

Featured Essay

Mahler's Sketches for the Tenth Symphony

by Steven D. Coburn

Until a few years ago, the Mahler's Tenth Symphony known to the public was a single Adagio movement, with a short intermezzo entitled *Purgatorio* occasionally attached. A recent spate of recordings of "performing versions" or "completions" of the entire Symphony has changed this perception, however, and called attention to the fact that we must reckon with sketches for a full five-movement Symphony. Others have dealt in great detail with the convoluted history of the emergence of this knowledge from a privileged few to the general public, but I will summarize it here.

Mahler's great last effort, which is both a monumental and deeply personal document, has only recently been assessed as such;² it still remains known primarily through the *Adagio* and through the various completions or performing versions. In this article I will discuss the manuscript as Mahler left it, with specific emphasis on its level of completion and potential for performance.

There are 168 surviving pages of manuscript for the Tenth Symphony, one of which has a few sketches on the reverse side.³ There are also a few instances of unusual pagination (Mahler numbered the pages of his sketches from the preliminary sketches on up through the various other states) that suggest missing pages. All of the surviving pages are available in facsimiles. The first of these, published in 1924 by the Paul Zsolnay Verlag, is a model of accuracy and perfection in its duplication of the original. Unfortunately, only 116 of the pages were included. An additional 44 pages, plus the original 116, were published in 1967 by the Verlag Walter Ricke in a competent but less than perfect facsimile. The remaining 5 pages appeared for the first time in the 1975 edition of Cooke's *Performing Version*, and have been included in subsequent editions. A description of most of the sources for the Tenth Symphony is found in Cooke's *Performing Version*.⁴

Franz Schalk introduced the Tenth Symphony to the public in Vienna on 14 October 1924 in the above-described two-movement form. He used a performing version of the *Adagio* and the *Purgatorio* prepared with the collaboration of composer Ernst Křenek.⁵ At about the same time Alma, Mahler's widow, had a large portion of the sketches published in facsimile.⁶ Unfortunately, this facsimile was not widely circulated, and the fact that there was a great deal more material for the Tenth than two movements remained largely unknown.

Years later, in an attempt to bring the remainder of the Symphony to the public, Mahler authority Jack Diether suggested the possibility of a completion to both Dmitri Shostakovich (in 1942) and Arnold Schoenberg (in 1949) in the belief that only another great composer could finish Mahler's work. Both Shostakovich and Schoenberg declined to work on the sketches.

In 1959, musicologist Deryck Cooke completed his first performing version. Although Clinton Carpenter, Hans Wollschläger and Joseph Wheeler were all working on completions of their own at this time, it was Cooke's status as the pre-eminent Mahler specialist of his era, as well as his personal relationship with Alma that allowed his realization to receive a BBC broadcast performance on 19 December 1960. Unfortunately, Alma was no longer happy with the idea of performing the Tenth Symphony, and asked Cooke to refrain from further performances. Three years later, however, she recanted, and shortly before her death later that year, made 44 additional sketch pages available to Cooke. His newly revised performing version premiered on August 13, 1964 at a BBC Henry Wood Promenade Concert, and shortly thereafter was recorded by Eugene Ormandy and the Philadelphia Orchestra.⁷

One would think that at this point, when Mahler's reputation and popularity were beginning to build, and with at least three performing versions in addition to Cooke's extant, that the practice of performing the two-movement torso of the Symphony would have been abandoned. This was not the case, though. It was not until after the publication of Cooke's revised performing version in 1976 that any more recordings of the complete Symphony were made, respectively by Simon Rattle in 1980 and James Levine in 1981. Finally, by the mid-1980s, thanks in part to the Mahler Tenth Symposium held in Utrecht in 1986,⁸ several of the other completions of the Symphony were made known to the scholarly public and eventually were recorded in the 1990's. In 1985, composer Remo Mazzetti completed a new performing version and in 1989, Cooke's re-revised performing version appeared. The rising popularity of the Tenth Symphony was evident in the Mahler Fest X (January 1997, Boulder, Colorado), where several of the versions were performed for the general public.

As with the early performance history, others have already described Mahler's working methods in the Tenth Symphony and detailed descriptions of its manuscripts have already been discussed.⁹ When discussing Mahler's compositional process, it is useful to distinguish the various stages of composition found throughout the sketches and drafts. These stages usually fall into fairly discrete categories, described by Edward R. Reilly and elaborated and expanded by James L. Zychowicz, whose terminology I will adopt here.¹⁰ Mahler normally began a composition with a few isolated ideas, usually written in pocket notebooks. There are no definitive examples of these for the Tenth Symphony. The next stage of the process was to make preliminary, usually single-page sketches that elaborate ideas on large-size paper. Some of these contain merely a few notes or chords but some contain entire passages. Mahler would then number these preliminary sketches in the order in which he wanted them to occur in the movement, but as we shall see, he often added additional pages and revisions after he ordered the pages and before proceeding to the next stage. Only a few isolated single-page preliminary sketches for the Tenth have survived, the great majority are incorporated into some sort of numbered continuity. It is here that Mahler normally made his most extensive changes or corrections and where one can most readily observe his compositional process.¹¹

¹ The most thorough treatment is Claudia Maurer Zenck's "Zur Vorgeschichte der Uraufführung von Mahlers zehnter Symphonie," *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* 39: 4 (1982), pp.245-70, but the most succinct is the introduction to *A Performing Version of the Draft of the Tenth Symphony*, rev. edition, prepared by Deryck Cooke in collaboration with Berthold Goldschmidt, Colin Matthews and David Matthews (London and New York: Faber and Faber, Associated Music Publishers, Inc., 1989), pp. xiii-xlix.

