

The Tenth Symphony – A Continuing Study (Part II)

by Clinton A. Carpenter

This is the continuation of a six-part essay written by Mr. Carpenter in 1977 for the Dutch Mahler Society. We release the first half of in the December 2003 issue to commemorate the Twentieth Anniversary of the world premiere of Mr. Carpenter's completion of the Tenth Symphony. These essays were published in 1978. It is reproduced here with the kind permission from Mr. Clinton Carpenter.

Third Movement

It is somewhat interesting to note the fact that both Cooke and Wheeler originally intended to complete only the second, fourth, and fifth movements, assuming that the first and third movements would be played in the "Krenek" version, which was already available. At the time I started my work on the Tenth, I had no information that anybody else had done any part of the symphony, so I worked on all five movements from the very start. This may account for the fact that I find the "Krenek" version of this movement much less satisfactory than evidently Cooke did. There is a great similarity between the Cooke and "Krenek" versions of this movement. Since I do not know the Wheeler version, I don't know how much his present version differs from the "Krenek" version.

My prime object in this movement was to orchestrate this music so that it is of equal weight with the other four movements. At present, it mostly sounds as if it is a "Lied" from the period of the Second or Third Symphonies. The changes that I have made in this movement were all made with the intent to make this music more "symphonic". I have considered the music as it now exists as only a sketch and not the final version.

Cooke retained the title "*Purgatorio*" for this movement. I have deleted it because I feel that Mahler wouldn't have used it for the final version. Also, it will cause unnecessary extramusical discussion. I feel that the title "*Purgatorio*" should merely be an indication of the mood of the movement. I have used "*Unheimlich bewegt*" at the beginning to try to indicate the basic mood, which is seen as more tragic than Cooke. Just two examples: the oboe part in measure 97 is marked "*klagend*" and there is no "*drängend*" at measure 101 (which tends to liven up the movement). A perspective listener may hear echoes of other Mahler works in the first and last parts of my version of this movement.

The timing of this movement in the Morris recording takes 4 ½ minutes and my timing is 4¾ minutes. There are only minor differences between Cooke and myself in tempi. Both of us discard the continual *accelerando* (in measures 35 through 84) called for in the "Krenek" version.

In a movement as short as this, there would seem to be no possibility of a difference in the number of measures, but there is. Both Cooke and the "Krenek" version have 170 measures, whereas I have 168. The difference is the result of a difference in reading the manuscript for measures 78 to 81 in the Cooke score. I use only two measures instead of four. To clearly understand this, it would be necessary to show the manuscript so that the reader could have an exact idea of the situation. There are two measures above the staff that Krenek and Cooke treat as additional measures, whereas I treated those measures as an additional voice superimposed on the two measures below. Possibly this is a technical error of the manuscript (the reader is requested to refrain from comment), but having lived with my own version for so many years I like it better this way.

As usual in the matter of authenticity, Cooke always keeps to the notes of the orchestral score and manuscript written by Mahler. When Cooke decided to rewrite the "Krenek" version, he did make a few changes. He omitted some doublings and cleaned up some of the orchestration. Also eliminated were some of "Krenek's" extra voices. This evidently is one

movement to which Cooke did not make any changes, from his first version to his final version. In contrast to Cooke, I have deviated quite a bit from the manuscript in this movement (much further than in any other movement). Many commentators have written that Mahler would have done just that. There are major differences between the first section and the *da capo* section in my version. I have also added additional voices and have actually changed the notes in some instances. (Do I hear cries of outrage?)

