Mahler's Ambivalence toward the Andante of his Second Symphony and its Impetus behind the Evolution of the Symphony's Program.

John R. Palmer
Department of Music
Sonoma State University
1801 East Cotati Avenue
Rohnert Park, CA 94928-3609, USA.

Abstract

Mahler was unsatisfied with the Andante moderato of the Second Symphony, even years before completing the five-movement work. His dissatisfaction manifested itself in his changing the movement order multiple times and in leaving the Andante out of the finale's web of thematic references to the symphony's other movements. Relatively speedy publication of the piece cemented the Andante's position, and the composer's only option was programmatic—working the Andante into a scenario he developed for the entire symphony. Mahler's program is arguably a response to his, and others', perceptions of discrepancies in the symphony, and the evolving text points to justifying the Andante's presence.

Key Words: Gustav Mahler, Second Symphony, Program Music, Compositional Process, Reception

One fault in the C-Minor Symphony is that the cheerful dance rhythms of the Andante contrast too sharply (and inartistically) with the first movement. The reason for this is that I designed the two movements independently of each other, without any thought of connecting them. Otherwise I could at least have begun the Andante with the cello melody followed by the present beginning, but to revise it now is no longer possible.[1]

<div align="right">Gustav Mahler to Natalie Bauer-Lechner, 1899</div>

Mahler's comment to Natalie Bauer-Lechner is not the earliest known evidence of his dissatisfaction with the Andante moderato of his Second Symphony, and it is not the last. From apparent neglect early in the course of the symphony's composition to repeated switching of the movement's position within the work years later, Mahler's behavior toward the Andante suggests ambivalence at best. Among the abundant evidence for this, the most compelling is the evolving program the composer developed for the Second Symphony, a program whose narrative Mahler expanded and altered to affirm a place for the second movement. His changing descriptions of the Andante suggest an attempt to justify its presence, a justification necessitated by the absence of the Andante in the web of references linking the symphony's finale to the other three movements. It is possible to trace this ambivalence back to the very origins of the Second Symphony, seven years before the completion of the work.

Mahler's earliest known sketches for his Second Symphony date from January 1888, and are mostly related to the first movement.[2] Sketches for the Andante moderato date from the same period and include all the melodic and some harmonic material for both the A and B sections, as well as the lilting cello line in the A' section (mm. 92–132). At the top of the page containing the A theme, Mahler wrote "2. Satz."[3] Despite having written in great detail both themes and one variation, Mahler apparently made no attempt to finish the movement for more than five years. This is all the more puzzling considering that he completed the full score of the first movement by September 1888, nine months after sketching his first ideas for it.[4]

Perhaps Mahler's acceptance that he might never complete the symphony, plus the success of Richard Strauß's *Don Juan* and *Tod und Verklärung*, prompted him in the Fall of 1891 to begin marketing the first movement as a symphonic poem.[5] Presumably at the same time he emended the title page of his full score of the first movement, crossing out "Symphonie in C-moll" and writing at the top of the page, "Todtenfeier."[6] (Unfortunately, the incorrect assertion that Mahler originally composed the first movement of the C-minor symphony as a symphonic poem, which he later integrated into a multi-movement symphony, appears frequently and informs programmatic interpretations of the piece.[7])

Three years had passed without progress on the C-minor Symphony, and Mahler evidently preferred dismembering the unfinished work to allowing it to languish in his desk drawer. It would be another two years before Mahler would again work directly on the symphony. (In a memoir, Mahler's friend Josef Foerster, writes that Mahler composed "Urlicht" in 1892, at least in piano/vocal form. However, as I note below, manuscript evidence shows that Mahler did not intend to include "Urlicht" in the symphony at the time, and probably did not have such an intention until 1894.[8])

Once Mahler did resume work on his C-Minor Symphony, however, he composed quickly. In late June 1893 Mahler arrived at Steinbach am Attersee with the entire first movement and sketches for the second. In a month he produced an orchestral draft of the Andante, dated "Steinbach 30. Juli 1893" and labeled "4. Satz" at the top of the first page.[9]   By 16 July Mahler finished an orchestral draft of the scherzo movement, based on his *Wunderhorn* Lied, "Des Antonius von Padua Fischpredigt," the piano/vocal score of which dates from 8 July, and the full score from 1 August.[10]Mahler also completed an orchestration of "Urlicht" by 19 July 1893, but it is clear from the manuscript that this version was meant to be part of a series of *Wunderhorn* Lieder and not for inclusion in the symphony.[11]In late August, Mahler left Steinbach for Hamburg with a still-incomplete symphony in C-minor.

With Mahler at Steinbach in the summer of 1893 was Natalie Bauer-Lechner (1858–1921), a close friend and self-appointed chronicler of the composer's life throughout the 1890s. Her copious recordings of their conversations include discussions of the Andante of the Second Symphony:

Mahler completed his Andante in seven days and said himself that he has reasons to be happy with it. "But, what I wanted and what I had in mind at the conception has not been completely achieved, and some has been lost."

"But," I answered, "that is certainly the case with every realized work vis-à-vis the sketch?"

