Johannes Brahms and the Railway: A Composer and Steam

Every day at 12:37 p.m., EuroCity 177, the “Johannes Brahms,” leaves the Berlin-Gesundbrunnen train station for Vienna, Austria.\(^1\) It is not at all unusual for a railway route to bear a composer’s name; persons of significance are often honored this way in the European rail network. But is there more to this particular naming than meets the eye? What of Johannes Brahms and the railway?

Certainly Brahms was, by virtue of his birth year, no stranger to the age of steam. In Germany the first railway began service in 1835; in Austria, it was 1837.\(^2\) An overview of Brahms’s correspondence and biographical writings shows no expression of concerns, fears, or complaints about train travel.\(^3\) On the contrary, his comments seem to indicate that he found it to be a comfortable experience, even though, according to Jan Swafford, he chose to travel in second class, the “comfortable but simple” middle of the three main ticketed classes of those days.\(^4\) For example, in a letter he wrote from Vienna to George Henschel in May 1881, Brahms advised Henschel that he would be in the Viennese suburb of Pressbaum (24 kms. distance) that summer, observing, “I shall be only a short distance away by rail, which, however, I always travel with great pleasure.”\(^5\)

But in Brahms’s comments on train travel there is, at times, a more plaintive thread. This is particularly true in letters to his stepmother Karoline, and is illustrated by his use of the phrase “Die Reise ist weit,”\(^6\) or similar expressions. Such comments usually came in response to Karoline’s asking Brahms when he would next be coming to Hamburg. This thread also occurs in letters to friends. To Amalie von Bruch on 1 July 1868, he wrote: “You would not believe how often I think of Vienna. If only the journey there—and each journey back [to Hamburg]—were not so long!—One ought to just stay there.”\(^7\) Perhaps it wasn’t the means of transport that was an issue for Brahms, but the length of time it took to make the trip.

Brahms’s interest in the railway was just one example of the larger interest he had in technology in general. J.V. Widmann describes his perspective thus: “Even the smallest discovery, every improvement in any sort of gadget for domestic use; in short, every sign of human reflection, if it was accompanied by practical success, delighted him thoroughly. Nothing escaped [... ] if it was something new, in which progress could be discerned.” Brahms, Widmann continues, felt lucky that he lived in the age of great discoveries; he couldn’t praise enough the electric light, Edison’s phonograph, and the like.\(^8\)

Brahms’s use of the train falls into three categories: to travel to his holiday destinations, for his work as a musician, and for general travel. His holidays were very regular, and he was comfortable frequenting the same destination year after year. In Austria these habits led to repeated summer stays in Baden-Baden, Bad Ischl, Mürzzuschlag, and Pörtschach. Many of his holiday destinations were well-known gathering places for intellectuals, artists, and high society in nineteenth-century Europe, but he also enjoyed taking longer trips in Switzerland (late 1860s and late 1880s), and he made eight lengthy journeys to Italy by train between 1878 and 1893. The Italian trips, done in the company of various friends and colleagues, were always made in April and May. He also often took day excursions, such as one in 1869 to Semmering about which he wrote from Vienna to his family in Hamburg.\(^9\)

Brahms used the train when he was on tour as a pianist and conductor. Train travel was a lifesaver for touring musicians.
Traveling like Franz Liszt had done, by post-chaise in grueling stints, over rough terrain, and often at night, was no more. The arduousness of traveling abroad, which Robert and Clara Schumann experienced during their journey to Russia in January–May 1844, was in the past. It took the Schumanns roughly five days to get from St. Petersburg to Moscow by post-chaise and sleigh, a distance of just over 595 kilometers. By comparison, in 1889 the same journey took fourteen hours by train; it now takes four-and-a-half hours by direct train. Brahms toured across much of German-speaking and Habsburg Europe throughout his professional life. Most notable are the tours in the 1880s with the forty-nine-member Meininger Hofkapelle and its conductor, Hans von Bülow. Before railway travel, such group tours would have been a logistical nightmare!

As for traveling in general, Brahms made regular trips between Hamburg and Vienna to see his family, and to Bonn, Frankfurt, and Vienna to visit the Schumanns and other friends. Typically, little is said about such trips in Brahms’s correspondence, but there is one journey that I would like to spotlight because of the detailed information we have about it: the visit to Vienna of Brahms’s father in the later 1860s.

Brahms made many entreaties to his father to visit him in Vienna, and Johann Jakob finally agreed to come in 1867. In a letter of 23 July, Brahms gave his father detailed instructions on making the journey by train, including a schedule that showed all the stops and changes. Brahms covered many details in this letter, from what kind of ticket to buy, to which side of the train to sit on for the best view between Dresden and Prague, to possible opportunities for stop-overs if the trip were too much for Johann Jakob to do in one stage. And just as travel experts advise today, he reminded his father to pack lightly, have the correct documentation, and bring enough local currency to take care of necessary transactions:

Beloved Father,

Well, you’re probably returning from Heide tomorrow, and, I hope, are in as good spirits as I could wish for, in such good spirits—that you will right away do what I ask of you.

You have now been to see beloved old things, now see something new: come to Vienna! . . .

Now you absolutely must not contradict, nor think it over, but if possible get started this very evening.

I hope for that with such certainty that I will now merely write out how you must travel!

You make arrangements so that you can stay away for 2 to 3 weeks, and must also plan for a somewhat longer time. Then you see to it that you have, or can get, about 40 thaler—I have no Prussian bills at home and it is Sunday.

