

Chapter 3: Writings on performance

The discussion on Schoenberg's performance aesthetics is done here from a historical perspective. I identify three periods in Schoenberg's writings. He first mentioned performance aesthetic issues in 1909. The first period finishes at the end of the First World War. The next one covers the writings that were written after the First World War and 1933, the year the Nazis came to power and Schoenberg emigrated to America. The last period contains writings written in America. I emphasize these conceptual borders in time in order to stress significant transformations in his thought, which were influenced by changing cultural and social environments. The main issues that are discussed in the following are the relation between the roles of composer and performer in music making, and the manner in which Schoenberg formulated his conception of the musical idea.¹

Writings on performance, 1909-18

There is relatively little information about Schoenberg's performance aesthetics from the early years of the twentieth century. This does not obscure the fact that one can note seemingly contradictory tendencies already at this early period. On the one hand, on 24 August 1909 he wrote a letter to Busoni criticizing the latter's transcription of Schoenberg's Op. 11 No. 2. Trying to understand why Busoni had decided to create his version of this piece, a matter that seemed to irritate Schoenberg, he enquired of Busoni: 'I would like to ask you if you have perhaps taken too slow a tempo. That could make a great difference. Or too *little* rubato. I never stay in time! Never in tempo!'² Here Schoenberg admitted that his approach to performance transcended his own score indications. His tempo annotations from the end of 1909 on the performance score of his

¹ Published translations are used in this dissertation where appropriate; all other translations are mine except where indicated.

² Translation from Ferruccio Busoni, *Selected Letters*, trans. and ed. Antony Beaumont (London, Boston: Faber and Faber, 1987), 395.

String Quartet, Op. 10 (see appendix 5 for more details) also suggest that he understood performance as involving great flexibility in tempo. Never again would Schoenberg put such emphasis on this matter as he did in these two instances.

On the other hand, as mentioned in chapter 2, in 1912 Schoenberg cited Mahler saying: 'I consider it my greatest service that I force the musicians to play [*spielen*] exactly what is in the notes'.³ In the preface to the first edition (1914) of *Pierrot lunaire*, Op. 21 Schoenberg argued quite clearly that actions originating with the interpreter, which are not included in the score, have a negative effect (in practice, the situation was different when Schoenberg conducted – see part III of this study). The following document also pursues this direction. Schoenberg received his copy of Busoni's *Entwurf einer neuen Ästhetik der Tonkunst* (Outline of a New Aesthetic of Music) from 1907 from the author himself in 1916 and his annotations are post-1917.⁴ Busoni wrote:

Notation ... is primarily an ingenious expedient for catching an inspiration, with the purpose of exploiting it later. But notation is to improvisation as the portrait to the living model. It is for the interpreter to *resolve the rigidity of the signs* into the primitive emotion.

But the lawgivers require the interpreter to reproduce the rigidity of the signs; they consider his reproduction the nearer to perfection, the more closely it clings to the signs.-

What the composer's inspiration *necessarily* loses through notation, his interpreter should restore by his own.⁵

Busoni believed that composer and performer have both equal accesses to musical ideas.

For him, compositions and performances were on the same ontological plane.⁶ At this

³ *SI*, 'Gustav Mahler', 464-5. ASC, T23.02. See also Reinhard Kapp, 'Die Stellung Schönbergs in der Geschichte der Aufführungslehre', Rudolf Stephan and Sigrid Wiemann (eds.), in *Die Wiener Schule in der Musikgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Wien: Lafite, 1986), 85-101. Kapp contextualizes Schoenberg's position in the history of performance theory, arguing that Schoenberg's performance aesthetics was derived from that of Wagner which was transmitted to him through Mahler.

⁴ Schoenberg owned the 1916 edition of the book and Stuckenschmidt argues that the annotations are post-1917. See Ferruccio Busoni, *Entwurf einer neuen Ästhetik der Tonkunst: mit Anmerkungen von Arnold Schönberg und einem Nachwort von H. H. Stuckenschmidt* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1974), 82. It is possible that the annotations were written after the First World War. I show below that the fear that performers would not express the composer appears in several manuscripts written between 1918 and 1933.

