet. I used a E♭ clarinet, three B♭ clarinets and a bass clarinet. Both of us use a total of four bassoons and contra-bassoon. Cooke uses four bassoons with an alternate contra-bassoon; I use three bassoons with a separate contra-bassoon. The brass section has the usual difference in the trombone that I noted in my first article. Cooke uses no percussion instrument at all. I used them sparingly – the kettledrum twice, the bass drum three times and the cymbals once. There is the usual difference in harps – Cooke uses one and I use two. In reviewing the Cooke score, I see that he has the harp doubling the horn more than I do.

As far as the actual notations in the score, both of us use more than the Critical Edition has. However, I use many more notations than Cooke does. As an example, the viola recitatives have many more expression marks in my score than in Cooke's.

I would again like to stress the point that the Critical Edition is not the only correct edition for performance of the first movement. In fact, I personally find any of the other three versions (Cooke, Krenek, and mine) more satisfactory in performance than the Critical Edition. The reader will note that I have included the much-maligned "Krenek" version also. It may be that some conductors play the *Adagio* in the Critical Edition with the idea that this is the only authentic Mahler in the Symphony, and therefore they do not have to examine the "completed" versions. If this is so, they should at least understand that the *Adagio* of the Tenth, despite its magnificent music, is not a finished work in the sense that the *Adagio* from the Ninth Symphony is.

Second Movement

In every performance that I have ever heard of the Tenth Symphony (either in concert, on records or over the radio), the second movement is by far the least satisfactory of all the movements. The usual critical reaction ranges from "What a tragedy that Mahler left this work so incomplete" to "Mahler would either have totally revised this movement or omitted it." It is my personal feeling that this "problem" can be solved by doing two things: adopting a much slower tempo for the entire

movement and by adding additional voices to fill in all the empty places of the manuscript. If the tempo is slower, the harmonic changes make much more sense. At the tempo usually taken, much is just a jumble. To me, the tempo in this movement is one of the two big misconceptions in the symphony at present – the other being the drum beats in the fourth and fifth movements. My orchestration for this movement is much fuller than Cooke's with many more added voices. Cooke's orchestration has a much more sparse look. My fuller orchestration is probably due to the fact that my tempo is designed to be slower. This is especially true of the first part of the movement.

How slow would I desire the performance? The timing of the Morris recording is 12 ¼ minutes for my timing. My timing is therefore only 2 ¼ minutes longer, so I am not speaking of taking everything twice as slowly. Cooke keeps the tempo marking of the manuscript that refers to "Alla Breve" and "entire measure in one beat". I have used the tempo indication: "*In gemächlicher Bewegung. Ohne Hast*" to indicate to the conductor a more moderate tempo. I would urge the conductor to forget about "alla breve" and think in terms of each beat. In a word: "Don't hurry". I have also used the tempo gradations that Mahler used in the Ninth Symphony; Tempo I, Tempo (on page 33) and Tempo III (on page 39). Cooke merely indicates "*noch gemessener*" for my Tempo II and "*Plötzlich viel langsamere*" for my Tempo III. As might be expected, Cooke and I differ in minor ways in tempi during the movement, since little if any indication is given in the manuscript. One such place is on pages 46 and 47 where I use a "*drägend*" and Cooke uses "*ein wenig zurückhaltend*".

There is a difference of one measure between the two versions. Cooke has 522 and I have 521 measures. The difference is caused by measure 44. The manuscript has no indication of 2 measures and I therefore used a time signature of 8/4. Cooke has divided up the manuscript into two measures of 2/2.

Cooke will be much more satisfying to the purist than I will be in the matter of authenticity. Cooke always keeps the instruments that Mahler used in the manuscript. I treated the manuscript as an early version, in which Mahler would have made many changes, so I have altered the instruments in many instances. I have always felt that this is one of the reasons this movement is so unsatisfactory in performance. There are many places given to the trombones that I do not feel would have ended up that way in the final version. I have made these changes, whereas Cooke evidently felt that this was not permissible. Since there is almost no indication of the actual time signatures for individual measures (the manuscript merely has /4 at the beginning), it is not surprising that a few measures are different in the two versions. For instance, on page 51 (measure 369) Cooke has 2/2 whereas I used 5/4. One of the most important points of authenticity is whether any additional voices are added. Both Cooke and I felt that this was absolutely necessary. But there are many more additions in my version, probably because of the slower tempi that I desire.