Now you get a ticket direct to Vienna by way of Berlin, Dresden, Prague. The ticket must be valid for 5–8 days. Be sure of both things! Costs about 30 thaler second class all the way. There are only two trains. You can of course travel through in one go—in about 32 hours. That works only if you have rainy, cool weather! Otherwise you couldn’t stand it. But since the ticket is good for a week, you can also stop over for a day or half a day in each city, and look around it. But if so, go first of all to a good hotel and make use of porters and [public] servants for hire as guides. If you continue on right away in Berlin you must take a hackney to the other station. A policemen hands out the voucher at the exit. Before you travel the night through, as is practical in the heat, drink a glass of grog so you sleep well. But take along very little, for example no scruffy things for the trip! No cigars, nothing new, nothing that is taxable. You’ll find every conceivable thing here with me. Don’t let that make your journey uncomfortable . . . .

[Here Brahms wrote out the timetables for the trip.]

All this Fritz must make very clear to you, and write it down plainly so that to some extent you are always informed. Ask the conductor frequently, too.

When you get on, try to get a corner seat and between Dresden and Prague sit on the left side for the sake of the view (Saxon Switzerland). How much I’d prefer to fetch you, but that would really be very complicated. I would also like to say that Mother should come along, but that too would be relatively all too complicated, expensive and whatnot.

So don’t even stop to think it over. Should you happen to be taking along your last or other people’s money, we’ll send it to Mother from here straightaway . . . .

By coming right away you’ll give me the greatest pleasure I could hope for.

So first of all: ticket that is valid for 5–8 days, getting off and staying over, or else continuing on, whichever is more agreeable to you, very little luggage . . . .

Also, don’t forget at all times to eat well whenever there is time, have breakfast, etc. . . . .

I wait impatiently for you simply to report your departure to me. The comparisons are interesting: on 25 July 1867, the day that Johann Jakob left, there were only two departures per day from Hamburg to Vienna; now there are thirteen. Of these only two are non-stop; the other eleven options require one change in Germany, either in Würzburg (daytime) or in Munich (evening). In 1867 one would have had to make multiple train changes on the route; using the same route now, the best connection would involve changing trains only once, in Dresden. In 1867 this trip took an average of thirty-two hours; following the same route now takes about fourteen hours. According to current Deutsche Bahn schedules (and not following the 1867 route), it takes between nine-and-a-half and fifteen hours to make the trip by train.

In 1867 the route went from Hamburg east to Berlin, and then south to Prague and Vienna. The routing now is from Hamburg south to Nuremberg, and then continuing in a gradual southeasterly direction to Vienna, crossing the German-Austrian border at Passau. In Brahms’s time, the German States held responsibility for railways within their borders, and not all states moved forward on building rail lines at the same speed. The roundabout route through Northern Germany and Austria in use in 1867 may have been the result of the Kingdom of Bavaria’s delay in building railroad track, although the Königliche Bayerische Staats-Eisenbahnen (founded in 1844) had finally connected Salzburg with Bavaria via the Maximilians-Bahn in 1860. Perhaps there were too many connections, making for too long a through-trip to be attractive to travelers coming from Austria to central and northern Germany. Finally, the price in 1867 for a one-way ticket in second class was 30 thaler. Not cheap! In our times (using 2010 currency rates), this ticket would cost approximately $414. By comparison, a one-way second-class ticket purchased from the Deutsche Bahn website in 2010 cost between $223–249.
Table 1. Johann Jakob Brahms’s Train Trip, Hamburg to Vienna

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Brahms 1 – 1867</strong></th>
<th><strong>Brahms 2 - 1867</strong></th>
<th><strong>Brahms 3 - 2011</strong>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>25 July 1867</strong></td>
<td>25 July 1867</td>
<td>28 July 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg –</td>
<td>Hamburg -</td>
<td>Hamburg -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leave 2230 hrs</td>
<td>leave 0730 hrs</td>
<td>leave 1629 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin -</td>
<td>Berlin -</td>
<td>Berlin -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrive 0520 hrs</td>
<td>arrive 1557 hrs</td>
<td>arrive 1833 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depart 0645 hrs</td>
<td>depart 1900 hrs</td>
<td>depart 1841 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dresden -</td>
<td>Dresden -</td>
<td>Dresden -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrive 1140 hrs</td>
<td>arrive 2330 hrs</td>
<td>arrive 2051 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depart 1245 hrs</td>
<td>depart 0103 hrs</td>
<td>depart 2108 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodenbach (present-day Děčín) -</td>
<td>Bodenbach (present-day Děčín) -</td>
<td>Děčín-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrive 1420 hrs</td>
<td>arrive 0230 hrs</td>
<td>arrive 2153 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depart 1510 hrs</td>
<td>depart 0305 hrs</td>
<td>depart 2156 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague -</td>
<td>Prague -</td>
<td>Prague -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrive 1900 hrs</td>
<td>arrive 0550 hrs</td>
<td>arrive 2326 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depart 1924 hrs</td>
<td>depart 0609 hrs</td>
<td>depart 0004 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna -</td>
<td>Vienna -</td>
<td>Vienna -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrive 0756 hrs</td>
<td>arrive 1512 hrs</td>
<td>arrive 0622 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time taken is 33:26 hrs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Time taken is 31:42 hrs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Time taken is 13:53 hrs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From Deutsche Bahn website schedule planner <www.bahn.de>
or under significant physical hardship. Brahms embraced the stride forward that the steam railway represented, and viewed the train as it was intended: as a manifestation of progress and a tool to assist him in his life’s actions. As a symbol of the industrial age, the railway did not threaten Brahms; he was comfortable with steam propelling him to whatever destination lay ahead. Even today, Brahms lovers who wish to do so can follow much the same route he took across Germany and Austria when he traversed the distance between Vienna and his beloved Hamburg. *Alle einsteigen bitte!*  

Thomas Quigley

I am grateful to my life-partner Ernest de Beaupré and Brahms colleagues Styra Avins and Wiltrud Martin for their help in preparing this article.