"That should not be so, and particularly with smaller compositions complete success at achieving the intention is more likely. So it seems to me that, for example, with my "Himmlischen Leben," the realization of the sketch is completely adequate, and in each and every way most auspiciously coincides with it; indeed, in some respects even surpasses it."[12]

Very early, then, Mahler expressed a degree of discontent, or, at best, tempered satisfaction, with the Andante. His comment also suggests that the reason for the five-year hiatus in composition was that he had few ideas of how to flesh out the sketches he had made in 1888. One also senses resignation in the passage, particularly where Mahler assesses the success of "Das himmlische Leben." Despite his disappointment, and although he would not complete the symphony for another 18 months, Mahler did not elect to expunge or significantly alter the "inadequate" 1893 score of the Andante. After the fruitful summer at Steinbach in 1893, the symphonic project languished for seven months until an external event triggered its completion.

On 29 March 1894, Mahler attended the memorial service in Hamburg for Hans von Bülow, and it was then that he heard a choral setting of Friedrich Klopstock's "Aufersteh'n, ja aufersteh'n," which provided the inspiration for the finale of the C-minor symphony.[13] By July 1894 the finale was essentially complete, and the inscription on the fair copy of the entire C-minor symphony (minus "Urlicht") reads "Completed on Tuesday, 18 December 1894, in Hamburg."[14]   The Andante appears as the second movement in this manuscript, and, aside from orchestration, is little changed from the 1893 orchestral draft. The primary exception is a single-page "Einlage" (insertion), with which Mahler added what are now mm. 175–82, encompassing a variation of the first melody of the B section (mm. 44–47) on Ab major.[15]

Compared to the Allegro maestoso or the symphony's finale, composition of the Andante seems to have been relatively painless. Mahler sketched the thematic material for both sections nearly exactly as they appear in the printed score.His alterations to the 1894 manuscript are minimal, as are his subsequent revisions. However, the composer was very unsure of what to do with the movement after he had finished it. I have noted that his initial sketches bear the inscription "2. Satz," and his orchestral draft of 30 June 1893 is marked "4. Satz." In the 1894 manuscript of the complete C-minor symphony (minus "Urlicht") the Andante is again second, and Mahler's indecision continued after he acquired Otto Weidich, his Hamburg copyist, to make fair copies for use in performance.

Weidich's first copy of Mahler's Second Symphony was probably used for a 25 January 1895 rehearsal in Hamburg, in preparation for the première of the first three movements in Berlin on 4 March 1895.[16] Formerly in the possession of Bruno Walter, the MS contains the Allegro maestoso followed directly by the scherzo, which in turn is followed by the Andante *con moto*; neither "Urlicht" nor the finale are present. The rehearsal numbers run continuously through the first two movements—the first instance of the senseless numbering of the scherzo in numerous published scores. By early 1895, then, the composer wished the scherzo to appear second and the Andante third, and he composed a brief timpani introduction to the scherzo to create a transition from the end of the Allegro. At the 4 March 1895 concert, however, the Andante was played second, and this is the order in which Weidich copied them into his second manuscript of the symphony, now at Yale University.[17]Other than eliminating a brief oboe flourish, Mahler altered nothing about the movement except its position in the symphony.[18] Thus, the Andante changed position four times before the symphony was performed, creating several formats for the complete work. (See Table 1.)

Table 1: Changes in the Order of Movements of Mahler's Second Symphony

January 1888
I. Allegro   II. **Andante**

Summer 1893
I. Allegro   II. scherzo   III. ?   IV. **Andante**   (V. finale)

December 1894
I. Allegro   II. **Andante**   III. scherzo   IV. "Urlicht"   V. finale

January? 1895
I. Allegro   II. scherzo   III. **Andante** IV. "Urlicht"   V. finale

March 1895
I. Allegro   II. **Andante**   III. scherzo   IV. "Urlicht"   V. finale

It is clear, then, that Mahler was unsure of how to use what is now the second movement of his Second Symphony. However, the composer's claim, made to Bauer-Lechner in 1899, that he never intended the Andante to be part of the work is undermined by the earliest know sketches for the movement, which show very clearly at the top of the last of three pages a large "2. Satz" in Mahler's hand. Furthermore, the two leaves bearing the Andante sketches are of the same paper Mahler used for most of his early work on the Allegro maestoso, with which the Andante sketch leaves are preserved.[19] It is doubtful that Mahler intended the movement for another piece, for, unlike "Das himmlische Leben," the errant Andante wandered only within the bounds of the Second Symphony. Also, there is no indication that the composer had written the music for a different context, as might be the case with the "Blumine" movement of the First Symphony.[20]

Perhaps the most compelling evidence for the composer's ambivalence concerning the Andante lies in the completed score of the C-Minor Symphony itself. Into the finale Mahler worked thematic links to other movements, the majority of which are to the Allegro maestoso. The most prominent of these occur in mm. 62–69 and 143–50 of the finale, both of which are drawn from mm. 270–77 of the Allegro (beginning with the first four notes of the *Dies irae*), and in mm. 301–13 of the finale, which is almost an exact quote of the Allegro, mm. 282–94. Also, the outburst at m. 465 of the scherzo, after the second appearance of the Trio, becomes the opening chord of the finale, and the alto part in mm. 58–63 of "Urlicht" appears in the finale in mm. 661–72.[21] There are no references to the Andante moderato.

Nevertheless, the simple fact remains that Mahler did retain the Andante moderato in his Second Symphony, possibly because he had had only one chance to hear the movement *in situ*. Public performances of his works did not prevent Mahler from making significant changes, and, in the case of the First Symphony, might have prompted such a change.