To compare the orchestration, let us start with the woodwinds. Both Cooke and I use a piccolo, which is not indicated in the manuscript, but Cooke used it as an alternate with the fourth flute, whereas I use it as a separate part, in addition to four flutes. Cooke uses four oboes (and no English Horn) and I use three oboes and a separate English Horn. There is no English Horn in the manuscript. Mahler indicated an E♭ clarinet in the manuscript as well as B♭ clarinets. Cooke uses an E♭ clarinet with three other B♭/A clarinets. I use an E♭ clarinet, three B♭/A clarinets and a bass clarinet (there is no bass clarinet in the manuscript). Both of us use four bassoons with an alternate contra-bassoon. There is no contra-bassoon in the manuscript. There is the usual difference in the brass with Cooke using one more trombone than I do. In the percussion a kettledrum part is indicated by Mahler. In addition to this, we both have used a Glockenspiel, triangle, and cymbals, which are not indicated by Mahler.

In a movement of this length with not too many indications by Mahler concerning dynamics, it is not surprising that Cooke and I differ in some places. In general, I used quite a bit more *p* or *pp* than Cooke. Many times his score continues a section *f* or *ff* straight through, whereas mine doesn't. Of course, there are some places where the reverse is true. There are not many basic differences in mood in the

movement between the two versions. However, there is one place which is completely different (measures 469-77 on page 58). My version has a totally different effect although both versions are soft.

To summarize, I would like to emphasize that the biggest difference between the two versions is one of tempo. With a slower tempo it has been necessary to add many more additional voices. Hopefully, these changes will make this movement a much more satisfactory listening experience. A symphony with one long weak movement will not be played very often. And the Mahler Tenth should be played very often.

In the Next Issue...

FEATURED ESSAY Mahler's Third Symphony

In preparation for the performances of Mahler's Third Symphony by the Milwaukee Symphony Orchestra during March 2004, Susan Filler will contribute a feature article about this symphony, summarizing Mahler's accounts of the compositional process in correspondence during 1895-96 (and complementary reports from Bruno Walter and other eyewitnesses), and the germinal role of the song *Das himmlische Leben* in this symphony as well as the Fourth Symphony. She will also consider questions of overall balance in the Third Symphony that have posed a hazard for conductors, and will offer suggestions for additional reading on the subject. Susan has been asked to present the pre-concert lectures for the two performances in Milwaukee. This article will give our members a leg up in advance of the lectures and concerts.

A Member Remembers...

Our new member Hilliard Levenson will describe a fifteen weeks group study course on Gustav Mahler, his life and music, offered at Northwestern University Institute for Learning and Retirement at the Evanston Campus.

Mahler in Arts: Gustav Klimt's Beethoven frieze

Created around Max Klinger's Beethoven polychrome sculpture in 1902 was the most spectacular *Gesamtkunstwerk* produced by the Secession. This Fourteenth Secession exhibition opened with Gustav Mahler's own wind arrangement of selected motifs from the choral finale of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony and for the following three months became a temple consecrated to the cult of Beethoven, with almost 60,000 visitors. Overshadowing the other Secession members' contributions was Gustav Klimt's frieze (painted on plaster al secco), portraying the liberation of humanity through art: There has been speculation that the armored knight portrayed in the painting is Mahler. Our new member Lynne Chang will discuss the Beethoven frieze that marks the beginning of Klimt's 'golden period'.

Editorial Board

Editor-in-chief	Susan Filler
Associate editors	Teng-Leong Chew Jan Hoepfer
<i>Please send letters and any essay submission to</i>	
Susan Filler	sfiller2@juno.com
Teng-Leong Chew	t-chew@northwestern.edu

Advisory Board

Frans Bouwman	Zoltan Roman
Susan Filler	Stan Ruttenberg
Henry-Louis de La Grange	Benjamin Zander
Joel Lazar	James Zychowicz
Xiujun Li	

Official Website

<http://www.chicago-mahlerites.org>

Mahler Archives Online

<http://www.mahlerarchives.net>

© 2003 The Chicago Mahlerites