Notes: 1. See details at “Route of EC177 Johannes Brahms—Eurocity train,” <http://czech-transport.com/index.php?id=420>. There is a return EuroCity 176 “Johannes Brahms,” which begins in Brno, Czech Republic, and ends in Hamburg. 2. In England George Stephenson’s “Locomotion,” built in 1825 for the Stockton and Darlington Railway (40 kms., between Witton Park and Stockton-on-Tees), was the first public steam railway in the world. The first steam railway in Germany began service in 1835, between Nuremberg and Fürth on the Bayerische

Brahms in the New Century

From time to time, the American Brahms Society sponsors academic conferences focused on Brahms and his music. Our most recent event, Brahms in the New Century, took place on 21–23 March 2012, hosted by the Brook Center for Music Research at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. More than seventy attendees heard papers given by thirty presenters from the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia, covering a wide range of topics. (Papers are listed in the “Papers and Presentations” section on page 10.) Conference attendees also were treated to an exhibit of Brahms sources held by The Juilliard Manuscript Collection, including manuscripts of the Double Concerto, Op. 102, and the Piano Quartet, Op. 60, and to a display of manuscripts, letters, and unpublished Schenker graphs held by the Music Division of the New York Public Library. Among conference highlights: Scott Burnham, Scheide Professor of Music at Princeton University, presented the keynote address, “Between Schicksal and Seligkeit: Mortality as Music in Brahms,” which explored how Brahms confronted the dialectic between cold fate and spiritual consolation in the face of human mortality across three great choral works: the Gesang der Parzen, Op. 89, Schicksalslied, Op. 54, and Ein deutsches Requiem, Op. 45; and Neal Peres da Costa (Sydney Conservatorium of Music, University of Sydney), along with Ironwood, a string quartet specializing in historical performance practice, presented a gripping reading of Brahms’s Piano Quintet, Op. 34.

The ABS is grateful to our hosts at the City University of New York, especially to Barbara Dobbs Mackenzie, Zdravko Blažeković, and Michelle Smith; to Jane Gottlieb of the Juilliard School library and Robert Kosovsky of the New York Public Library; to members of the Program Committee: Heather Platt, Walter Frisch, Ryan Minor, and chair Peter Smith; to Robert Kvam, Dean of the College of Fine Arts at Ball State University, who arranged for Ball State’s sponsorship of the event, which among other things provided for participant packages and the printing of programs; to Daniel Beller-McKenna, who designed the event’s webpage; to Valerie Goertzen for her assistance with registration and for proofing the programs; and most especially to Heather Platt and Peter Smith, respectively our past and present ABS Board presidents, for their very substantial overall contributions to the success of the conference.
Review


Recently there has been a spate of publications and conferences devoted to lateness. That this concept, and the related concern with death, has vast applicability is demonstrated by a Scott Burnham essay that freely ranges from J.S. Bach to Bob Dylan, and from Friedrich Hölderlin to Joan Didion, before zeroing in on its main focus, the late styles of Schumann. Along similar lines, the interdisciplinary conference “Rethinking Late Style,” held in 2008 at the Australian National University, embraced the paintings of J.M.W. Turner, the music of Arnold Schönberg, and the artwork of John Mawurndjul, a member of the Kuninjku people of Australia’s West Arnhem Land. Indeed the concept of lateness has become so ubiquitous that it has made its way out of academic venues into the general media. Witness the recent coverage of the final writings and subsequent death of the prodigious commentator Christopher Hitchens. In a National Public Radio article discussing one of Hitchens’ final essays for Vanity Fair, his friend Tina Brown said: “There’s no doubt that not being able to speak probably has taken him further into himself to write an emotionally pure kind of writing that he really in the past might not have wanted to do…” Hitchens himself invited such considerations of his late style when he wrote a Preface to the paperback re-edition of his memoir, Hitch 22. This Preface was written after he was diagnosed with esophageal cancer, but the first three chapters of the memoir, which eerily dwell on death, were written before the diagnosis.

Edward Said had numbered among Hitchens’ longtime intellectual sparring partners, and Said’s On Late Style, a posthumously published volume based on essays and lectures that date back at least as far as the 1980s, has influenced many of the recent investigations of the concept of lateness. Although Said writes about Beethoven, Bach, and Glenn Gould, as well as creative artists in other media, he does not discuss Brahms at any length.

In the musical realm, the late works of Bach and Beethoven have engendered studies dating back more than a century, and recent decades have witnessed a flowering of conferences and publications devoted to the late works of nineteenth-century composers, and in particular to those of Schumann and Schubert. Unlike Beethoven, Schubert, and Schumann, Brahms did not write his last compositions while dealing with intense psychological and physical problems. Almost all of his works were completed before he became ill, so that issues of imminent death and competency are not as pressing as they are with some other composers. Nevertheless, many commentators have observed a change in the style of his last works, and Margaret Notley’s recent monograph, Lateness and Brahms, interprets these works through the filter of such influential studies of lateness as those by Said, Adorno, and Rose Rosengard Subotnik.