After three complete performances of the five-movement version of his First Symphony (Budapest in 1889, Hamburg in 1893, and Weimar in 1894), Mahler cut the "Blumine" movement for a Berlin performance in 1896 and for the published score of 1899.[22] Mahler had ample opportunity and time before publication to assess the effect of the symphony in performance both with and without the "Blumine" movement. Such was not the case with the Second Symphony, a two-piano arrangement of which appeared in 1895 (before the première of the complete work) and the full score in 1897.[23] This is almost certainly the obstacle Mahler alluded to when he told Bauer-Lechner in 1899 that "to revise it now is no longer possible."

"Das himmlische Leben" affords another example of Mahler altering the situation of one of his works after its initial conception and composition. Mahler completed the piano/vocal score of the song on 10 February 1892, and the full score on 12 March of the same year, as one of a group of five Lieder with texts from *Des Knaben Wunderhorn*, all of which were composed in the first four months of 1892. The set, which Mahler entitled "The 5 Humoresques" on his manuscript, was not published until 1899, by which time he had replaced "Das himmlische Leben" with "Das irdische Leben."[24] Between its composition and the publication of the *Wunderhorn* set, "Das himmlische Leben" served briefly (in the summer of 1895, at least) as the seventh movement of the Third Symphony and ultimately as the fourth and final movement of the Fourth Symphony, composed 1899–1900.[25]

No doubt Mahler withdrew "Das himmlische Leben" from his *Wunderhorn* set because he had found a home for it in the Fourth Symphony, which he was composing while arranging the publication of the songs. As with the "Blumine" movement of the First Symphony, a performance of "Das himmlische Leben" with "Trost im Unglück," "Wer hat dies Liedlein erdacht?" and "Rheinlegendchen" on 27 October 1893, in Hamburg, did not compel the composer to keep the set of Lieder in its original configuration, and the lag time between the composition of "Das himmlische Leben" and publication of the *Wunderhorn* Lieder allowed him to experiment with "Das himmlische Leben" other contexts.[26]

Similarly, Mahler's doubts about the Andante of the Second Symphony seem to have been fueled by early performances of the piece, despite it being frozen in place by rapid publication. This becomes evident through the composer's programmatic attempts to link the movement to the rest of the symphony, beginning after his second hearing of the work in concert. Mahler did not provide a program, public or private, for the 4 March 1895 performance in Berlin of the first three movements, and he did not refer to the first movement as "Todtenfeier."[27] The three movements, "Allegro maëstoso," "Andante *con moto*," and "(Scherzo) Allegro commodo," were listed as comprising the "First Part" of the symphony. The composer conducted the orchestra for the partial première, which was made possible by Richard Strauß.

Mahler's work provoked mixed reactions, some of which may have reinforced his misgivings about the Andante. For example, the *Vossische Zeitung* reviewer noted, among other offenses, a lack of "internal unity."[28]Having heard rehearsals for the 4 March 1895 première in Berlin of the first three movements, an anonymous reviewer for *Signale für die musikalische Welt* wrote, "Judging from the rehearsal of the three movements, the question cannot be one of symphony at all, but at most one of suite …."[29]These auditors, it seems, missed the unity expected in the post-Beethoven symphony, a unity Mahler achieved through the composition of the work's finale. However, the presence of the finale at a later concert did not prevent listeners from sensing discontinuity in the work, a discontinuity acknowledged by the composer himself.

For the 13 December 1895 première in Berlin of the complete symphony, Mahler again placed the Andante second, and again provided no program. Otto Lessmann, writing in the *Allgemeine Musik Zeitung*, found the piece lacking a central idea, while a reviewer in the *Börsenzeitung* described the work as "program music without a program."[30] Critic Ferdinand Pfohl, writing in the *Hamburger Nachrichten*, publicly requested a program, "… since the sequence of individual movements simply cannot be understood without further information and their relationships to the basic idea of the whole work cannot at all times be brought into clear, logical perspective."[31] Despite hearing both the "Urlicht" and "Aufersteh'n" texts, as well as the many thematic references in the symphony's finale, Pfohl and others found a disparity between movements. Critics, and other auditors, of Pfohl's generation had arguably come to expect a printed program to accompany a new symphonic work, and Pfohl might have asked for one no matter what he had heard, but his comments are similar to those of Lessmann and the anonymous *Signale* and *Börsenzeitung* reviewers, as well as those made by Mahler himself four years later.

Mahler's earliest known programmatic description of the Second Symphony dates from roughly a month after the December 1895 performance. Whether or not this was to any degree a response to comments by Pfohl and others is perhaps impossible to determine. What we can determine, however, is how Mahler's program changed with each iteration, particularly in the language he used to incorporate the Andante into this narrative.

It is worth pointing out, I believe, that in all of Mahler's known communications concerning the Second Symphony prior to the première of the complete work on 13 December 1895, there is not a stitch of programmatic description.[32] In contrast to the Third Symphony, it is only after the first performances of the Second that Mahler began to weave a verbal narrative for the work, and his three versions of the program show a growing desire to link the second movement with the other four, particularly the first. Unsatisfied with the Andante of the Second Symphony, and unable to change the piece because it had already been published, Mahler set himself the task of making a programmatic place for the movement in the symphony in which it stands alone.