² Steven D. Coburn, *Mahler's Tenth Symphony: Form and Genesis*, Ph.D. diss., New York University, 2002.

³ But for this one exception, Mahler's sketches for the Tenth invariably use a single side of each paper. The orchestral drafts, on the other hand, use both sides.

⁴ Cooke, *Performing Version*, pp. xix-xxii.

⁵ This version was published many years later as *Adagio and Purgatorio from Symphony No. 10* (New York: Associated Music Publishers, 1951). It is riddled with errors and unidentified changes and additions from Mahler's orchestral draft.

⁶ *Gustav Mahler. X. Symphonie: Faksimile-Ausgabe der Handschrift* (Berlin, Vienna, Leipzig: Paul Zsolnay Verlag, 1924).

⁷ Issued in 1965 by CBS, and reissued, digitally remastered, in 1995 by CBS Masterworks (MPK 45882).

⁸ The proceedings of which were published as *Fragment or Completion? Proceedings of the Mahler X Symposium, Utrecht 1986*, ed. Paul Op de Coul; *Mahler Studies* 1, ed. Jos van Leeuwen (The Hague: Universitaire Pers Rotterdam, 1991).

⁹ The original description is found in Cooke's *Performing Version*, pp. xix-xxii; the most exhaustive description is Susan Filler's *Editorial Problems in Symphonies of Gustav Mahler: A Study of the Sources of the Third and Tenth Symphonies*, Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University, 1977, vol.2; while the most succinct is Colin Matthew's "The Tenth Symphony," in *The Mahler Companion*, eds. Donald Mitchell and Andrew Nicholson (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp.491-507.

¹⁰ Edward R. Reilly, 'An Inventory of Musical Sources,' *News About Mahler Research*, 2 (1977), p.3; James L. Zychowicz, *Mahler's Fourth Symphony* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp.2-5.

¹¹ This stage is variously referred to as "composition or continuity drafts" (Matthews, "The Tenth Symphony") or as "preliminary short scores" (Cooke, *Performing Version*). These terms are misleading as they imply that Mahler

All five movements of the Tenth reached at least this level of completion. From this point Mahler proceeded to a more carefully notated draft. This is a refined and elaborated transcription of the numbered preliminary sketches into a discrete, beginning-to-end continuous draft of the movement usually referred to as the short score. Here, Mahler settled most of the major decisions regarding order and key and a fair amount of detail is usually present. It is clear that the first and third movements progressed to this point, since we have both the numbered preliminary sketches and the short score for each. On the other hand, the so-called short scores of the second and the last two movements are harder to define as such, there being only a single state to consider in each instance.

The next step in Mahler's process was the orchestral draft, which he completed for the *Adagio* only. Although he did begin work on the full scores for both the second movement and the *Purgatorio*, they remain unfinished. All of the preceding stages, from the preliminary sketches through the orchestral draft are on oblong-format paper of several sizes.¹² Mahler, of course, never proceeded to the final step for the Tenth Symphony, which would have been a fair copy of the full score in upright format, often inscribed by a copyist.

The order in which Mahler actually accomplished the above steps for the Tenth Symphony cannot be determined with absolute certainty despite the best efforts of several scholars.¹³ As is typical, there is little mention of the details of Mahler's composing in the letters or memoirs from the summer of 1910, when Mahler sketched the Tenth Symphony. These are concerned mostly with matters involving the immanent premiere for the Eighth Symphony and on a more personal level, Alma's affair with Walter Gropius. As interesting as this affair is biographically and regarding its impact on the music of the Symphony itself, it has little bearing on the actual order of composition of the sketches. The primary evidence here is the ordering of pages of the sketches, the markings on several of the movements' folders, and some tenuous inter-movement relationships. Unfortunately, it seems very nearly impossible to establish a detailed and certain chronological scenario of Mahler's creation of the Symphony from this evidence. Most of what follows is conjectural beyond the fact that Mahler must have sketched the bulk of the Symphony between 3 July and 25 August 1910, based upon a reconstruction of the summer of 1910 from Alma's memoirs and various letters.

In spite of its position as the first movement, and its more advanced state of completion, there is no other evidence that Mahler composed the *Adagio* first. In fact, there is more evidence to suggest that the Scherzo in E minor was the first movement he actually completed, perhaps originally as an independent piece. The key bears little relationship to the tonal structure of the remainder of the Symphony and Mahler's incorporation of quotations from this movement in the *Finale* seems gratuitous, suggesting a forced incorporation into the symphonic scheme. The extraordinary amount of vacillation as to the movement's title and placement, which is evidenced on its cover, supports this interpretation. At any rate, whether or not Mahler completed the Scherzo in E minor before he began the *Adagio*, it certainly predates the Scherzo in F-sharp major, which he most likely began after he completed at least the preliminary sketches of the *Adagio*.