Given the currency of the topic of lateness it is easy to assume from the title of this new collection of essays, Spätphase(n)? Johannes Brahms’ Werke der 1880er und 1890er Jahre, that it too will offer cogent, diverse definitions of what constitutes lateness or late style in Brahms. Indeed, Christiane Wiesenfeldt’s introduction, “Nostalgie, Progression und Inszenierung: Aspekte der Spätphase(n) von Johannes Brahms,” gives an excellent snapshot of current scholarship on the topic of lateness. It might also be supposed that the essays will directly engage some of the more difficult issues surrounding the idea of lateness in Brahms, including the degree to which elements that are often heard as symptomatic of lateness in other composers (such as introversion and melancholy) permeate all phases of his output. The term Spätphase(n) in the volume’s title and the following question mark seem to constitute enticing, provocative gestures in this direction. But although Wiesenfeldt’s introduction, the essays in the section “Spätwerk-Begriff” (pp. 247–324), and the closing discussion of the conference delegates address some of these issues, most of the twenty-seven essays reflect the volume’s subtitle and explore pieces and topics related to Brahms’s life and works in the 1880s and 1890s, with a special emphasis on his contact with the Meiningen court. As the subtitle of the volume also notes, these studies were initially presentations at a conference in Meiningen, and based on the brevity of each essay one assumes that the editors did not encourage the authors to amplify their ideas for this volume.

Many of the articles that most clearly address the issues of “late style” are grouped together under the heading “Spätwerk-Begriff,” which is surprisingly located toward the end of the volume. This section opens with Knud Breyer’s “Der Kreis als Ziel, das Ziel im Kreis: Eine zentrale Koordinate der Werkplanung bei Johannes Brahms.” On the one hand, Breyer elaborates on the ways in which some of Brahms’s late works circle back to earlier ones, and, on the other, he considers late works that are more of a teleological summing up of compositional techniques that Brahms used in earlier works, or that had been employed by previous composers. Most of the pieces in the latter category are the last composition in a genre, such as the Fourth Symphony. In the next essay, “The Construction of Nostalgia in Brahms’s Late Instrumental Music,” Daniel Beller-McKenna briefly explores the nostalgic aspects of some of the late works by invoking Fred Davis’s and Peter Fritzsche’s socio-logical and historical studies of nostalgia, and in particular Fritzsche’s conclusion that nostalgia involves linearity and irresistibility. Beller-McKenna considers the thematic recollection in the last movement of the Op. 115 Clarinet Quintet and examples of rhythmic dislocation in the Quintet’s second movement. In “Spätwerk als selbstbezügliche teleologische Konstruktion: Die ‘Vier ernsten Gesänge’ op. 121,” Wolfgang Sandberger emphasizes that Op. 121 is a late work within the late works, its lateness being defined not only by its chronological position, but also by its spirituality and its reflection on death. Sandberger contemplates both the introverted nature of the songs and some of the problems they posed to early listeners, as well as the deployment of such compositional techniques as rhetorical figures. Margaret Notley’s “Questions of Lateness and the Opening Allegro of Brahms’s E-Flat Clarinet Sonata” picks up themes from her monograph on the late works and discusses the sonata’s blending of historical lateness and late style. Aside from Wiesenfeldt’s introduction, this is one of the
few essays in the volume to reference some of the substantial literature on the concept of lateness. In addition, Notley responds to the recent critical reaction to Carl Schorske’s Fin-de-Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture (1981), a study that has influenced much of her work on the reception of Brahms’s music. The remaining two essays in this section concern late works, but unlike the other essays they do not directly address issues of lateness. Ulrich Krämer’s “Schönberg’s Bach oder Laterent Kontrapunkt in Brahms’ Spätwerk” focuses on the types of descending cycles of thirds that are widely cited as an important element of Brahms’s late style. Schönberg’s largely unknown essay on Bach’s Art of the Fugue and his more widely cited “Brahms the Progressive” provide the starting point for Krämer’s discussion of the contrapuntal and harmonic properties of the third cycles in such late works as the Capriccios, Op. 116, Nos. 1 and 6, and “O Tod, wie bitter bist du” (Op. 121, No. 3). Siegfried Oechsle’s “‘Entwickelnde Transformation’? Kompositionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zum Kopfsatz des c-Moll-Klaviertrios op. 101” is one of the most analytically detailed studies in the volume. In addition to the analysis of the manipulation of the first theme, Oechsle considers the affective quality of C minor and the ways in which the C major/minor contrast plays out across the work.

Many of the volume’s other essays touching on issues of lateness explore a particular aspect of a work dating from the final decades of Brahms’s life and then conclude by considering the extent to which the work represents the composer’s late style. For instance, the conclusion of Jürgen Heidrich’s essay “‘…der getreue Eckart des über alles geliebten Vaterlandes’? Johannes Brahms, das Dreiakaiserjahr und die ‘Fest- und Gedenksprüche’ op. 109,” focuses on issues of innovation and historicity raised by the late motets. Whereas Heidrich’s essay deals mostly with questions of genre, reception history, and the historical and political implications of Op. 109, Hans-Joachim Hinrichsen’s essay, “Späte Versöhnung: Die Violinsonate op. 108 und ihre Widmung an Hans von Bülow,” focuses on the last violin sonata’s motivic concision and the structural significance of the play between C-sharp and D-flat. (Hinrichsen frames this analysis with discussions of Kalbeck’s assertion that the music is a type of tone portrait of von Bülow.) Friedhelm Krummacher’s essay, “Spätmacher für Streicher? Harmonische Relationen in den Streichquintetten von Brahms,” likewise argues for the use of in-depth analyses in discussions of lateness. He compares the harmonic techniques in Op. 88, from 1882, with those in Op. 111, from 1890, and asks what the term “late style” implies about the music of the composer’s middle years.