There is more difference in the instruments used by Cooke and myself than in the other movements. This is because I have used reduced woodwinds and brass and Cooke uses all his instruments. Cooke uses four flutes (with an alternate piccolo), four oboes, four clarinets (one in E-flat and three in B-flat/A), and four bassoons. You will note there is no English horn or bass clarinet. I used only triple woodwinds: three flutes, three oboes (with an alternate English horn), three B-flat/A clarinets, and three bassoons. I used no piccolo, E-flat clarinet, or bass clarinet. In the brass, Cooke uses his usual 4-4-4-1. I used 4-3-3-0; you will note the reduction of one trumpet and no tuba in this movement. In the percussion, Mahler has indicated a timpani part and a gong. Cooke uses no additional percussion. In addition to those instruments called for by Mahler, I use a bass drum and cymbals. The harp part that both of us use was indicated by Mahler. One comment might be made concerning the strings. In contrast, I use divided strings (as in "*Das irdische Leben*") in the *da capo* section.

There are also some general differences in orchestration. My orchestration is fuller than Cooke's. This is part of my design to strengthen this movement. I have made much use of staccato accompaniment notes in the woodwinds and brass. It should be pointed out that all three versions (i.e., including the "Krenek") differ in the orchestration even when setting the same notes of the manuscript. This contradicts Cooke's statement that the manuscript is crystal clear as to what instruments Mahler desired in this movement. Examples of this will be given later in this article.

In general, there is no real difference in dynamics between any of the three versions. The only exception is the gong note at the end of the "Krenek" version (to be commented on later).

It should be interesting to compare all three versions in some detail from the *da capo* part to the end (starting with measure 126). Although Cooke admits on page xxi of his score that the *da capo* would have been changed, both the "Krenek" version and he used a literal repeat. On the other hand, I have actually changed instruments, changed register and even used different notes. The furthest I deviated from the original manuscript is in measures 134 and following where I used a French horn solo, which is quite different from the original flute. Also in measures 144 and following I used a variant in the cellos and basses instead of the original oboe. In the coda (starting in measure 154) it is interesting to note that both the "Krenek" version and Cooke use identical instruments. However, my choice of instruments varies quite a bit from those versions. In addition, additional elements have been added to darken the mood. It might be worthwhile to repeat that my version was written years before I knew the "Krenek" or the Cooke versions. So my version isn't different just for the sake of being different.

The final note for the gong is an interesting point of comparison. For years, performances based on the "Krenek" version ended with a *fortissimo* crash, completely ruining the mood. Cooke corrected this when his version came out, but he still has a *forte* in the string basses. My version is *piano* for all instruments. The erroneous loud gong is comparable to the tremendous drum whacks at the end of the fourth movement and in the fifth movement, which is a point that will be discussed in the article on the fifth movement. Hopefully, the drum beats will eventually be corrected, similarly to this gong beat.

To summarize, it was my intent to bring this movement more on a par with the rest of the symphony. This has led me to make more drastic changes than in any other movement. I hope that this movement in my version will evoke in the listener a different impression than it does at present.

Fourth Movement

This movement was much changed in Cooke's later version. Comparing the first edition of Cooke's version with his final version, on the whole I like the latter much better. However, I do object to his lessening of the dynamic level in this movement. This was one of his stated objectives. However, more about this later in the article. There is still a basic difference between my version and Cooke's. I see this as a tragic movement; Cooke's almost happy ending doesn't fit in with my concept at all. For example, pages 117 to 119 in the Cooke score have staccato notes; there are none in my version (only slurs). I have used no parody in my version. Cooke specifically calls for this in measure 219 (page 94). This place is merely marked "Tanz" in the manuscript. I don't consider this place to be a parody. Cooke has a quite a bit lighter texture than is in my version. This is especially true of those places in the Cooke version that sound similar to the waltz sections from the Fifth Symphony (measure 248 and following on page 97-98 and measure 410 and following on page 109-110 in the Cooke score). It is obvious that Cooke and I see different things in this movement. Just to mention one instance: on page 92 (measures 196 and following) Cooke uses the first violin and English horn. I have used first and second violins *molto espressivo* (I consider this one of the most beautiful sections of the symphony).

To turn to the timing of this movement, the Wyn Morris recording is about 1½ minutes shorter than my timing. Morris takes this movement in 13 ¼ minutes, and I time it as 14 ¾ minutes. The tempi are basically the same in both versions but mine are somewhat slower. On the other hand, I find the ending of this movement much too slow by Morris (Cooke has marked it "Langsamer" on page 117 and "poco rit." on page 119).