The single biographical event that can most likely be placed in context here is that at this point, that is, after the Scherzo in E minor, Scherzo in F-sharp major, and *Adagio* were at least sketched, Mahler learned of Alma's affair with Walter Gropius. Henry-Louis de La Grange has convincingly argued that Mahler must have composed the *Purgatorio*

after this event, and as a direct response to it.¹⁴ If this were the case, it seems likely that Mahler reworked the *Adagio* at the same time. The tonal elements clearly played out in the enormous climax of the *Adagio*, which we know Mahler added later, make little long-range tonal sense without the *Purgatorio* movement. Thus, Mahler probably sketched the *Finale* last and was not able to work through it as thoroughly as the earlier movements of the planned work.

Adagio

The material for the *Adagio* represents at least three stages of work: the preliminary sketches, the short score and the orchestral draft. These include several *Einlage*¹⁵ passages that Mahler used to expand or alter certain sections of the music without having to rewrite entire sketch pages. These exist primarily at the preliminary sketch level, usually added after Mahler had numbered the pages. There are also three unnumbered sketch pages that probably belong with the short score. The preliminary sketches consist of ten numbered pages, including two rewritten ones, resulting in a score of eight pages plus two *Einlage* passages for page VII. Mahler inscribed the materials for the preliminary sketches with Roman numerals, while he used Arabic numerals for the short score – an important distinction. The two *Einlage* passages are interesting, as they are the only indication in this earliest state of the huge climax around which the *Adagio* seems to be structured.

Originally there was no such passage whatsoever. The music preceding the climax simply stopped, then the primary material in F-sharp major resumed immediately after. At some point after completing page VII, Mahler added an *Einlage* passage that also would have been quite dramatic – a pianissimo E-minor chord preceding a floating violin passage – before the resumption of F-sharp major. A later *Einlage* passage in A-flat minor (the first *Einlage* passage is crossed out) suggests the missing climax, since it is in the same key and has a similar sustained A natural, but it still only hints at what Mahler would eventually compose. Overall, the *Adagio* as found in this earliest sketch is substantially shorter, missing not only the climax, but also the viola introduction and much of what eventually became the coda.

The short score, enclosed in a bifolio cover, consists of ten numbered pages, including the rewritten page 8 and a short sketch of the ending of the movement on the early state of the same page. Unlike the Roman numerals found in the preliminary sketches, here, Mahler's numbering is Arabic. Mahler composed three *Einlage* passages for this draft: the first between pages 3 and 4, the second expands the early version of page 8 (the second version of page 8 incorporates the *Einlage* passage), and the third is an unnumbered continuation of the second page 8. In both facsimiles pages 6 and 7 are missing from the short score. These pages bridge the point at which the climax finally appears in the orchestral draft, and for a time there was much speculation as to whether the music on these missing pages was a version of that climax or something different. The discovery of these two pages in the Moldenhauer Archives, now at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, shows that at this point the climax was fully realized as we know it from the full score. Nevertheless, it is significant that Mahler introduced such an important passage at a later stage of his composition.

As to the orchestral draft, Mahler used eight numbered bifolios (rather than single sheets, as in the short scores and sketches) with no *Einlage* passages. As in the short score, the numeration is Arabic. In spite of virtually duplicating the short score, there are some obvious omissions such as the lower string parts in measures 178-181,¹⁶ and some less than obvious omissions such as the relative paucity of woodwind parts. Since the orchestral draft is largely playable as it stands, it has been assumed that the only editorial intervention necessary here would be filling out a few spots of the orchestration, providing some wind

created this stage of composition as a continuous draft, composed beginning-to-end, rather than as a series of sketches that would only become continuous in the short score (*Particell*), which better describes its genesis.

¹² See Filler, *Editorial Problems*, pp.420-22 for a detailed description of paper types.

¹³ Filler, *Editorial Problems*, pp.387-410; Jan Jongbloed "Mahler's Tenth Symphony: The Order of the Composition of its Movements," in *Fragment or Completion? Proceedings of the Mahler X Symposium, Utrecht 1986*, ed. Paul Op de Coul; *Mahler Studies 1*, ed. Jos van Leeuwen (The Hague: Universitaire Pers Rotterdam, 1991), pp.143-53; and Matthews, "The Tenth Symphony," pp. 491-507.

¹⁴ Henry-Louis de La Grange, "The Tenth Symphony: Purgatory or Catharsis?," in *Fragment or Completion? Proceedings of the Mahler X Symposium, Utrecht 1986*, ed. Paul Op de Coul; *Mahler Studies 1*, ed. Jos van Leeuwen (The Hague: Universitaire Pers Rotterdam, 1991), pp. 154-63.

¹⁵ An "Einlage" passage is a short segment of music, often sketched on a separate sheet of paper or on the back of a sketch page, which functions as an insert to or replacement of a previously composed passage by way of expansion or alteration.

¹⁶ All measure numbers throughout this article refer to Cooke's transcription of the draft.

doublings, and perhaps adding a few subtle counterpoints where the texture seems inappropriately thin. Unfortunately, Mahler's late addition of the climax and his difficulties composing the coda, taken in the context of the Ninth Symphony where he re-ordered the entire second movement *after* completing the orchestral draft, leads me to concur with Colin Matthews in questioning the "finality" of the form of the *Adagio*.¹⁷ Naturally, it would be impossible to anticipate any large-scale recomposition, and since the movement is cohesive and effective as it stands (perhaps even more so than the first movement of the Ninth) it may well already exist in a nearly finished state. As such, the *Adagio* presents minimal obstacles to a performing version.