A number of essays are like Breyer’s in that they discuss various ways in which the late works return to or recycle material from earlier works, some of which had remained unpublished. Brahms himself had drawn Clara Schumann’s attention to this type of circling back to the start of his career, remarking how the last of his 49 Deutsche Volkslieder, WoO 33, “Verstohlen geht der Mond auf,” recalls the slow movement of his Piano Sonata, Op. 1. In “Gewinn und Verlust: Abrechnung mit den Klaviertrios op. 8,” Michael Struck compares the two versions of the Op. 8 Piano Trio with the view that the second version, despite its retention of much material from the original 1854 version, is nonetheless arguably a new, and thus a late, work. Struck is one of the few authors to address the volume’s title of Spätephase(n), and he argues for the consideration of diverse late phases and late crises, rather than a simplistic, monolithic late phase, in Brahms’s work. Katrin Eich, in “Früher als spät? Brahms’ Klavierstücke op. 116–119 im Spiegel von Datierungshypothesen,” teases out various aspects of the hypothesis that some of Brahms’s late piano pieces may have originated during the early years of his career. In “Die ‘49 Deutschen Volkslieder’ für eine Singstimme (Chor) und Klavierbegleitung WoO 33 und ihre früheren Fassungen,” Michael Mustgrave compares Brahms’s earlier folksong arrangements with his later arrangements of the same melodies. Brahms’s study of folk music is one of the well-known consistent threads throughout his life, and Otto Biba, in “Späte Volksmusik-Studien von Brahms,” describes four very different sources of folk music that the composer studied in his final decades, including an edition of Japanese folk music that appeared in Vienna in 1888.

In “Der süße Kern der Selbstkontrolle: Eduard Hanslicks Brahmskritiken und Norbert Elias’ Zivilisationstheorie,” Markus Gärtner observes that although Hanslick discussed the works Brahms wrote during his final decade, he did not specifically explore the composer’s late style in the same manner that he tackled the late style of other composers such as Beethoven and Schumann. Gärtner invokes the theories of self-control formulated by the twentieth-century sociologist Norbert Elias in order to further evaluate both Hanslick’s writings and elements of Brahms’s late period. Although many descriptions of Brahms’s late works by nineteenth-century writers have been cited and discussed by a wide range of authors, Joseph Viktor Widmann’s poetic reception of Brahms’s A-major Violin Sonata, Op. 100, has not been previously explored. Inge van Rij takes up this poem and its relation to the sonata in “‘Der Hort des Minnesangs:’ Song and Structure in Brahms’s and Widmann’s ‘Thunersonate’” Van Rij, however, does not pursue questions of lateness.

The essays dealing with Brahms and Meiningen also frequently focus on the clarinet works. Peter Jost, in “Brahms’ Klarinettentrio op. 114 — ein ‘markanter Wendepunkt in seinem Schaffen’?” highlights the unconventional formal procedures in the first movement of the Clarinet Trio and briefly compares some of the compositional techniques in this work to those in earlier and contemporaneous pieces. He concludes that this Trio does not represent a turning point in Brahms’s oeuvre. In “Auch ein Werkpaar? Anmerkungen zum Klarinettentrio op. 114 und zum Klarinettenquintett op. 115,” Christian Martin Schmidt considers the differences between this “pair” of works and other “pairs,” such as the clarinet sonatas. In relation to the theme of “lateness,” he observes that, in contrast to the challenges many of the late works posed to listeners, these compositions were eagerly awaited and widely praised. In addition to noting some of the issues raised by the study of lateness, Schmidt closes his essay with the observation that many of Brahms’s final instrumental cycles end with a variation movement.8

This volume also embraces works such as the Third and Fourth Symphonies that a number of scholars do not classify as late. (Although Malcolm MacDonald categorizes these symphonies, along with other works written after 1883, as late, Notley does not. She concludes that “many, probably most, twentieth-century writers understood Brahms’s final period to have begun only after his completion of the G Major String Quintet [Op. 111] in 1890 and a short interlude in which he thought his creative life over.”) The contributors who explore...
compositions that predate 1890 do not, however, discuss this divergence of opinions.) Styra Avins, in “The ‘Excellent People’ of the Meiningen Court Orchestra and the Third Symphony of Johannes Brahms,” describes the high standard of performance of the Meiningen court orchestra and some of Brahms’s revisions to his Third Symphony, which may have been made as a result of hearing the orchestra perform this work before the score was published. Similarly, Robert Pascall is concerned with the final phases of the composition of the Fourth Symphony. He addresses the manner in which the reception of this work was shaped by performances of the Meiningen orchestra and by the enthusiasm of its conductor, Hans von Bülow. Pascall’s essay is titled “Zur Meiningen Uraufführung der 4. Symphonie und ihrer Bedeutung für Komponist und Werk.” Johannes Behr and Katharin Kirsch’s study of the corrections to the Second Piano Concerto, “Ein bislang unbekannter Korrekturabzug zum 2. Klavierkonzert op. 83 von Johannes Brahms,” also does not pursue this work’s relation to lateness. The concerto dates from 1881, and MacDonald discusses it at the end of his chapters on Brahms’s middle period works, along with the immediately preceding Academic and Tragic Overtures. In “Ouvertüren zur späteren Symphonik?: Brahms’ Ouvertüren im Kontext der Symphonien op. 73 und op. 90,” Fabian Bergener interprets these overtures as bridging the time between the two pairs of symphonies, and he assesses the extent to which they anticipate the late style.

While most of the contributors to this volume focus on the music Brahms wrote during his last decades, others delve into his life. The essays by Maren Goltz and Kurt Hofmann deal respectively with the Meiningen orchestra’s programming of Brahms’s music and the Meiningen palace where Brahms was a guest in his later years: “Von der ‘Mission’ zu musterungültigen Aufführungen: Die Brahms-Programme auf den Konzertreisen der Meiningener Hofkapelle (1882-1914)”; and “Späte Orte: Die Geschichte von Schloss und Park Altenstein.” Goltz’s web page (which can be accessed by using the search engine at http://www.db-thueringen.de) provides further information drawn from the Meiningen archives, including the orchestra’s programs and information about musicians who were active in Meiningen, dating from 1680 to 1918. Robert W. Eshbach explores this orchestra’s performances and its influence; “Brahms in ‘das Land ohne Musik’: The Visit of the Meiningen Orchestra to England in 1902” investigates the “interpretative revelation” that took place in England as a result of the Meiningen orchestra’s performances of Brahms’s compositions under Fritz Steinbach.