⁵ Ferruccio Busoni, *Sketch of a New Esthetic of Music*, trans. Th. Baker (New York: G Schirmer, 1907), 15-16.

period and in the following one, Schoenberg did not feel comfortable with the notion that the performer has such significance. His annotation responds as follows: 'The more interpretation respects the written symbols, or rather, the more it tries to deduce from them the true intention of the author, the higher it must be rated'. He explained: 'For the interpreter is not the tutor, let alone the spiritual mentor, of an orphaned work of art, but its keenest servant. His desire is to apprehend every wish the composer utters, to cherish his every thought, scarcely conceived'.⁷

For Schoenberg, extensive tempo fluctuations that go beyond the score indications, as referred to in the aforementioned letter to Busoni, was not contradictory to being a servant of the composer's intentions, as suggested in the previous quotation. In 1912 Schoenberg claimed that playing the right notes results in the performer's participation in 'the spirit of the music'.⁸ A work of art which is a spiritual entity demands spontaneity in performance (as expressed in the letter to Busoni). This is part of the 'mystic notion of spontaneity ... in musical performance' that Kerman identified as a 'Romantic myth (owing much to the example of Beethoven) which cast the artist as sage and suffering hero'.⁹

Writings on performance, 1919-32

After the First World War, Schoenberg started to formulate his twelve-tone method – a composition technique that made him world-famous. In chapter 2, I mentioned the argument that Schoenberg saw the core of the great German tradition as organicism, not tonality as commonly believed. In some cases 'the will' towards which the performer must

⁶ Nicholas Cook, 'Between Process and Product: Music and/as Performance', *Music Theory Online*, 7/2, (April 2001), <http://societymusictheory.org/mto/issues/mto.01.7.2/toc.7.2.html>, [17].

⁷ Translation in Alfred Brendel, 'On Playing Schoenberg's Piano Concerto', in *The New York Review* (16 February 1995), 29. Note that although first mentioning the score, he immediately corrected himself and referred to 'the true intention of the author' as the authority to which the performer must turn.

⁸ *SI*, 'Gustav Mahler', 464-465.

⁹ Kerman, 'How we got into Analysis ...', 15.

convey seems to be manifested in the score itself. Jonathan Dunsby has argued that the Second-Viennese approach to performance rests on the following belief: 'the musical score ... offers the most complete possible evidence of what the composer intended, and the performer has the responsibility of decoding this information and representing it to the last detail'.¹⁰ This observation is especially pertinent for the 1920s. Schoenberg, who was always alert to contemporary musical developments, was aware of the ideas of *Neue Sachlichkeit* (new objectivity) that started to flourish at the time.¹¹ Hindemith, for example, wrote in his preface to the Ragtime movement of the *Suite '1922'*:

Mode d'emploi – Direction for Use!!

Pay no attention to what you have learned in your piano lessons.

Do not consider for long whether you should play D# with the fourth or sixth finger.

Play this piece very ferociously, but keep strictly in rhythm like a machine.

Regard the piano here as an interesting kind of percussion instrument and treat it accordingly.¹²

Threatened by the growing popularity of this movement, Schoenberg saw it as problematic.¹³ Joseph Auner claims that 'Schoenberg's compositional activities and other writings indicate ... [an] ambivalent encounter with contemporary developments'.¹⁴ For example, his opera *Von heute auf morgen* was written in the 'Zeitoper' (topical opera) style associated with 1920s works by Krenek, Hindemith and Weill. This style emphasized everyday events, modern technology, and popular music such as jazz. Auner claims that Schoenberg's use of this idiom 'was intended simultaneously to participate in and challenge the genre'.¹⁵ Schoenberg had a similar ambivalent attitude to the ideology of *Neue Sachlichkeit*.¹⁶ On the one hand he called it an 'exaggeration', on the other hand, he admitted that 'it originated as a natural and justified reaction against' a performance

¹⁰ Jonathan M. Dunsby, 'Performance and analysis of music', *Music Analysis*, 8/1-2 (1989), 7.