When we come to the number of measures in this movement, this is the movement in which there is the greatest difference by far—12 measures between the two versions. Cooke's has 578 and I have 590. How could such a difference occur? Mainly because there are quite a few questions as to what Mahler wanted deleted. He might write a section, line it out, and then give a possible indication that it was to be reinstated. Cooke and I differ quite a bit as to what is to be deleted. Sometimes I included a section merely because it contained music that was heard only once elsewhere, and I felt that the music should be heard again. The following is an outline of the differences between the two versions (using the AMP/Faber score):

Page	Measure(s)	Number of measures omitted	Additional number of measures in my version*
85	107	Cooke omitted four measures	+4
88	144	Carpenter omitted one measure	+3
108	393	Cooke omitted one measure	+4
108-109	397	Cooke omitted eight measures	+12
116	511	Carpenter omitted one measure	+11
118	549	Cooke combined two measures into one	+12

*The last column is to show the relationship of measure numbers in the two versions. For examples, measure 110 in the Cooke version would be measure 114 in my version (note the +4). Measure 410 in Cooke's version would be measure 422 in my version (because of the +12).

As always, Cooke carefully retains the notes written by Mahler in the manuscript. On the other hand, I am more liberal, as usual, changing pitch (an octave up or down) and even varying melodic line in some cases. Both Cooke and I have added additional voices; I have added many more.

This is the movement in which both editors "pulled out all the stops" in the instruments used, especially Cooke. In the woodwinds, both of us use our full complement of instruments (given earlier). Basically, this is the same in both versions except for the use of the piccolo. I use a separate piccolo part, and Cooke alternates the piccolo with the fourth flute. In the brass, there is the usual difference of one more trombone in Cooke's orchestration. In the manuscript, Mahler indicates the following percussion instruments: timpani, cymbals attached to the bass drum, and muffled bass drum (for more about the latter, see the end of the movement). In addition to these, both of us use glockenspiel, triangle, and cymbals. I use a gong; Cooke's score also indicates a gong for this movement, but it is not used. In addition, Cooke's score also indicates the following (not used by me): snare drum (very important part), military drum (for the "muffled drum"; I used a bass drum, as specified), Rute (certainly gives a Mahlerian touch), and xylophone. For the timpani part, Cooke calls for two players, whereas I call only for one (Mahler does not specify two players). We both use one harp, and both use important *glissandi* not indicated by Mahler in the manuscript. Interestingly enough, the glissandos are used in different places (Cooke on pages 95 and 110, and I used *glissando* on page 116, measure 520).

There is a vast difference between the orchestration used by Cooke and that used by me. This shows what a wide variation is possible using the same basic notes written by Mahler, but it should be remembered that there are not many instrumental indications in the manuscript. The orchestration of Cooke is much more transparent. My orchestration is much fuller, even in the soft places. One such example is on page 112 (measure 452 and following) where Cooke's orchestration is much simpler than mine.

There are major differences in the dynamics between the two versions. My version is much louder than Cooke's. Cooke states that the dynamic level has been reduced from the first version to allow the climaxes to stand out. Frankly, I like his first version better in this respect. One excellent example of this is on page 115, where the manuscript has *fortississimo* and Cooke uses only trumpets, violin *pizzicati*, a cello tremolo, and a timpani roll. There are also some places where my version is loud and Cooke's is soft—pages 88 (measure 152 and following) and 108 (measure 387 and following) are good examples of this. And sometimes the reverse is true—as on page 113 (measure 482 and following), where Cooke is loud and my version is soft.

The movement ends in the Cooke version with one of the two major errors of the symphony (naturally, this is only my opinion). This is the tremendous crash of the military drum (marked "muffled bass drum" in the manuscript) on the last beat. Since this is repeated quite a few times in the final movement, I shall postpone my discussion of this until the last movement. You will remember that the other major error, in my estimation, is the tempo of the second movement.