Ingrid Fuchs’s “Brahmsiana in der Sammlung Fellinger: Unbekannte Dokumente von der Hand Maria Fellingers und Bertha von Gasteigers zu den letzten zehn Lebensjahren von Johannes Brahms” contributes to our understanding of Brahms’s interactions with two of his admirers. By contrast, Peter Schmitt’s “Zögling und Übervater?: Zum Verhältnis der Komponisten Robert Fuchs und Johannes Brahms” explores Brahms’s influence on a contemporary composer and in particular the case of his Clarinet Quintet.

Friedhelm Krumbacher concludes his essay with some provocative questions about the notion of late style and whether, beyond its use in the marketing of conferences or concerts, it has significance. The criticism that the term “lateness” has become so fashionable that it is now overused is mentioned in passing in a small number of the other essays as well, and the problematic nature of this concept comes to the fore in the transcription of the conference’s closing discussion. Perhaps Robert Pascall best summed up some of the issues when he acknowledged lateness as an historical category, but questioned its power as an aesthetic category that could condition “how a listener hears a late piece. The rhetorics of late style—refinement, distillation, … transcendence, serenity, … alienation, … abstraction…—can be interpretively applied to any piece of any time; as appropriate, they remain general artistic rhetorics. Furthermore, a late work can only be identified in retrospect; death is and was often a surprise.” He then suggests “that lateness as an aesthetic category disappears in the face of artistic and expressive depth” (pp. 341-42). No doubt subsequent studies will further pursue the problematic nature of lateness and the unique set of issues that are involved in its application to Brahms’s oeuvre. On a much broader scale, one foresees future generations of cultural historians viewing the current fascination with the concept of lateness, to which Spätphase(n) is but one small contribution, as symptomatic of the psychological undercurrents brought on by the dawning of our new century.

Heather Platt

For the Record . . .

Last spring this Newsletter published notice of the sale of the autograph of an album containing an alternative version, for solo piano, of the waltz-like trio section of the second movement of the Horn Trio, Op. 40, by the Doyle Auction Galleries in New York City on 20 April 2011. We can now report that the album has become part of the William Scheide Library at Princeton University. As best we can tell, the little piece received its first public hearing in Seattle’s Meany Hall on 28 April 2011 in a concert by Craig Sheppard, a member of the University of Washington faculty (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6BKzPDxpB4E). Its German première by Jakob Hauschildt took place on 8 October 2011 during the Conference of the German Gesellschaft für Musikforschung at the Christian-Albrechts-Universität Kiel, and Katharina Loose of the Johannes Brahms Gesamtausgabe gave a paper on it. (Hauschildt’s performance will be included on a CD in the annual volume of the Gesellschaft für Musikforschung, together with Loose’s article.) Unaware of the auction, the ABS notice, and the events in Seattle and Kiel, Alex Needham of The Guardian announced on 12 January 2012 that the work “had been discovered in the library at Princeton University by the conductor and musicologist Christopher Hogwood…. ‘He saw signatures of the famous musicians who had come to dinner with [composer and conductor Arnold Wehner], including Liszt and Schumann—and was astonished to find this complete little work by Brahms, written when he was 20,” said Tom Service of ‘Music Matters’ and a Guardian classical music writer.” According to Service’s blog, the “world première” of the piece took place on BBC Radio 3’s “Music Matters” show on 21 January, with András Schiff performing. Three days before that, though, the work became available on YouTube, played in the Princeton home of William Scheide by the young pianist Andrew Sun, and was broadcast the next day on radio station KPRB Princeton 103.3 FM. (See also http://oldmusicautographs.blogspot.com/2012_01_01_archive.html.)

George Bozarth

An Afternoon in the Saleroom

It is not often that one gets the opportunity of a first look at a Brahms manuscript that has just come to light. Whereas manuscripts of published works cycle through the salerooms with some regularity, the chance of viewing something new is rare indeed, given Brahms’s famed destruction of his drafts. This was my good fortune when a prompt came from a Brahms manuscript that has just come to light. Whereas the annual volume of the Gesellschaft für Musikforschung, together with Loose’s article.) Unaware of the auction, the ABS notice, and the events in Seattle and Kiel, Alex Needham of The Guardian announced on 12 January 2012 that the work “had been discovered in the library at Princeton University by the conductor and musicologist Christopher Hogwood…. ‘He saw signatures of the famous musicians who had come to dinner with [composer and conductor Arnold Wehner], including Liszt and Schumann—and was astonished to find this complete little work by Brahms, written when he was 20,” said Tom Service of ‘Music Matters’ and a Guardian classical music writer.” According to Service’s blog, the “world première” of the piece took place on BBC Radio 3’s “Music Matters” show on 21 January, with András Schiff performing. Three days before that, though, the work became available on YouTube, played in the Princeton home of William Scheide by the young pianist Andrew Sun, and was broadcast the next day on radio station KPRB Princeton 103.3 FM. (See also http://oldmusicautographs.blogspot.com/2012_01_01_archive.html.)