In January of 1896 Natalie Bauer-Lechner recorded Mahler's earliest known version of the program for his Second Symphony, later published in her *Erinnerungen an Gustav Mahler*:

The first movement embodies the titanic struggle of a colossal being, still entangled in the world, with life and with the fate to which he must submit: his death. The second and third movements, Andante and scherzo, are episodes from the life of the fallen hero. The Andante embodies love.[33]

The narrative continues through the succeeding three movements, comparing the effect of the scherzo to that of watching dancers without hearing the music, describing "Urlicht" as the struggling of the soul toward its god, and the finale as a representation of the Last Judgment as depicted in Christian mythology, *sans* judgment.

With his program, Mahler establishes a protagonist in the Allegro (a colossal, struggling being), and deftly links the Andante to the Allegro by noting that the Andante is an "episode" from the life of this being, whom he then refers to as a "hero." Whereas the composer also describes the scherzo as an episode and gives a long and detailed scenario, the description of the "episode" encompassed by the second movement is minimal: "The Andante embodies love." The movement does not convey narrative or a scenario; rather, it communicates an emotional state. Three months later, in a long letter to critic Max Marschalk, Mahler included a program of only the first three movements of the work, modifying and expanding his narratives for the Allegro maestoso and the Andante.

I have called the first movement "Todtenfeier," and if you want to know, it is the hero of my D-major Symphony whom I bear to the grave, and whose life I, from a high vantage point, reflect in a clear mirror. […]

The second and third movements are conceived as interludes: the second movement, a *memory!* A glance of the sun [Sonnenblick], pure and unclouded, from the life of this hero.

It has surely happened to you: you bear a beloved person to the grave, and then perhaps on the way back suddenly arises the picture of a long since past hour of happiness that impresses on you like a sunbeam into the soul—darkened by nothing—you can nearly forget what has happened! That is the second movement! — Then, when you awake from this melancholy dream and must return to the chaotic life, … This is the third *movement!*[34]

Perhaps the most glaring difference between the Bauer-Lechner and Marschalk versions is the statement in the latter that the Allegro represents the funeral rite of the "hero" of Mahler's First Symphony. The primary character is now not a nameless "being," but a somewhat more concrete character, and, significantly, that character is dead. This is the only version of the program in which Mahler forges a link between his Second and First Symphonies, and I submit that he does this not because he at any time during or after the composition of the piece considered the first movement of the Second to be related to his First, but because of the addressee of the letter. Mahler links the program of the Second Symphony to that of the First because Marschalk had recently written a positive review of the earlier work.[35]

Despite the change of character and existential state of the protagonist, Mahler again connects the Andante to the Allegro, in this case by describing the second movement as "a memory! … from the life of this hero." Mahler thus maintains the episodic nature of his program for the movement, but the perspective changes and the scenario becomes longer and more complex.

The composer positions the reader as a pallbearer who has just lowered "a beloved person" into the grave, and in whom a memory arises "like a sunbeam into the soul." The experience, of seeing "the picture of a long since past hour of happiness," presumably from the life of the deceased, is not that of the dead protagonist, but of a participant in the funeral rite. Labeling the Andante an "interlude" and invoking images of sunlight, clarity, and happiness that is "darkened by nothing" programmatically justifies the great disparity between the Allegro and Andante. The contrast in programmatic mood between the Allegro and Andante parallels the musical contrast, and is stark enough that the pallbearer "can nearly forget what has happened" to the deceased.

Unlike the Bauer-Lechner version, the Marschalk version devotes as much space to a description of the Andante as it does to that of the scherzo. Here, Mahler more deeply embeds the Andante in the program by forging a programmatic link between it and the ensuing movement. Once the "melancholy dream" of the Andante passes, the observer "must return to the chaotic life" represented by the scherzo, and the Andante effectively becomes a transition from the Allegro to the scherzo. The Bauer-Lechner version makes no such connection.

In a letter to his sister, Justine, Mahler enclosed his last and most extensive program for the C-minor symphony,written for King Albert of Saxony and published in the *Dresdner Nachrichten* of 20 December 1901, the day of the Second Symphony's Dresden première.[36]

> 1st movement. We stand by the coffin of a beloved person. His life, struggles, passions and aspirations, once again, for the last time, pass before our mind's eye. […]
>
> The next 3 movements are conceived as intermezzi.
>
> 2nd movement—Andante: a happy moment from the life of this precious departed one, and a melancholy memory of his youth and his lost innocence.[37]

In the Dresden version of his program, Mahler both melds aspects of his earlier versions and introduces new concepts. As in the Marschalk version, the scenario is that of a funeral rite and the main character of the first movement is dead, not alive as in the Bauer-Lechner memoir. Unlike the Marschalk version, however, there is no mention of a "hero" or a connection to Mahler's First Symphony. Mahler, in contrast to his communication with Marschalk, could not assume that King Albert (or the Dresden public) was favorably disposed toward his First Symphony, and for good reason: At the 16 December 1898 Dresden première of the First, attended by the King, the audience had booed the work, and the next day the reviews in the Dresden press were uniformly scathing.[38] Thus, in the 1901 Dresden program for the Second Symphony the deceased is simply "a beloved person," and, as in the Marschalk iteration, memories of his life pass through the minds of the observers.

Mahler once again links the Andante programmatically to the Allegro by describing it as one of the episodes from the life of the Allegro character "pass[ing] before our mind's eye." Parallels with the "Sonnenblick" description in the Marschalk version are clear, particularly in the use of "melancholy memory" ("melancholy dream" in Marschalk) and "happy moment" ("hour of happiness" in Marschalk) However, the idea of "lost innocence" is new, anticipated by neither the Bauer-Lechner nor Marschalk versions.