Of all five movements, I see this as the most tragic of all and filled with climax after climax. My orchestration tries to make this clear.

Fifth Movement

Cooke has indicated that he "cleaned up" the *Allegro moderato* section of this movement in his final version. I find it much better than in the first version. However, there still remains a great deal of difference in orchestration between my version and his—at the beginning and at the end of this movement. Also, this is the movement that contains the other great misconception of this symphony. (The first being the tempo of the second movement.) However, there will be much more about this when the subject of dynamics is discussed later.

First, let's turn to the duration of this movement. There is a considerable difference in the timing between the two versions. The Morris recording takes 27 ¾ minutes, whereas my timing is 22 minutes. Hence, my version appears to be 5 ¾ minutes shorter. However, this difference is mainly that of a given interpretation, rather than a basic difference in conception, as there is in the second movement. This is proven by the fact that both Ormandy and Martinon (using the Cooke version) are timed at 21 and 20 ½ minutes, respectively. Basically the tempi are the same in each version, except that Morris adopts tempi quite a bit slower at the beginning and at the end.

In contrast to the fourth movement, there is no real difference in the number of measure in the two versions—Cooke's has 400, and I have 399. The difference is on page 152, where in measures 280 and 281, Cooke adds one measure, whereas I have one measure only together with a hold sign on the trumpet note.

In the matter of authenticity, Cooke, as usual, sticks to the exact notes that the manuscript has. I have varied pitch, changed melodic lines, and sometimes altered the time values (quarter notes instead of a half note). Both of us have added additional voices, but I have added much more. Due to the nature of the manuscript, there are a number of places where it is difficult to determine the number of beats in a measure. There are four places where Cooke has a 4/4 measure and I have a 3/4 measure. Twice it is vice versa. In one place, Cooke has 4/4 whereas I use 2/4 with a hold sign. In connection with the additions to the score, it might be mentioned that I use the main five-note "motto" in quite a few places where it is not indicated by Mahler, especially in the climax on page 152 (in the timpani).

Now, to a comparison of our instrumentation. In the woodwind section, we both use our full complement of instruments (both of us use a separate English horn part). Cooke calls for the piccolo to alternate with a flute, while I use a separate piccolo part. The manuscript calls for two contrabassoons, so this "extravagance" is not attributable to the editors. Cooke uses four bassoons and no contrabassoon sometimes, while I use one contrabassoon all through the movement and alternate the other one. We both use our full complement of brass instruments (Cooke has an extra trombone). Both of us use timpani, bass drum, cymbals, and gong in the percussion. Cooke uses a military drum for the "muffled" bass drum part, while I use the bass drum as called for in the manuscript. In addition, I use a triangle and Glockenspiel (Cooke uses neither). We both use harps—Cooke has one part, while I use two harps. There is not too much similarity in the harp parts—I use them when Cooke doesn't, and vice versa.

Since the instrumentation is so exposed at the beginning of the movement and also at the end, it is very informative to compare the two versions. I do not use a solo tuba at the beginning as Cooke does. I start with string basses and later use a bass clarinet and other instruments. The same also applies when this part returns on page 127—Cooke uses the solo tuba, whereas I use the cellos. There is also a further difference—Cooke uses the held lower notes (as in the manuscript), whereas many times I have used rhythmic figures instead. On the whole, I use a fuller instrumentation; one example is on page 123 where my accompaniment to the flute solo involves more instruments (including both harps). On page 147, Cooke has second violins and clarinets, whereas I use the full orchestra. A few times the reverse occurs—page 135 is one such example where my orchestration is thinner than Cooke's.

The end of the symphony (pages 162 to 164) indicates a basic difference between the two versions. I have attempted to make this as beautiful and expressive as possible. I wanted to achieve a level of supreme beauty equal to the ending of *Das Lied von der Erde* and the Ninth Symphony. In measure 380, I have used cellos and not a bass clarinet, violins and not flutes. In measure 384, where Cooke uses three solo second violins, I have used all the second violins *divisi*. In measure 394, where Cooke has used a solo cello and a bass clarinet for the two parts, I have used the cellos *divisi*. The ending of the symphony is for strings alone; there are no horns in my version.