George Bozarth

An Afternoon in the Saleroom

It is not often that one gets the opportunity of a first look at a Brahms manuscript that has just come to light. Whereas manuscripts of published works cycle through the salerooms with some regularity, the chance of viewing something new is rare indeed, given Brahms’s famed destruction of his drafts. This was my good fortune when a prompt came from Kiel, where colleagues in the Forschungsstelle of the Brahms Gesamtausgabe had been alerted by colleagues at the Leipzig Mendelssohn Gesamtausgabe to the contents of an autograph album of the Göttingen Music Director Arnold Wehner, which contains an entry by Brahms. The fear was that, once sold, the source might disappear, leaving scholars with only the evidence in the catalog description. The central interest for the Forschungsstelle was that the Brahms manuscript found in the album was an earlier version of the trio section of the Scherzo of the Horn Trio, Op. 40 (here in A minor rather than A-flat minor), a work scheduled for editing in the Gesamtausgabe in the near future.

At the Doyle Galleries in New York, after waiting what seemed an eternity for previous readers to finish, I managed a very focused half an hour, trying to think of everything I needed to note. I quickly entered into the world of which Brahms in the mid-1850s was rapidly becoming a part: that of leading performers, composers, and music directors, and the social settings in which they worked, whether in court or institutional situations, or in the private homes of the highly cultured. Arnold Wehner, Director of Music at the University of Göttingen from 1846 to 1855, obviously sustained an appetite for collecting significant musical autographs over the years. His album is only a small folio, 7½ by 10 inches with a nicely embossed binding, obviously intended for brief entries. But he added to it: the present compass of around 100 unnumbered pages includes many additional unruled pages, and the binding is now badly broken at the spine as a consequence. Items also have been written on spare sides, out of successive chronology.

Wehner appears to have begun the album around 1843, and it reflects his travels. An early entry, by Mendelssohn, is dated “Leipzig, 14 Sept 1843,” and there are entries by Robert and Clara Schumann from 1845 (Clara’s is dated Dresden, 15 August 1845). The Brahms item, appearing about three-quarters through the album, on the recto side, belongs to a later stage; the verso is blank. The page is darker than the earlier ones, even darker than the online facsimile, and the ink is very deep brown, almost black. The staves, hand drawn with a raster, measure 9½ inches across by almost 6 inches high, and take up most of the page. The album shows a beautifully written score, seemingly taken straight down in Brahms’s flowing hand on one occasion without corrections and with total confidence of concept and detail. Although no date or location is given for the Brahms entry or for the one by Reményi that precedes it, they can easily be attributed to the summer of 1853 when both musicians visited Göttingen (the following entry is inscribed by the pianist Alfred Jaëll and dated 18 October 1855). Thus Brahms’s item dates from the middle of the most transformational year in his life, when he moved from relative anonymity in Hamburg via the friendship with Reményi to meeting Joachim in the spring and the Schumanns in September, to fame by the end of October through Schumann’s article “Neue Bahnen” published in the Neue Zeitschrift für Musik.

Setting aside the subsequent false claims of a “rediscovered” and “unknown” work that enlivened the musical airwaves via the BBC this January (and acknowledging the very painstaking clarifications by Michael Struck, who also advised on the Doyle catalog description, in letters to the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung and Gramophone magazine), the question of the identity of what has become known as the Albumblatt remains. This title merely identifies its physical context; the piece has no title and is not, therefore, to be associated with other “Albumblätter,” such as those in Schumann’s Bunte Blätter, Op. 99. Nor is the album titled; it was offered by the auctioneers only as an “Album amicorum” of Arnold Wehner.

The obvious first question is whether the notated item was intended as a piano piece at all. Like most composers, Brahms wrote in piano score as a short score for larger works, and his manuscript could have been a reduced notation of chamber music. Given that the material eventually appeared in the Horn Trio with horn or violin doubling at least part of the upper line of the piano right hand at the reprise of the passage (from
m. 327), the album entry could already have been a short score. (There is not room on the page for a violin part.) Nor can we know whether the notated music was an independent piece and not already part of a larger movement. If it was an excerpt, then it might have belonged to the A-Minor Violin Sonata that was among the works Schumann and Joachim urged Brahms to publish later in 1853, and that subsequently went missing. But the entry seems too self-contained for a chamber or extended piano work. The tempo marking is Allegro con espressione: that is, not a relaxed contrast to a faster passage. (The parallel marking in the Horn Trio is Molto meno Allegro.) The item comes across as an independent piece with the melody in the upper voice throughout, somewhat in the style of Mendelssohn’s songs without words, which is why it has been taken as a piano piece. If it is one, it may relate (if already transposed to A-flat minor) to the piece described by Brahms as “Menuet or? in As” in his Blätter aus dem Tagebuch eines Musikers, which he sent to Joachim in early 1854.

But quite apart from the music’s origins or relationships, what is most immediately striking is that Brahms has inserted a complete, self-contained composition, taking up the entire available but very limited space, in an autograph album. Albums normally contain only brief quotations from familiar works of the author for the recipient, as is the case with the preceding Reményi item—nine bars inscribed “Aus meinem Concerte/ zur freundlichen Andenken/ an Herr Wehner in Göttingen/ Remény, Ede.” Moreover, the work never appeared again in this form. This seems very bold, given that Brahms had not yet published any music by the summer of 1853. So one wonders whether Brahms had played this passage at Wehner’s request as an indicator of what he was working on—or perhaps performing with Reményi—and then wrote it down as a remembrance, perhaps also at Wehner’s request.