¹¹ See Glenn Watkins, *Soundings: Music in the Twentieth Century* (London and New York: Schirmer, 1988), 253-339, especially 288, 289, 292 and 302.

¹² *Ibid.*, 289.

¹³ See *SI*, 'New Music, Outmoded Music, Style and Idea', 120; and *SR*, 160, 209, 279 and 306.

¹⁴ *SR*, 209.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 219.

¹⁶ Towards the end of his life he admits this in 'Today's manner of performing classic music', *SI*, 320-322.

practice that was prominent at the turn of the century.¹⁷ The fact that Schoenberg criticised this movement does not, of course, negate the possibility that he was influenced by it. The various documents that I present in this section show that Schoenberg was obsessed with the score. In this he was not different from the surrounding musical environment that was dominant after the First World War. Although such ideas appeared in his writings as early as 1912, it is reasonable to conclude that Schoenberg's obsession with the score in his writings from the 1920s (as we will see in a moment), is due to the appearance of movements such as *Neue Sachlichkeit*.

Schoenberg's fixation on the score is reflected in several descriptions of him conducting. The violinist Marcel Dick described Schoenberg's conducting: 'Eyes cautiously glued to the score... There was no eye contact with the players... Schoenberg gave the impression that he continuously searched for new things in the score, in performances as well as rehearsals. There was no basic difference in the way he conducted performances and rehearsals. Actually, his rehearsals were often more interesting'.¹⁸ The critic Rutters commented on a performance of the *Gurrelieder* in the *Algemeen Handelsblad* of 20 March 1921: 'strange how he ... holds his head in the score. The result is that the musicians feel no contact with him, and that he gives entrances more vaguely than would appear to be desired for an ensemble of such dimensions'. A one-and-half-minute silent black-and-white film of Schoenberg conducting a rehearsal of *Verklärte Nacht*, Op. 4, with the Los Angeles Philharmonic, Hollywood Bowl, March 1935, seems to support this notion.¹⁹

¹⁷ See *SR*, 306-307.

¹⁸ Dick, 'Reminiscences of Schoenberg as Conductor', 109-110.

¹⁹ Non-commercial silent film of Schoenberg conducting *Verklärte Nacht* Op. 4 with Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra in Hollywood Bowl, at March 1935, V036, VHS (NTSC), b/w, silent, length: 1:23. From the UCLA Film and Television Collection and the Philip Kahgan (violinist, Los Angeles Philharmonic) Collection.

I mentioned above that the priority of playing the 'right notes' appears as early as 1912. One can find this idea also in the 1940s. However, the evidence from the 1920s reflects that Schoenberg was practically obsessed with the concept during this period. In 'Mechanische Musikinstrumente' of 1926 he blamed performers for not making an effort to play the score faithfully since they hoped to avoid any discomfort while performing.²⁰ A letter from 16 August 1922 to the singer Marya Freund provides some information about the intensive effort Schoenberg had in mind: 'I am anxious to explain to you why I cannot allow any will but mine to prevail in realising [*dargestellten*] the musical thoughts [*musikalischen Gedanken*] that I have recorded on paper, and why realising them must be done in such deadly earnest, with such inexorable severity, because the composing was done just that way'.²¹ In this letter the performer was asked to repress her will in order to solve the 'picture-puzzle', a concept that was explained by Steuermann: 'every line of [the score] ... conceals as well as it reveals the secret meaning of the melody, the rhythm, the sonority. It was created by magic - as we do not know what the "secret" of music is - and we can re-create it by magic only: the magic of devotion and sincerity'.²² The meaning of the music is internal to the score and external to the performer. The latter's task is not to create but to 're-create' this meaning by 'devotion' to the score and through 'sincerity'. The latter word seems to indicate that there is a moral issue at stake here.²³ Morality in performance was a value espoused by many musicians in the first part of the twentieth

²⁰ 'unter tausend Musikern findet man vielleicht kaum einen, der Willen und Fähigkeit besäße, wirklich das zu enträtseln und zu spielen, was in den Noten steht. Fast ausschließlich spielt man so schnell oder langsam, so Kurze Noten oder so lange, so starke oder so schwache, ja fast so hohe oder so tiefe, als sich bequem auf dem instrument herausbringen läßt'. 'Mechanische Musikinstrumente', *Pult und Taktstock*, Vienna, March-April, (1926): 39. For a translation of the article see *SI*, 'Mechanical Musical Instruments', 326.