There are plenty of minor differences in dynamics (i.e., loud and soft) between the two versions, as would be expected in a manuscript that was not completely finished. But the only major difference is the famous drum beat that starts this movement and is heard again and again throughout the first part. To get a proper background for this music, one must go to Alma Mahler's book *Gustav Mahler: Memories and Letters*. Using the Basil Creighton translation of 1946, published by the Viking Press of New York, there appears on pages 122 and 123 an incident concerning a funeral. "It was the funeral cortège of a fireman. . . . From our eleventh floor window, we could only guess what [the master of ceremonies] said. There was a brief pause and a roll of muffled drums, followed by a dead silence. . . [Mahler's] face was streaming with tears. The brief roll of the muffled drums impressed him so deeply that he

used it in the Tenth Symphony". In the German edition of this book, published in 1949 by Bermann-Fischer Verlag (on page 170), there is the following clarification: "*Der Obmann tritt vor, hält eine kurze Ansprache, wir ahnen im 11. Stock mehr also wir hören, dass gesprochen wird. Kurze Pause, dann ein Schlag auf die verdeckte Trommel. . . .*" (The underlining is my own). If the drum beats in the symphony are to echo this episode, then the tremendous whacks that are always heard are completely out of place. A drum stroke on a muffled drum eleven floors up doesn't sound as it does in the Morris record, or any other performance. However, there is no question that Mahler has indicated *forte* in the manuscript, although Cooke increases this to *fortissimo*. But surely, it is easy enough to imagine a beat that would be *forte* on an unmuffled drum that would sound softly on a muffled drum. Furthermore, there are instances in Mahler's scores where instruments are instructed to play *forte* or *fortissimo* and the sound level as instructed by Mahler in the score is to be *piano*. To eliminate any difficulty on this point, I have marked all these drum beats (except one at a climax) to be *piano* or softer. As indicated in Alma's book, these beats should be felt rather than heard, which may be somewhat of a problem for the conductor. But even if they are only played softly, these places would be 100% better than at the present.

There are some further differences in dynamics between the two versions. On page 124, my version crescendos to *fortissimo*. On page 125 (measure 58), I used the brass *fortissimo* and also *fortissimo* later. On page 128, starting with the *Allegro moderato*, I follow the instructions in the manuscript and keep a "*sempre pp*" until page 133. One last example—on page. 141 (measure 185) where Cooke is soft, I continue on *fortissimo*.

To conclude this series of articles, I should perhaps reiterate some points made in the first article. It should be obvious that these articles are a very inadequate way of comparing the two versions. Only by comparing the scores in detail can an adequate comparison be made. This would also apply to Wheeler's score. However, as I expressed earlier, I feel a similar series of articles by Wheeler would be beneficial since all three scores are not available to the public.

I would like to emphasize again that the printing of the Cooke version with the manuscript is a monumental achievement for which all Mahler lovers should rejoice, since it makes the music much more accessible to the average musician.

Although I do look forward to the day when I will be able to hear my own version played, I would like to see the drum beats correct in performances of the Cooke version (just as the gong beat in the AMP score at the end of the third movement was previously corrected).

When I started work on the Tenth Symphony, it was completely visionary to hope for a hearing of a completed Tenth, a complete critical edition of Mahler's works, or recordings for all his works. With the first and last accomplished and the second item progressing very well, I now look forward to the day when the Tenth Symphony will take its rightful place among the other nine symphonies.



The Chicago Mahlerites welcome the following new members:

Barbara Peterson from Evanston, Illinois
David L. Hooker from Chicago, Illinois
Flyod Wige from Lakewood, Washington
Robert Goldman from Chicago, Illinois
Yosef Gruenbaum from Jerusalem, Israel
Charles Conrad from Carmel, Indiana