Missing from the Dresden document is a programmatic connection to the scherzo, another unique feature of the Marschalk version. The only conceptual link between the Andante and the ensuing movements is Mahler's grouping of it, the scherzo and "Urlicht" as "intermezzi." The addition of "Urlicht" to the list of intermezzi is striking, as the composer had directed in the published score that there be no break between the end of "Urlicht" and the beginning of the finale, as well as no break between the scherzo and "Urlicht."[39] I will return to this issue, as it is a primary topic in a letter of 1903 from Mahler to conductor Julius Buths.

Mahler calls the second and third movements "interludes"for Bauer-Lechner and Marschalk, and describes "Urlicht" similarly in 1901, referring to the movement as an "intermezzo." However, it is not until 1901 that he clarifies this characterization in his programs. The two early programs are inconsistent in their use of "characters" from movement to movement (who is having the experience, the mourner or the deceased?); the 1901 program is not: the memories, turmoil and experiences of the middle three movements are those of the deceased, and the questions and events of the outer movements are experienced by observers—by us.[40]

In the 1901 program, Mahler's description of the Andante, scherzo, and "Urlicht" as intermezzi and his extra-musical explanations of the movements support one another, and, on the hand-written program Mahler used a symbol, to separate the three central movements from the outer ones. Mahler's earlier conception of the work, illustrated in the printed concert program for the 4 March 1895 première of the first three movements, is quite different. Here, the Allegro, Andante, and scherzo constitute the "first part" of the symphony. Initially, it seems, Mahler divided the work along timbral lines—instrumental vs. vocal movements. By 1901 he felt that a verbal grouping of the three central movements would emphasize the ties, both musical and programmatic, between the massive outer movements. Such a grouping, however, overlooks the links between the finale and both the scherzo and "Urlicht." It also belies his direction in the score that the third, fourth and fifth movements be played without a break, separating these movements from the Andante, which is separated from the Allegro by a five-minute pause. On the basis of the score alone, the only movement that appears to be an independent episode is the Andante.

Perhaps Mahler's changing bundle of episodes or intermezzi is primarily the result of his ambivalence toward the Andante. "Urlicht" is linked directly to the finale not only through its *attacca subito* relationship but through a direct reference at mm. 661–72 of the finale. The opening measures of the finale, with its quote of m. 465 of the scherzo, makes the scherzo something more than an interlude that lies outside the musical events of the symphony. The Andante, however, does indeed lie outside the web of references in the finale, and does act as an interlude, a respite, in the midst of the symphony. Mahler tried to make the Andante fit into the program by listing one or two other movements under the rubric of interlude or intermezzo, despite this being a less apt description for them than it is for the Andante. Had he jettisoned the Andante, he would have had no musical reason to refer to any movement as an interlude.

To summarize: From Bauer-Lechner's succinct, "The Andante embodies love," Mahler enlarges his narrative for the Andante to four sentences, describing for Marschalk an event that does not necessarily concern love. In both versions, Mahler links the Andante to the Allegro by describing it as depicting an episode from the life of the Allegro protagonist, be he alive or be he dead. In the Dresden version, Mahler's description of the Andante is clear and concise. Here, the "happy moment" is a reiteration of the "hour of happiness" in the letter to Marschalk, but Mahler has added "a melancholy memory of his youth and lost innocence."The concept is present in Mahler's program for Marschalk, for after the mourner experiences the "hour of happiness" from the life of the hero, he returns to reality, "awake[ning] from this melancholy dream…."However, the Dresden program lacks the link between the Andante and the scherzo Mahler forged for Marschalk, in which the tumult of the scherzo awakens the observer from the dream of the Andante. Also, in the Marschalk program the memory arises in a pallbearer, but in the Dresden program, the agency is less clear and seems to occur in the mind of the departed one.

Although the Andante descriptions differ, they are all reflective of the stark contrast between it and the other movements, particularly the first. In each version, Mahler makes a case in the narrative for the Andante, and he achieves this to a greater degree in the second and third iterations than in the first. Tellingly, Mahler suggests to Marschalk that the atmosphere of the Andante is so unlike that of the preceding movement that "you can nearly forget what has happened" in the Allegro.

This is precisely the problem Mahler described to Julius Buths in 1903, as the composer stressed the need for a pause after the Allegro. Buths had written to Mahler suggesting a break between "Urlicht" and the finale. Mahler replied to Buths in a letter of 25 March 1903, approving of Buths's suggestion but also stressing that

Nevertheless, after the first movement must certainly come an ample pause for recollection, because the second movement does not act as contrast, rather as a mere discrepancy after the first. This is my fault and not a lack of understanding on the part of the listener. Maybe you have already sensed this, if you have rehearsed the two movements consecutively. The Andante was composed as a kind of intermezzo (like an echo of long past days from the life of the one whom we have borne to the grave in the first movement "at the time the sun still smiled on him").

While the first, third, fourth and fifth movements are thematically and sentimentally connected, the second is there for itself, and in a certain sense interrupts the strict, harsh course of events. Perhaps this is a weakness of the format [die Disposition], but the intention has certainly become clear to you through the above suggestion.