²¹ *ASL*, 74. 'Ich möchte gerne über manches, die Aufführung meiner Werke betreffendes, mit Ihnen sprechen. Denn es liegt mir daran, Sie darüber aufzuklären, warum ich bei der Verwirklichung der von mir in Noten dargestellten musikalischen Gedanken keinen anderen Willen als den meinigen gelten lassen kann, und warum bei dieser Verwirklichung dieser blutige Ernst, diese nachsichtslose Strenge angewendet werden muß: weil mit ganz derselben komponiert wird'. *ASC*.

²² Steuermann, *The Not Quite Innocent Bystander*, 'The Picture Puzzle', 101.

²³ This was Steuermann's understanding of the concept 'picture-puzzle'. I mentioned in chapter 2 that in America Schoenberg saw the performer's relation to the score in a less purist manner. See Schoenberg's letter to Steuermann from 1949, *ASL*, 277

century.²⁴ Traditional streams in Judaism and Christianity believe that the word of God is revealed in holy texts. Indeed, Carl Dahlhaus has identified a transition of religious ideas into the realm of music.²⁵ The most radical expression of the concept that the score contains all the information that is needed for performance can be found in the manuscript 'Aus einem Gutachten für die *Akademie*' (Expert opinion for the *Akademie*) from 4 July 1929: 'What is essential is not the quality of sound – no matter how much it may be the composer's intention to write for particular sounds – but what is *written*: the (geometrical, mathematical or "architectonic") relations among pitches and time spans ... the idea is completed, without any interpretation, as soon as it is notated'.²⁶ Here performance serves only the purpose of 'general accessibility', and it is not truly important since the musical idea is written already into the score.

I showed in chapter 2 how the concepts of the musical idea and organicism were intermingled in Schoenberg's thought. References to organicism in the 1920s conveyed score-oriented concerns. In the manuscript 'Zur Vortragslehre' (For the treatise on performance) from c. 1923-24 Schoenberg contrasted what he saw as two types of performance. The first he called the 'obtrusive and gesticulating type of performance' which is achieved 'through a certain liveliness in rhythm and tempo, a certain emphasis in the delivery of phrases, in contrasting, opposing and juxtaposing them, a certain build-up in tempo and dynamics, a purposeful distribution of *expressivo* and its opposite'.²⁷ The second type of performance is done by 'reproducing the relationships of the idea in a

²⁴ One example is Bruno Walter, who came from a very similar background. See Bruno Walter, *Bruno Walter: in rehearsal*, DVD, conducting Johannes Brahms, Symphony No. 2, Vancouver International Orchestra, A CBC Vancouver Production, Recorded at the Vancouver International Festival, 1958, interview with Albert Goldberg, Mono, TDK (2002).

²⁵ See Dahlhaus, 'Schoenberg's Aesthetic Theology', 81-93. See also Inglis Gundry, *Composers by the grace of God: a study of music and religion* (London: Thames, 1988).

²⁶ 'Wesentlich ist nicht, was klingt (wie sehr es auch des Bestreben des Komponisten sein mag, für den Klang zu schreiben; sondern was geschrieben ist: die (geometrischen, mathematischen oder "architektonischen") Verhältnisse zwischen Tonhöhen und Zeiträumen ... der Gedanke ist fertig, ohne jede Interpretation, sobald er notiert ist'. ASC, T35.30.

²⁷ *SI*, 319-20. Original in ASC, T01.16.

subtle, carefully considered manner'. The latter type of performance is achieved by trying 'to make even the tiniest note sound, and place it in correct relationship to the whole'.²⁸ He argued that this type of performance is related to what the composer notated in a such manner that 'every note is really heard, and that all the sounds, whether successive or simultaneous, are in such a relationship to each other that no part [*Stimme*] obscures another, but, on the contrary, makes its contribution towards ensuring that they all stand out clearly from one another'.²⁹ Schoenberg wanted performers to project the contents of the score in the clearest possible manner. I will elaborate below on Schoenberg's changing notion of 'clarity' in performance.