Scherzo in F-sharp Major

The state of the sketches for the Scherzo in F-sharp major is more complex than that of the *Adagio*. Cooke holds that all we have is what appears to be a 12-page short score, with some 11 additional sketch pages, plus an orchestral draft. The 23 pages that are preliminary to the orchestral draft cannot be divided this way as that would imply that the 11 pages of sketches represent a discrete earlier state from the 12 page short score. What we actually have is a numbered score comprised of preliminary sketches, where the 11 sketch pages are either multiple attempts at or *Einlage* passages for the 12 pages of preliminary sketch that represent the first continuous state of the movement. There is only a single continuous set of materials for this Scherzo, and as such, we ought to consider it as a preliminary sketch rather than as the short score. Mahler's numbering in Roman supports this interpretation, as does the great quantity of *Einlage* passages and multiple attempts at pages – a state more characteristic of preliminary sketches than short scores. As the only other score for this movement is the orchestral draft, one might wonder if there is a missing intervening short score. Colin Matthews points out, though, that the orchestral draft virtually duplicates the preliminary sketch, weaknesses and all.¹⁸ Matthews further suggests that in his haste to transfer the movement to score, Mahler probably scribbled the notes into the most convenient parts rather than giving careful consideration to the orchestration. There is also no question that Mahler did not take the time to copy some of the details of harmony and counterpoint that were present in the preliminary sketch into the orchestral draft. The result is an orchestral draft that is actually less representative of Mahler's conception of the musical content than the preliminary sketch itself. And in the absence of a more refined and detailed short score, the orchestral draft is substantially less developed than its presence would otherwise lead one to believe.

If we look at the page-layout for this movement, we can begin to see the complexity involved in its genesis and as a result to doubt the finality of the state found in the orchestral draft. The pages are best understood in the following order:¹⁹

- 1) Ia (R23), sketch page for Ib (unnumbered by Mahler [R16]), Ib (Cooke, plate 4)—the alphabetic modifiers indicate that Mahler expanded the beginning of the movement after he at least began page II.
- 2) II (R24)
- 3) III-early state (R25), insert to III-early state (R17), sketch page for III (unnumbered) (R18), III-late state (R26)
- 4) sketch page for IV (unnumbered) (R21), more advanced sketch page for IV (unnumbered) (R20), IV (R27)
- 5) V (R28)
- 6) sketch page for VI (unnumbered) (R19), VI-early state (R30), VI-later state (R34), VIa (R31), VIb (R32), VIc (R33)—representing the latest state for VI, the alphabetic modifiers suggesting that Mahler began page VII before he completed the latest state of page VI.
- 7) VII-early state (R29), VII-late state (R35)
- 8) VIII (R37), insert to VIII-early state (R22), insert to VIII-late state (R36)

¹⁷ Matthews, "The Tenth Symphony," p. 497.

¹⁸ Matthews, "The Tenth Symphony," pp. 498-99.

¹⁹ The various sketch pages in the Ricke Facsimile bear numbers placed in the upper left-hand corners by the editor, Erwin Ratz.

From only the single preliminary sketch, it is possible to construct an entire continuous early stage for the movement from the early attempts of the various multiple pages. This is not to say, however, that the early stage of the movement existed as a complete discrete entity before Mahler began the late stage – the evolution from early to late was a convoluted and indirect process. The primary differences between these early and late stages is an expanded first scherzo section, thus the multiple page I's, an expanded coda, thus the two inserts to page VIII, and the transposition and recomposition of two other large sections resulting in the multiple pages VI and VII. The first of these is the second Trio (measures 300ff), which Mahler expanded and transposed from G flat to D. The finality of this Trio's disposition is questionable because of the extreme complexity and quantity of revision present on the multiple page VI's and because of the extreme thinness – mostly a single line – of Mahler's transference of this section into the orchestral draft. The second large section that Mahler expanded was the third Scherzo section (measures 366ff), originally in F sharp (following on the heels of the previous Trio's original G flat) but transposed to F natural. Page VII-early state shows the original key of F sharp while page VII-late state shows F natural. Mahler composed this later state before pages VIa-VIc, as the key signature change to F natural rather than F sharp at the bottom of VIc demonstrates.

I have argued elsewhere that Mahler most likely put the Scherzo in F-sharp major aside at one point while working on the Tenth, only to reinstate it later with revisions that would bring it more into line with the newly added *Purgatorio* and *Finale* movements.²⁰ This would explain the complex series of changes found in the preliminary sketch and Mahler's skipping over the creation of a completely separate short score. Instead, he recomposed only selected passages, then proceeded directly to the orchestral draft. It seems that during his revisions to this movement, Mahler was primarily concerned with the tonal structure of the piece. Once he settled it, he then proceeded to refine the harmonic, contrapuntal and orchestral details. As to the final disposition of the complex phrase and rhythmic structure, Mahler never addressed this parameter in the extant sketches. This unfortunately leaves us with some serious if not irresolvable problems regarding orchestration, filling in of parts and harmonies, phrasing and time signatures.