It is entirely consistent to interpret the beginning of the fifth movement as a link to the first, and the long pause before it will make this clear to the listener also.[41]

In his 1903 letter to Buths, Mahler again suggests grouping the middle three movements of the Second by supporting a pause between "Urlicht" and the finale. Also, Mahler points out that such a pause would facilitate the interpretation of the beginning of the fifth movement as a reference to the first movement ("… den Anfang des 5. Satz als Anknüpfung an den ersten zu deuten"). Maher relates to Buths that the Andante was conceived as a kind of intermezzo that, unfortunately, "interrupts the … course of events," and that the Allegro maestoso, scherzo, "Urlicht," and the finale are connected. However, in his letter of March 1896 to Marschalk the composer states that both the second and third movements are "interludes," and in his December 1901 program indicates that all three central movements are intermezzi. It is not until his letter to Buths in 1903 that Mahler writes anything about the symphony that articulates its actual musical characteristics. The first, third, fourth and fifth movements are connected, and there exists a "course of events" that culminates in the finale. The close ties that "Urlicht" and especially the scherzo share with the last movement make it difficult to hear the two as intermezzi or interludes. The "intermezzo" designation was a result of the composer's wish to construct an extra-musical program encompassing a particular movement (Andante moderato) that does not fit into the musical scheme. In his 1903 letter, Mahler gives a programmatic statement for the second movement only; the others he describes in terms of their connections to one another. Once he had acknowledged that the Andante was out-of-place musically he was able to discuss the rest of the symphony in musical, albeit brief, terms.

Mahler was unsatisfied with the Andante moderato of the Second Symphony, even years before completing the five-movement work. His dissatisfaction manifested itself in his changing the movement order multiple times and in leaving the Andante out of the finale's web of thematic references to the symphony's other movements. Relatively speedy publication of the piece cemented the Andante's position, and the composer's only option was programmatic—working the Andante into a scenario he developed for the entire symphony. Mahler's program is arguably a response to his, and others', perceptions of discrepancies in the symphony, and the evolving text points to justifying the Andante's presence. Mahler's ambivalence toward the Andante was certainly not the primary impetus behind developing a program for the Second Symphony, but it was clearly a force in shaping the structure and narrative.

Notes

[1]Natalie Bauer-Lechner, *Erinnerungen an Gustav Mahler* (Vienna: E. P. Tal, 1923) (hereafter NBL), 133; Natalie Bauer-Lechner, *Recollections of Gustav Mahler,* trans. Dika Newlin, ed. Peter Franklin (London: Faber, 1980) (hereafter NBLE), 127.

[2]NBLE, 29. The sketches are in **A** Wn, Musiksammlung, S. m. 4364. Henry-Louis de La Grange, in *Gustav Mahler: Vers la Gloire* (Paris: Fayard, 1979), 919, gives "8. VIII. 88" as a date for a sketch; however, this MS is actually a rough draft of the first movement.

[3]**A** Wn, S. m. 4364, folio 7v.

[4] MS is part of the Moldenhauer Archive in the Paul Sacher Foundation, Basel, Switzerland. A facsimile of the title page is in Gilbert Kaplan, *Gustav Mahler: Symphony No. 2 in C Minor, 'Resurrection,' Facsimile* (New York: The Kaplan Foundation, 1986) (hereafter GKF), 56.

[5] Mahler used the term "symphonic poem" in reference to the Allegro of the C-minor symphony in a letter of 16 October 1891 to Ludwig Strecker, director of B. Schott Söhne in Mainz. See *GustavMahler: Briefe*, ed. Herta Blaukopf (Vienna: Paul Zsolnay Verlag, 1983) (hereafter GMB2), 92. Mahler mentions Strauß's success in a letter to Arthur Seidl of 17 February 1897 (GMB2, 201).

[6] See GKF, 56.

[7] A few examples are: Michael Steinberg, *The Symphonies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 285, 287; Constantin Floros, *Gustav Mahler: The Symphonies*, trans. Vernon Wicker (Portland: Amadeus Press, 1993), 54–61; Peter Franklin, *The Life of Mahler* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 58, 98; Carolyn Abbate, *Unsung Voices: Opera and Musical Narrative in the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 128–9.

[8] Josef Bohuslav Foerster, *Der Pilger: Erinnerungen einen Musikers* (Prague, 1955), 406. See Donald Mitchell, *Gustav Mahler: The Wunderhorn Years* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975) (hereafter DM2), 137.

[9] Edward R. Reilly, "Die Skizzen zu Mahlers zweiter Symphonie,"*Österreichische Musik Zeitschrift* 34/6 (1979), 269. MS is missing, but is described in a *Katalog der Seidelschen Sortiments-Buchhandlung* of 30 November 1923, in the Handschriftsammlung of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 486116.

[10]The piano/vocal score of "Antonius" is in New York at the Pierpont Morgan Library (**US** NYpm), and is part of the Robert Owen Lehman collection. The full score of the song is at Harvard University (**US** CA), Houghton Library, fMS Mus 125. The scherzo draft is also at **US** NYpm.

[11]Mahler modified the instrumentation in 1894 when he inserted"Urlicht" into the work, maintaining his 1893 version for publication as an independent *Wunderhorn* Lied. 1893 MS at **GB** Lbm, Zweig 49. Date from MS and Reilly, "Die Skizzen," 269. For a detailed account of the history of the composition of "Urlicht," see John R. Palmer, *Program and Process in the Second Symphony of Gustav Mahler* (Ph.D. diss.,University of California, Davis, 1996), 160–72.