Whatever Brahms’s reasons were for notating this manuscript, it stands as a new and significant illustration of the composer’s famous remark to Henschel about waiting for first ideas to mature gradually in his mind. Other examples from this period are the neo-Bachian suite movements of 1854–1855 that were later transformed in the second movement of the Op. 88 Quintet. But only the case of the theme of the Adagio variations of the Op. 36 Sextet, described in a letter to Clara of 7 February 1855 and also completed around a decade later, parallels its chronology. With the towering example of the major rewriting in 1889 of the Op. 8 Piano Trio (completed in 1854) also in mind, one can only marvel at Brahms’s patience in awaiting the ideal realization of earlier ideas in his finished work, revealed afresh by this remarkable find.

Michael Musgrave

News from the Board of Directors

The ABS Board of Directors’ annual meeting took place on 11 November 2011 in San Francisco during the annual meeting of the American Musicological Society. The terms of the currently serving officers having expired, Peter Smith was elected President, Ryan McClelland Vice-President, and Virginia Hancock Secretary, for the term 2012–16. Styra Avins and Virginia Hancock were reelected to Board membership, and Kevin Karnes agreed to serve as Treasurer. The Board wishes to express heartfelt gratitude to outgoing President Heather Platt, outgoing Vice-President Peter Smith, and outgoing Secretary Kevin Karnes, all of whom have served for the past four years with exemplary energy and effectiveness, and to outgoing Treasurer George Bozarth for his dedicated service since the founding of the Society in 1983.

Papers and Presentations

Papers read at the conference, Brahms and the New Century, CUNY Graduate Center, New York, 21–23 March 2012:
Robert W. Eshbach, “Joachim, Reményi . . . and Brahms”
Karen Leistra-Jones, “Improvisational Idyll: Joachim’s ‘Presence’ and Brahms’s Violin Concerto, Op. 77”
David Brodbeck, “Rethinking the ‘Billroth Affair’”
Styra Avins, “Brahms’s Letters: Reassessing the Past, Considering the Future”
Laurie McManus, “Brahms in the Priesthood of Art?”
Nicole Grimes, “Brahms, Marxist Criticism, and Historiography: Adorno’s Cultural Pessimism versus Bloch’s Cultural Optimism”
Neal Peres Da Costa, “Weekly Meetings with Brahms at Home: Etelka Freund’s Interpretations of Brahms’s Piano Music”
Ann Riesbeck, “Brahms Performance Practice in a New Context: The Bruce Hungerford Recorded Lessons with Carl Friedberg”
Kyle Jenkins, “S-C Complications in Brahms’s Sonata Movements”
Carissa Reddick, “Cyclicism and Expanded Type 1 Forms in Chamber Works by Brahms and Dvořák”
Boyd Pomeroy, “Brahms, the ‘Tonic-Heavy’ Sonata, and Deep-Level Developing Variation”
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To join the American Brahms Society, please fill out the form below and mail it with your check (payable to The American Brahms Society) to: The American Brahms Society, School of Music, University of Washington, Box 353450, Seattle, WA 98195.

I would like to become a member of the American Brahms Society.

Name: __________________________________________

Address: _______________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Email: _________________________________________

Institutional Affiliation: __________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Please send information on the ABS, including a sample Newsletter, to the following people: __________________________________________________________

Annual Dues for 2012 (US dollars and checks only, please):

☐ Regular Member ($25)

☐ Retired/ senior citizen member ($20)

☐ Student Member ($15)

☐ I would like to make a contribution of $_______ to the Karl Geiringer Scholarship Fund. My contribution is in honor/memory of ____________.

NEW: Dues and contributions may be submitted online, using PayPal or credit card, at http://courses.washington.edu/brahms/membership/.

The American Brahms Society is a non-profit organization. The IRS has determined that donations in excess of dues may be considered as charitable contributions.
Editors’ Notes

The Editors would like to thank the contributors to this issue. Thomas Quigley was the Research Assistant on the McCorkle Brahms Thematic Catalogue Project, and his bibliographic interest in Brahms stems from those days. His “day job” is as the Head of the Kerrisdale Branch Library in the Vancouver Public Library System, and he also teaches on the topics of Community Service and Reader’s Advisory at the University of British Columbia’s School of Library, Archival and Information Studies. His two annotated bibliographies of the Brahms literature (Johannes Brahms: An Annotated Bibliography of the Literature through 1982 [Metuchen, N.J. and London: Scarecrow Press, 1990] and Johannes Brahms: An Annotated Bibliography of the Literature from 1982 to 1996 with an Appendix on Brahms and the Internet [Lanham, Md. and London: Scarecrow Press, 1998]) are standard research tools for Brahms scholars.

Heather Platt is Professor of Music History at the School of Music of Ball State University, a long-time member of the Board of Directors of the ABS, and its most recent Past President. Her articles on Brahms and his music have appeared in Indiana Theory Review, Integral, The Journal of Musicology, and numerous essay collections. Most recently, her article “Brahms’s Maidens in Their Cultural Context” appears in Expressive Intersections in Brahms: Essays in Analysis and Meaning (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012), a volume that she co-edited with current ABS President Peter H. Smith. She is also the author of the standard reference work Johannes Brahms: A Research and Information Guide 2nd ed. (New York and London: Routledge, 2011).


We are grateful to Ms. Ingrid Spitzbart, Director of the K-Hof Kammerhof Museen Gmunden, who graciously provided the photo of Brahms and Victor von Miller zu Aichholz on page 4, to Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Sandberger and Mr. Stefan Weymar of the Brahms-Institut an der Musikhochschule Lübeck for supplying the photo on the front page, to George Bozarth for his editorial assistance and short article on page 9, and to Douglas Niemela, who distributes the Newsletter from the Society’s office at the University of Washington in Seattle. Correspondence, ideas, and submissions for the Newsletter are always welcome, and email communication is especially encouraged. Materials for the Fall issue should be sent to the Editors by 1 September 2012.