Purgatorio

Unlike the Scherzo in F-sharp major, the *Purgatorio* presents a different type of problem. The extant material is fairly advanced and complete, except for a single gap in the composition indicated by a "Da Capo" that makes it impossible to understand precisely what Mahler intended. There are two pages of preliminary sketch that present a fairly cohesive state of the first two thirds of the movement. The orchestral draft extends only to measure 30, however, and lists only those instruments actually playing. This in itself presents an interesting problem as to whether these opening instruments are the *only* instruments Mahler intended for the beginning section. Whether this is so or not, he clearly intended to add other instruments in the central section, as indicated in the short score where some details of the instrumentation are relatively explicit, being indicated not only by abbreviations, but by the music's disposition on the four staves.

The larger issue is, however, the problem of the "Da Capo." After the return to the opening of the movement, Mahler left a gap in the short score, indicated by "Da Capo," and notated the music only far enough along in the section to compose a smooth transition to the extremely brief coda. The part of the return he actually notated both at the beginning and the end of the section virtually duplicates what came before and suggests an exact repeat. Outside of the strophic song settings, however, Mahler rarely repeats a whole section verbatim without some small variations, and there are no other instances in these sketches of a similar exact repeat of material. So whether Mahler intended an exact repetition, as suggested by the short score, or a varied repetition, as suggested by earlier precedent and the rest of the manuscript, is simply impossible to determine. This seems to me an insurmountable obstacle, since an exact return, if that was what Mahler intended, would possibly have structural and even metaphorical implications, being unique in this Symphony and coming directly after the cyclically and symbolically important central section, while any variations in the reprise would be impossible to second guess. The extreme

²⁰ Coburn, *Mahler's Tenth Symphony*, pp. 163-86 (Chapter 4).

importance of the *Purgatorio* to the structural, tonal and symbolic integrity of the entire Symphony makes this issue one of the principal problems in preparing a performance version or completion.

Scherzo in E minor

Mahler left the Scherzo in E minor at an earlier state of composition than we have so far encountered, since he never even began an orchestral draft. In spite of the relatively unfinished state of this movement, there is no shortage of materials. Unfortunately, these are more complicated than those for the preceding three movements. At issue is the stage of composition Mahler achieved for the movement. Like the *Adagio*, there appear to be two relatively discrete, numbered and continuous drafts of the movement, which we would normally label as the preliminary sketch for the earlier draft and the short score for the later draft. But unlike the *Adagio*, Mahler's numbering between the apparent short score and preliminary sketch is unclear.

In the *Adagio*, Mahler used Arabic numerals for the short score and Roman for the preliminary sketch, allowing no confusion between the two. In the Scherzo in E minor, though, all of Mahler's numbering is with Roman numerals, implying that the only stage that exists is a preliminary sketch. What makes the interpretation of the sketches for this movement confusing is that in addition to the 12 continuous numbered pages of the latest existing state of the movement, which both Cooke and Matthews call the short score, there are an additional 13 sketch pages. 12 of these seem to form a continuous draft of the movement that could be interpreted as a discrete preliminary stage. Matthews calls this the composition sketch, while Cooke calls it a "fragment of a preliminary short score."²¹ Six of these sketch pages bear numbers – IV-VIII, with a duplicate page VII. Out of the remaining seven pages, one (R43) contains miscellaneous sketches from various parts of the movement, while the rest can be put into sequence with or are re-workings of the numbered pages. The pages divide as follows into early and late states, with their contents by measure number in parentheses:

continuation of this material is onto the page IV shown in Cooke's *Performing Version* as Plate 5. Logically, if Mahler were creating a continuous draft, he would have numbered this page as II if he considered R41 as part of R40, or III if he considered R40 and R41 as distinct pages. He would not have considered R39 in the numbering at all as it was clearly preliminary to R40 and not part of the continuous draft. On the other hand, if R40 and R41 are earlier sketches preliminary to late state of pages I-III, this explains the numbering of Cooke's page IV and suggests that all the subsequent sketch pages that comprise the hypothetical "composition sketch" or "preliminary short score" are in fact merely superseded sketches for the late version of each respective page and not part of a discrete entity. This would explain the measure-by-measure versus page-by-page correlation between the early and late states as well as the exclusively Roman numeration.

It seems likely to me that there were never two completely separate stages of composition here – numbered preliminary sketch ("preliminary short score" or "composition sketch") and short score – as there were for the *Adagio*. The thinness of the scoring, much of which is only minimally realized as a melody with bass, a melody with simple chords, or in several instances merely a single melodic line, and the very rough state of the manuscript itself suggests that this is a preliminary sketch anyway. In spite of the substantial amount of revision and recomposition the movement had undergone up to this point, Mahler's numbering in Roman is the strongest evidence that he thought of the entire draft of the movement as a preliminary sketch, not a short score. Also, the presence of blue pencil corrections throughout the sketch suggests that Mahler was planning to revise the movement at a late stage and further suggests that the movement was in a relatively early state as compared to the preceding three movements.