Given Schonberg's with the score during these years, it is not surprising that the issue of memorized performances occupied him. In the manuscript 'Zur Metronomisierung' (On Metronome Markings) from 25 October 1926 he complained about conductors, without mentioning names, who performed music from memory without using the score. The Kolisch Quartet, famous for their memorized performances, were, surprisingly, encouraged by Schoenberg (on his birthday in 1927) to do so.³⁰ Rudolf Kolisch saw memorized performances as a way to express the musical subconscious.³¹ Schoenberg too was preoccupied with the issue of the unconscious in art.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ 'Das oberste Prinzip aller musikalischen Reproduktion müsste sein: was der Komponist geschrieben hat, auf solche Weise zum Klingen zu bringen, dass jede Note auch wirklich gehört wird und dass alles, ob es nun gleichzeitig oder ungleichzeitig klingt, in einem solchen Verhältnis zu einander steht, dass keine Stimme [deleted: nichts Wichtiges] verdeckt sondern im Gegenteil dazu beiträgt, dass alle sich von einander gut abheben'. ASC. See also *SI*, 'For the treatise on performance', 319. I find it questionable when the *SI* translation goes 'in such a way that every *note* is really heard' (emphasis is mine) since 'Stimme' is 'voice'; this makes more sense also in relation to Schoenberg's letter in *BSC*, 294.

³⁰ Tully Potter, 'Twelve-tone memories: a history of the Kolisch Quartet'. in the Booklet of the CD: *In Honor of Rudolf Kolisch*. Music & Arts. CD-1045. Berkeley (2003), 14. See Pasztor, A., 'Playing Schoenberg to Schoenberg: Jenő Lehner of the Kolisch String Quartet remembers', *New Hungarian Quarterly*, 33 (fall 1992), 171.

³¹ Note point 5 in the following, taken from a document describing Kolisch's methodology of performance: '1. *Study of the score* (Macro-structure; Retrace every thought process; Motif vocabulary). 2. *Mental concept*. 3. *Instrumental preparation independently* (Formation of "row material"; Realization). 4. *Confrontation with concept*. 5. *Act of performance: subconscious re-creation* (Objective vs. Romantic)'. Quoted from Smith, 105 where it was taken from a document which is part of the Kolisch Collection in Harvard University.

In a letter to Kandinsky from 24 January 1911 he wrote: 'I am sure that our work has much in common... In what you call the "illogical" [*Unlogische*] and I call the "elimination of the conscious will in art" ... art belongs to the *unconscious*! One must express *oneself*! Express oneself *directly*! Not one's taste, or one's upbringing, or one's intelligence, knowledge or skill. Not all these acquired characteristics, but that which is *inborn, instinctive*'.³² Schoenberg then claimed that 'unoriginal people' use prototypes and formulas instead of creating their own unconscious forms. Perhaps one may conclude that he believed that professional performers of Kolisch's calibre can transcend the 'conscious form-making' of merely reproducing the score, by memorizing the score and then performing without it. The issue is far from being straightforward (Schoenberg's ideas about the unconscious may have changed since 1911). However, it is clear that when attacking performers for ignoring the score, Schoenberg saw memorised performances as a sign of performers' dishonesty; when referring to the Kolisch Quartet from his circle, Schoenberg applied a different standard. Another example of such an attack can be found in the November-December 1925 issue of the journal *Pult und Tackstock* (vol. 9/10) where Schoenberg reacted to a passage by Dr. Ernst Kunwald discussing the benefits of rehearsing and performing with or without a score. Schoenberg wrote under it 'I am for memorised rehearsals! ... and against memorised conducting [in performance]'.³³ Perhaps Schoenberg hoped that a performer must prepare for a rehearsal to such a level that he or she will know the composition by heart. Yet this explanation does not clarify Schoenberg's bizarre statement, since in practice it is known that he rehearsed and performed with a score (I will elaborate more on this contradiction in chapter 9).