[12] Mahler hatte sein Andante in sieben Tagen vollendet und sagte selbst, daß er Grunde habe, sich daran zu freuen. „Aber das, was ich gewollt und was bei der Konzeption mir vorschwebte, ist doch nicht in allem erreicht und manches verloren gegangen."

„Das wird aber", entgegnete ich, „wohl bei jedem ausgeführten Werk dem Entwurf gegenüber der Fall sein?"

„Daß müßte nicht sein und namentlich bei kleineren Kompositionen gelingt es auch eher, das Gewollte ganz zu erreichen. So will mir scheinen daß z. B. in meinem „Himmlischen Leben" die Ausführung dem Entwurfe ganz adäquat ist und sich in allem und jedem aufs glücklichste damit deckt, ja ihn in manchen Stücken noch übertrifft." *Gustav Mahler in den Erinnerungen von Natalie Bauer-Lechner*, ed. and rev. Knud Martner (Hamburg: Karl Dieter Wagner, 1984) (hereafter NBL 1984), 25.

[13] Letter to Arthur Seidl of 17 February 1897, GMB2, 200. Edward Reilly has determined that "Aufersteh'n, ja Aufersteh'n" was sung to the melody "Jesus lebt," from the *Hamburger Gemeindegesangbuch*, a melody that bears no relationship to Mahler's setting of the poem. However, there is a striking resemblance between Mahler's setting and one by Carl Gottlieb Hering (1766–1853), published as no. 18 in his *Vollständiges Choralbuch* (1833) (see Palmer, *Program and Process*, 26–7). Thomas Bauman, in his "Mahler in a New Key: Genre and the 'Resurrection' Finale," *The Journal of Musicology*, 23/3 (2006), 468–85, argues that the finale of the Second Symphony is a re-enactment of this moment of genesis, providing the formal impetus behind the movement.

[14]GMB2, 113, 114, 116. Fair copy MS is at **US** NYpm.

[15]Eight bifolios comprise the second movement in the 1894 MS. Inserted into the fourth of these is a single leaf marked "Einlage." Material on the "Einlage" follows continuously from the last measure of bif. 4, f. 1v, which corresponds to m. 172 of the published score. The addition extends the material after m. 172 and takes the place of the first three measures on bif. 4, f. 2r, which are very like mm. 173–75. Mahler's original conception progressed from what is now m. 174, although with a bass line that returns to D# on the third beat, through a measure similar to m. 183 to m. 184, then continued as in the published version.

[16] MS at New York Public Library (**US** NYp), in Walter, Bruno (1876–1962). Papers. ID: NYPG93–C3234). Also at one time in the possession of conductor Karl Muck (1859–1940). The Hamburg rehearsal was with the Opera House orchestra (GMB2, 119; DM2, 278).

[17]**US** NH, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Osborn Collection, Music MS 508. Complete orchestra score in the hand of Otto Weidich with additions and corrections by Mahler. Does not include "Urlicht." The timpani introduction to the scherzo, later crossed out, is on p. 89.

[18] On the oboe motive, see DM2, 283 and Palmer, *Program and Process*, 114.

[19] See Palmer, *Program and Process*, 104–05.

[20] DM2, 217–24.

[21]For a more comprehensive list of references, see Palmer, *Program and Process*, 237.

[22] DM2, 158–9.

[23] The two-piano arrangement was completed by Hermann Behn (1859–1927) by early September 1895 and was published "immediately" by Hofmeister in Leipzig, the costs covered by Behn and merchant Wilhelm Berkhan (GMB2, 129). Behn and Berkhan also underwrote the costs for the 1897 publication of the full score, also by Hofmeister in Leipzig.

[24] DM2, 140–2; La Grange, *Years of Challenge¸* 724.

[25] Concerning Mahler's planned inclusion of "Das himmlische Leben" in the Third Symphony, see a letter of 17 August 1895 to Arnold Berliner in which Mahler gives a name for each movement, "Das himmlische Leben" occupying seventh position. On 29 August 1895 he writes to Friedrich Löhr about the symphony and includes a list of programmatic titles, "Das himmlische Leben" listed as the seventh movement.The next summer (27 June 1896) Mahler sends Anna von Mildenburg a list of slightly modified movement titles, without "Das himmlische Leben."GMB2, 126–8, 164–5.

[26] DM2, 141; Henry-Louis de La Grange, *Gustav Mahler: Vienna: Years of Challenge (1897–1904)* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 724–5.

[27] Facsimiles of the concert program are in Henry-Louis de La Grange, *Mahler* (New York, 1973) (hereafter HLG), plate 49; GKF, 114.

[28] Henry-Louis de La Grange, *Mahler*, vol. 1 (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1973), 320.

[29]*Signale für die musikalische Welt*, 53 (1895), 311; cited in Rudolph Stephan, *Gustav Mahler, II. Symphonie C-moll: Meisterwerke der Musik* No. 21 (Munich: Fink, 1979), 21.

[30] La Grange, *Mahler*, vol. 1, 346–7.

[31]*Hamburger Nachrichten*, 13 December 1895. The full review is available in Ferdinand Pfohl, *Gustav Mahler: Eindrücke und Erinnerungen aus den Hamburger Jahren*, ed. Knud Martner (Hamburg, 1973), 67–72. Quoted in DM2, 288.