Although I believe Mahler probably had worked out the primary shape of the movement, the internal ordering of elements was still relatively

Early	Late
1) R39 (1-26) early version of R40, R40 (1-56, 107-122), R41 (56-104) insert to R40 (all unnumbered)	I (1-58), II (59-114), III (115-122)
2) IV-early (Cooke plate 5) (123-209)	IV (123-185)
3) V-early (R42) (210-243)	V (186-243)
4) VI-early (R44) (244-282, 287-311)	VI (244-311)
5) R48 (312-374), R46 (311-379) (both unnumbered) VII-early (R45) (283-311+discarded mm), VII-later (R47) (311-365)	VII (312-365)
6) VIII (R49) (366-383)	VIII (366-379)
7) R50 (410-431, 432-459, 478-512, 549-556) (unnumbered)	IX (380-431), Xa (432-512), Xb (513-549), XI (549-578)

Although this seems clear enough, when we compare the content of the early sketch pages to their counterparts in the late sketch pages, there is a surprising correlation between the material on a page-by-page basis that implies that the sketch pages that both Cooke and Matthews view as a "preliminary short score" or "composition sketch" are in fact earlier, separate attempts at the respective late states for each page, not a continuous or discrete stage of composition. This implication becomes more certain when we examine the various sketches for the opening of the movement. The earliest state for the beginning is on R39, which is a very rough sketch for measures 1-26. Sketch page R40 (measures 1-56 and 107-22) and R41 (which is an *Einlage* passage for R40, containing measures 56-104) further refine the opening and as such would be the first two pages of a continuous preliminary sketch. Yet strangely, the

unrefined, as was the ultimate disposition of its tonal plot.²² As compelling as the material is, the flow and cohesiveness of the movement is awkward and less effective than the *Adagio* and *Purgatorio*. The likelihood that some structural revision was Mahler's next step can be seen by his blue-pencil corrections on the final state of page VIII, which strike out an entire passage, altering the formal proportions of the movement. Once he had then arrived at the final form, many other revisions and refinements of harmony and detail would inevitably have followed. Therefore, a realization of this movement would entail compositional decisions and creative invention on a level far

²¹ Matthews, "The Tenth Symphony," p. 502; Cooke, *Performing Version*, p. xxi.

²² Most of Mahler's later reworkings seem to be moving toward an increased presence of D minor, perhaps eventually tipping the scale away from E minor toward that key, which would be more in line with the overall tonal plan of the Symphony.

exceeding that of the previous three movements, perhaps reaching as far as structural revision, which would necessarily differ from what Mahler may have had in mind.

Finale

The materials for the *Finale* consist of a single unnumbered sketch page (R53), two sketches that appear to be preliminary to page 6 (R51 and R52, numbered 5½ and 6), and a short score, which includes two attempts at an ending – a small amount of material considering the projected scope of the movement. All of the numbered pages are in Arabic rather than Roman numerals, and this suggests that Mahler thought of the draft as a short score rather than a preliminary sketch. While it seems unlikely that Mahler would compose a short score without a preliminary sketch, the absence of earlier materials as well as the very rough state of the short score suggests that this was indeed the case. There are also several anomalies in comparison to the remainder of the Symphony's manuscripts that support this view.

For one thing, the majority of the short score is written on bifolios (normally first and third pages, or the cover and *recto* of each sheet) instead of on single sheets, as is the case with all of the other short scores and preliminary sketches for the Tenth Symphony. The only other place Mahler used bifolios in this entire manuscript was for the orchestral drafts. It is difficult to find a reasonable explanation for his departure from his typical pattern. Susan Filler suggests that it may be the result of a low supply of paper,²³ but Mahler used single sheets for R51, R52, R53 and the alternative page 8 (numbered respectively 5½, 6 and 8), and the resultant placement of these sheets within the short score suggests that he wrote them after he had established the use of bifolios. Therefore, bifolios were evidently not his only alternative at this point.

To complicate matters, the very first bifolio (excluding the enclosing cover) presents a problem of numbering and continuity – it is the only bifolio of which Mahler utilized the first sheet, or the cover, alone. The inside *recto* of the opening is blank. If there were a shortage of paper at this point, Mahler would surely not have left entire sheets blank. The second bifolio continues where the first page of the first bifolio leaves off, and the beginning of the *Allegro* section continues on the *recto* of the opening of this second bifolio. Logically, the continuation of the *Einleitung* ought to be on the *recto* of the opening of the first bifolio, with the *Allegro* beginning on the first sheet (cover) of the second bifolio. Why then is there a blank page here where there ought not to be? The most obvious answer is that Mahler was actually using the first bifolio as a cover for the movement for a certain length of time. If the blank second page was originally the back cover for the movement, Mahler would have neither numbered it nor written upon it. At some point, perhaps as late as the completion of the short score, Mahler would have added the new cover, tucked in the second sheet of the first bifolio, and thus made it seem like there was an extra blank page in the middle of the *Einleitung*.

This scenario renders Mahler's number V on the final cover as an addition later than the initial conception of the *Finale* and allows for the possibility that Mahler composed it *before* the Scherzo in F-sharp major was reinstated to the Symphony. Of course, had the final cover been the original cover, there would have had to have been a IV underlying the V, or some such configuration, to support this hypothesis. At any rate, assuming Mahler composed the *Finale* in the absence of the Scherzo in F-sharp major, this would explain the unique absence of quotations from that Scherzo movement in the *Finale*, which as we know, quotes from every other movement. And this further raises the possibility that Mahler may have eventually added a quotation from the Scherzo in F-sharp major to complete the cycle of quotations in the *Finale*.