³² 'Es giebt sicher unter den Besten, die heute streben, solche unbekante, Gemeinsamkeiten, die wohl nicht zufällig sind ... In dem, was Sie das "Unlogische" nennen und das ich "Ausschaltung des bewußten Willens in der Kunst" nenne ... die Kunst gehört aber dem *Unbewußten*! Man soll sich *ausdrücken*! Sich unmittelbar *ausdrücken*! Nicht aber seinen Geschmack, oder seine Erziehung oder seinen Verstand, sein Wissen, sein Können. Nicht alle diese nichtangeborenen Eigenschaften. Sondern die angeborenen, die triebhaften'. From the original letter that can be found in ASCW.

³³ 'Ich bin für Auswendig-Probieren! Sch. / und gegen Auswendig-Dirigieren Sch.', 181.

Moreover, in December 1920 he wrote to Erwin Stein about the singer Erika Wagner singing by heart: 'Didn't you know that I am against this "doing-music-by-heart" and that even Steuermann and Serkin played with the score for me? If you can have a quite deep insight into the notes, you will feel the music inside and make it so much better [*inwendig*]; and every time (playing it with from the score) – also during a concert performance, you find some new aspects in the notes that you have never seen before!!'³⁴

There are several writings from the 1920s that attack performers for ignoring the intentions of the composer. In chapter 9 I mention authors who emphasize this aspect in Schoenberg's thought (I show below that this was by no means the most important aspect in his aesthetics and that there are manuscripts with contradicting ideas). Between 1926 and 1934 Schoenberg's frequently complained that performers prefer to express themselves by demonstrating exaggerated effort rather than expressing what the composer has to say. As mentioned above, in 1926 in the manuscript 'Zur Metronomisierung' he blamed conductors for conducting without the score in order to 'dance' before the audience and to detract attention from the composer.³⁵ This manuscript gives the feeling that the performer's 'rights' threaten those of the composer: 'Interpreter's rights; are there not also author's rights? Does not the author, too, have a claim to make clear his opinion about the realization of his work... Has not the author at least the right to indicate, in the copies of the work he himself published, how he imagines his ideas should be realized? Is that too immodest?'³⁶ In the manuscript 'Splitter' from about 1930

³⁴ 'Frau Wagner hat auswendig gesungen; ist Ihnen unbekannt, daß ich gegen das "Auswendig-Musizieren" bin; daß sogar Steuermann und Serkin mir zuliebe nach Noten gespielt haben? Ich finde dann musiziert man umso besser inwendig, wenn man in die Noten recht tief hineinschauen kann und immer wieder auch beim Konzertvortrag, wenn man also auch hier nicht so weit [?] schon 'fertig' ist, daß man nicht noch immer aus den Noten etwas Neues entnimmt, was man noch nie gesehen hat!!' Translation by Matthias Pasdzierny and Avior Byron.

³⁵ *SI*, 'On Metronome Markings', 342-343. ASC, T35.11.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 'Das Recht der Interpreten: giebt es nicht auch ein Recht der Autoren? Hat nicht der Autor immerhin auch einen Anspruch da rauf seine Meinung über die Ausführung seines Werkes festzulegen ... Hat der Autor nicht wenigsten in dem von ihm herausgegebenen Exemplar seines Werkes das Recht,

he suggested that opera performers should suppress any sign of effort in performance. He even gave examples of 'harmful' behaviour: 'the contortions of conductors, who can put themselves on show; the top notes of singers, who see their chance to be heard; the humour, or feeling, of many a performer, who will not let us pass by unaffected'.³⁷ In his annotated copy of the conductors' journal *Pult und Taktstock* (vol. 3/4) of March-April 1926 Schoenberg wrote extensive sarcastic remarks in reaction to the views of the conductors Bernhard Paumgartner and Albert Bing that were expressed there. He wrote: 'The answer of both these "conductors" is typical. That is: the composer is always wrong! The possibility that he is right is not taken into consideration. So is the possibility that the conductor is wrong. The conductor always knows the right tempo; the composer never does, although he knows the work at least as well as the conductor... Unfortunately no one stops the conductor from leaving unheeded these and other instructions [of the composer]'.³⁸ Schoenberg added mockingly: 'Should one not also leave pitch and rhythm to the "dancer", director and conductor, who are the only truly creative [*wahrhaftigen schaffenden*] artists? Who still needs notes today?'³⁹ In the aforementioned letter to Freund from 16 August 1922, Schoenberg demanded that only the will of the composer would be expressed. It seems that for Schoenberg of the 1920s, the will of the performer became a threat.