[32] See letters to Arnold Berliner and Oskar Bie, GMB2, 114, 116, 119, 121–2. The letters to Berliner report on Mahler's progress on the Second Symphony.   Notably, the letter to Bie of 3 April 1895 was to thank Bie for a favorable review of the 3 March 1895 Berlin concert at which the first three movements of the Second Symphony received their first performance. Bie knew the work, but Mahler evidently did not feel compelled to include a program.

[33]"Der Erste Satz enthält das titanenhafte Ringen eines in der Welt noch befangenen kolossalen Menschen mit dem Leben und dem Geschick, dem er immer wieder unterliegt: sein Tod. Der Zweite und Dritte Satz, Andante und Scherzo, sind episoden aus dem Leben des gefallenen Helden. Das Andante enthält die Liebe."NBL,22; NBL 1984, 40; NBLE, 43.

[34]"Ich habe den ersten Satz „Totenfeier‟ gennant, und wenn Sie es wissen wollen, so ist es der Held meiner D-dur-Symph[onie], den ich zu Grabe trage, und dessen Leben ich, von einer höhere Warte aus, in einem reinen Spiegel auffange.

Der 2., u. 3. Satz ist als Interludium gedacht: der 2. Satz, eine *Erinnerung!* Ein Sonnenblick, rein und ungetrübt, aus dem Leben dieses Helden.

Es ist Ihnen doch begegnet, daß Sie einen lieben Menschen zu Grabe getragen, und dann vielliecht auf dem Rückweg erstand plötzlich das Bild einer längst vergangenen Stunde des Glücks, das sich Ihnen nun wie ein Sonnenstrahl in die Seele legt — durch nichts verdüstert — beinahe können Sie vergessen, was eben geschehen! Das ist der 2. Satz! — Wenn Sie dann aus diesem wehmütigen Traum aufwachen, und in das wirre Leben zurückmüssen, … Dies ist der 3. *Satz!*" Letter to Max Marschalk, 26 March 1896. GMB2, 150.   Max Marschalk (1863–1940), a Berlin music critic and composer who for many years contributed to the *Vossische Zeitung,* wrote insightful essays on Mahler's music.

[35] Marschalk's analysis of Mahler's First Symphony appeared in *Die redenden Künste*, 3. Jahrgang. Heft 13 (Leipzig, 1896/97).

[36] La Grange, *Years of Challenge*, 414, n. 147. Transcriptions (with varying degrees of accuracy) appear in Henry-Louis de La Grange and Günther Weiß, eds., *Ein Glück ohne Ruh': Die Briefe Gustav Mahlers an Alma* (Wolf Jobst Siedler: Berlin, 1997), 87–9; Karl-Josef Müller, *Mahler: Leben-Werke-Dokumente* (Mainz, 1988), 435–37; Palmer, *Program and Process*, 288–9. La Grange and Weiß state that the program was enclosed in a letter to Mahler's sister, Justine, and kept by Alma. Facsimiles of the complete handwritten program can be found in DM2, 179–82; GKF, 40.

[37] "I. Satz. Wir stehen am Sarge eines geliebten Menschen. Sein Leben, Kämpfen, Leiden und Wollen zieht noch einmal, zum letzten Mal an unserem geistigen Auge vorüber. […]

Die nächsten 3 Sätze sind als Intermezzi gedacht.

2. Satz — Andante: Ein seliger Augenblick aus dem Leben dieses theuren Todten und eine wehmütige Erinnerung an seine Jugend und verlorene Unschuld."

[38] La Grange, *Years of Challenge*, 140–41.

[39] Direction at the bottom of the last page of "Urlicht" in the full score reads "folgt ohne jede Unterbrechung der 5. Satz;" direction at the bottom of the last page of the scherzo reads "folgt ohne jede Unterbrechung der 4. Satz."

[40]Here we can see the importance of a proper transcription. The difference between "sein Ohr" (La Grange/Weiß, Palmer, GKF,) and "unser Ohr"(Müller, *Mahler*, 435–7; Alma Mahler, *Gustav Mahler: Memories and Letters¸* ed. Donald Mitchell, trans. Basil Creighton [New York, 1969], 193) is fundamental, and the incorrect "unser Ohr"precludes the grouping of the programmatic descriptions of the three central movements according to perspective.

[41]"Trotzdem mußte allerdings auch nach dem 1. Satz eine ausgiebige Sammlungspause eintreten, weil der 2. Satz nicht als Gegensatz, sondern als bloße Diskrepanz nach dem 1. wirkt. Es ist dies meine Schuld und nicht mangelndes Verständnis des Zuhörers. Vielliecht haben Sie dies schon empfunden, wenn Sie die beiden Sätze hintereinander probiert haben. — Das Andante ist als eine Art Intermezzo komponiert (wie ein Nachklang längst vergangener Tage aus dem Leben desjenigen, den wir im 1. Satz zu Grabe getragen — „da ihm noch die Sonne gelacht‟ —).

Währenddem 1., 3., 4. und 5. Satz thematisch und stimmungsinhaltlich zusammenhängen, steht das 2. Stück für sich selbst da und unterbricht in gewissem Sinn den strengen, herben Gang der Ereignisse. Vielliecht ist dies eine Schwäche der Disposition, deren Absicht Ihnen aber durch obige Andeutung gewiß klar geworden ist.

Ganz konsequent ist es, den Anfang des 5. Satzes als Anknüpfung an den ersten zu deuten, und durch die große Pause vor demselben wird dies auch dem Zuhörer deutlich werden." Letter to Julius Buths, Vienna, 25 March 1903. GMB2, 279.