Another anomaly occurs after page 5, where Mahler inserted two single sheets (R51 and R52) before resuming the pattern of bifolios. The contents of both these sheets place them chronologically earlier than the final version of page 6, which reinitiates the bifolio pattern. The problem here is the discrepancy between the contents and the numbering. R51 seems to be a very rough draft of what eventually becomes measures 245-48 followed by a 39-measure continuation that does not turn up

²³ Filler, *Editorial Problems*, p. 381.

again in any other state of the short score. It also seems to be a sketch page inasmuch as it does not continue the music of page 5 and is in an entirely different key. R52, on the other hand, continues the music of page 5 smoothly and is clearly an earlier version of the latest state of page 6. What is strange here is the numbering of these pages. Mahler labeled R52 with a 6, which is logical enough, but he labeled R51 with a 5½, which places it chronologically later than R52, even though its content makes it appear earlier. This contradicts the musical continuity of the short score, unless R51 is actually a sketch for the material that concludes page 6 and continues onto page 7, in which case the 5½ makes no sense.

In addition, the fact that these are single pages instead of bifolios seems to indicate that Mahler knew they were not to be a part of the short score (assuming consistency), so why did he number them at all? There is no clear solution here. A possibility suggested by Filler is that one or both of these pages represent alternatives to pages 5 and 6 rather than preliminary sketches.²⁴ This clearly is not the case for R52, which is obviously an earlier state of page 6. On the other hand, R51 may represent a sketch written at a later point for a short-score page that is lost or was never written and that Mahler may have planned to substitute for page 6 and the ensuing pages. He did eventually delete most of the material on page 6, much of which seems crucial to the formal integrity of the movement. It also seems odd that Mahler crossed out the excised passage on both R52 and page 6. He was possibly rethinking this entire section, and R51 may have been his initial attempt at a completely new version. The numbering would in that case not be final, but simply an expedient to help Mahler remember its place in case the pages of the movement became scrambled.

The phenomenon of a single sheet (or sheets) inserted to represent an alternative or later state is repeated by the final anomaly of the manuscript – the two endings. From page 7 through the bifolio beginning with page 8, the short score has no irregularities with the exception of the second *recto* of the bifolio beginning with page 8, which ought to be labeled 9 but is unnumbered and contains the ending of the movement. In addition to this, there is a single sheet, also labeled 8, which represents an alternative continuation from page 7. This sheet was originally labeled "*Einlage zu 7*," and it continues from the insertion point found at the bottom of page 7 at measure 298. Mahler crossed out the material after this point on page 7, and this clearly indicates that the single page 8 is later than the original page 8 bifolio that is a continuation of the crossed-out material. The new page 8 continues to page 9, itself a new bifolio, and ends on page 10, essentially a transposition from B flat to F sharp of the earlier ending.

The chronology here is clear, as is the musical continuity of each state. The additional material found on the second page 8 and on page 9 prepares the modulation to F sharp, but otherwise offers only a few refinements and nothing substantially new – the only change is the key. What is not clear is why Mahler left the earlier B-flat ending as part of the manuscript after he had decided to transpose it. While Mahler may have merely tucked the sheets together without regard to their disposition, it is unusual that he would not at least cross out the excised passages as he had done on page 6. The only explanation is that Mahler was still ambivalent about the key of the ending when he put the manuscript down for the last time.

In addition to these problems, we have a movement that has at least one serious musical problem as well. The passage on the previously discussed pages 5½ and 6, which involves a long quotation from the Scherzo in E minor, clearly was not resolved. The version Mahler leaves us with is a truncated resumption of the *Allegro* heard earlier in the movement. It leads directly into the climax quoted from the *Adagio* much less effectively than such a dramatic and pivotal moment requires and seems difficult to accept as Mahler's ultimate intention.²⁵

Taken as a whole, these problems indicate a movement far from its final state. Although composed all the way through, and clearly intended by Mahler as a short score, the movement had not progressed to a point

²⁴ Filler, *Editorial Problems*, p. 530.

²⁵ Matthews, "The Tenth Symphony," p. 503, suggests that the famous climax may have been composed first here and transferred back to the *Adagio*.

where he felt he could remove or cross out the ambiguously labeled pages in order to create a single continuous draft. It is impossible here to determine Mahler's preference among an early state, an intermediate state, and a yet-to-be-composed even later state, in spite of the relative coherence and power of what exists. As we know, the *Finale* was the last movement completed, so it is likely that due to time constraints, Mahler simply skipped the lengthier task of creating a preliminary sketch that would then need to be transcribed, by and large, into a short score. And apparently, his conception was strong enough that he felt he could eliminate this initial stage. The result is, once again, a movement less advanced than otherwise believed.

Can There Be a Tenth?

It seems clear as we examine the sketches for the Tenth Symphony that the problems inherent in the surviving manuscripts are very different from movement to movement. That we have very nearly the complete materials that would have become the finished Symphony seems indisputable. But are these materials, as Cooke would have it, "fully prepared in the sketch?"²⁶ As we have seen, the only movement that offers up a state of completion capable of performance with *only* editorial intervention is the *Adagio*. This is the single movement that can be performed in its entirety as real and authentic Mahler. The *Purgatorio* is only slightly less developed if we take the "Da Capo" as literal. I believe that judicious scoring can render a version very near indeed to Mahler's intentions. Otherwise, assuming a recomposed "Da Capo," it requires a certain amount of compositional elaboration and variation – not impossible, but tricky, and under no circumstances authentic. In a way, Ernst Křenek's composer's instincts were correct that these two movements were the only ones that were advanced enough to present as Mahler's own.

The Scherzo in F-sharp major is a special case. Mahler seemed to have thought it well enough developed to begin an orchestral draft – a score he sketched through to the end, unlike in the *Purgatorio*. Also, unlike the *Purgatorio*, Mahler may not yet have arrived at the final form of this movement. We noted the problems Mahler had with the second Trio and the third Scherzo sections, but even assuming these to be final as they stand, there is the issue of detail. The orchestral draft is primarily a transfer to score of the preliminary sketch. Only in the opening several pages do we have anything like detail or carefully considered orchestration. As the score progresses, Mahler seemed more and more to have jotted the music into general categories of wind or string sections without careful consideration of the exact disposition of the parts. And along with this "generalization" of timbre, there is an increasing absence of harmonic and contrapuntal detail. Fortunately, some of this detail, including instrumental particulars, can be reconstructed from the preliminary sketch. But overall, there is much need for creative intervention to fill out the texture and redistribute the instrumentation in a more idiomatic way. Again, not an impossible task, but substantially more difficult than is the case for the *Purgatorio*, and thus that much further removed from Mahler. The best result here would be a performing version of a movement more-or-less authentic in form, but largely collaborative in its actual realization.

The *Finale* presents less trouble than its late conception and apparently hasty sketching would suggest, but nevertheless much more than encountered so far. Of course, there are the expected problems encountered already of the absence of harmonic, contrapuntal and instrumental detail, but these are solvable. The real problems with the *Finale* lie primarily in the section before the main climax, which would require some amount of compositional input to make effective; secondly, the possibility that the cycle of quotations from the other movements was not yet complete; and thirdly, the issue of the ending. I have reasoned elsewhere that Mahler's reasons for leaving the B-flat ending in the manuscript undeleted were likely tied to the outcome of his marital difficulties of the summer of 1910 and as such, the F-sharp ending should be considered definitive.²⁷ Regardless, the level of collaborative effort required to bring the *Finale* to an effective performance goes well beyond that of the Scherzo in F-sharp major, requiring most likely a certain amount of original composition, as well as a completely realized orchestration.

²⁶ Cooke's *Performing Version*, pp. xv-xvi.

²⁷ Coburn, *Mahler's Tenth Symphony*, pp. 276-345 (Chapter 8).

A more difficult situation arises with the Scherzo in E minor. It is the least advanced of the movements and the early state of the manuscript has problems of form and transition that make it less effective in its current state than the power of the material deserves. The blue-pencil revisions are the clearest evidence that Mahler considered this movement in need of reworking before advancing to the next stage – be it short score or orchestral draft. And like both the Scherzo in F-sharp major and the *Finale*, there are sections so thinly sketched that a high level of creative input would be needed merely to make them playable, even assuming the current form was satisfactory. Sadly, however, it is not satisfactory. An orchestral realization of the preliminary sketch, skillfully done, and as powerful as the music is, still does not do Mahler justice. In order to create a fully effective movement here, a fair amount of recomposition and restructuring would be necessary, far more so than that of Cooke's *Performing Version*. Of course, in Cooke's case, this would have been musicologically irresponsible, as his purpose was to create a performing version of the draft, not to assess the potential for completion and then bring it to a realization. At any rate, a truly effective result here can only be accomplished with a level of intervention that raises the role of anyone creating a completion to that of co-author.

Ultimately, there is so much material here, some of it fairly advanced, that it would be inexcusable to allow the sketches to languish in silence. We must never forget that the Tenth Symphony was far from finished by Mahler's hands, and although at least minimally sketched from end to end, hardly exists in anything like a definitive state. Of course, we can never know what Mahler would have done, especially in the more problematic movements, but this should not dissuade creative minds from active speculation in the form of completions. Cooke has provided us with a good starting point, but to risk becoming repetitive, his *Performing Version* was intended as an expediency to allow the non-musicological public to hear the draft of the Symphony, not as a co-authored completion of the work. But a co-authored completion, I believe, is what will be required if Mahler's Tenth Symphony is to enter the canon of his works.

Steven D. Coburn is a musicologist, pianist, and conductor who lives in New York City. He received the Ph.D. in musicology from New York University, where he completed a dissertation under the direction of Dr. Robert Bailey on "Mahler's Tenth Symphony: Form and Genesis." He has lectured on Mahler's music and has several articles in preparation. He currently teaches at Pace University.

Editorial Board

Editor-in-Chief	James L. Zychowicz
Associate Editors	Salvatore Calomino Teng-Leong Chew David Ellis Jan Hoepfer

Please send letters and any essay submissions to
 Teng-Leong Chew t-chew@northwestern.edu
 James L. Zychowicz JZychowicz@aol.com

Advisory Board

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

Official Website

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

Mahler Archives Online

<http://www.mahlerarchives.net>

© 2005 The Chicago Mahlerites