References to organicism were used also to express Schoenberg's occasional bias towards the role of composer compared to that of the performer. The first instance where

anzudeuten, wie er sich die Verwirklichung seines Gedankens denkt? Ist das unbescheiden?' From original German manuscript. 'Zur Metronomisierung' ASC, T35.11.1.

³⁷ 'Opera: aphorisms', *SI*, 339. 'an die Leibesübungen der Dirigenten, die sich sehen lassen können; an die hohen Töne der Sänger, die nicht überhört werden wollen!; an den Humor und das Gefühl manches Darstellers, der uns nicht ungerührt vorührt lassen will.' ASC, T26.06.22.

³⁸ 'Die Antworten dieser beiden "Kapellmeister" sind charakteristisch. Also: der Komponist hat immer Unrecht! Die Möglichkeit, dass er recht hat, wird gar nicht in Betracht gezogen. Und schon gar nicht die, dass der dirigent unrecht hat. Der Dirigent weiss also immer richtige Tempi, der Komponist nie, obwohl er das Werk doch annähernd so gut kennt, wie der Dirigent... Denn leider hindert neimand einen Dirigenten solche und andere Vorschriften des Kom unbeachtet zu lassen'.

³⁹ 'Sollte man nicht auch die Tonhöhen (?), Rhytmen [*sic*] dem Tänzer, Regiss und Kapellmeister, dem einzig wahrhaftigen schaffenden Künstler überlassen? Wer braucht heute noch Noten?'

one can find such a reference in his writings on performance was in his letter from 6 December 1920 quoted above,⁴⁰ where the conception of the organic totality is wedded with the composer's intentions. In this letter Schoenberg claimed that *espressivo*, giving 'life' to each voice, is possible only if the performer is aware of the organic nature of the art-work. In 'Constructed music' (1931-34), he claimed: 'I do not invent a melody, a motive, a bar, but only a work as a whole'.⁴¹ He added that the 'inspiration, the vision, the whole, breaks down during its presentation into details whose constructed realization reunites them into the whole'.⁴² In other words, performance has the function of recreating the organic image that was in the composer's mind. This Romantic view sees the composer as a prophet who receives a vision from God, which needs to be communicated (by the relatively passive performer) as faithfully as possible.⁴³

In 1921 Schoenberg drew two caricatures of performers in embarrassing positions. In Fig. 3.1 one can see the pianist's body twisting in an absurd manner while playing the piano. The pianist is smiling with closed eyes while the head is in a position reaching upwards. Note that the pianist is playing without a score. It seems as if Schoenberg is mocking exaggerated romantic expressive movements, which he might have seen as belonging to a past era.⁴⁴ In Fig. 3.2 Schoenberg drew a pianist in an opposite manner: inactive, sitting loosely on the piano chair and staring at the keyboard. The performer, who sits like a sack of potatoes while staring at the score, seems

⁴⁰ *BSC*, 295.

⁴¹ 'Ich empfinde nicht eine Melodie, ein Motiv, einen Takt, sondern bloss ein ganzes Werk. Deren Teile: Die Sätze, deren Theile: die Themen, deren Theile: die Motive und Takte, sind Details zu welchen man bei fortschreitender Ausführung gelangt'. 'Konstruierte Musik', *ASC*, T57.11, four undated pages probably from about 1931. See also *SI*, 107.

⁴² 'Der Einfall, die Vision, das Ganze zerfällt bei der Darstellung in Details, deren solide konstruierte Ausführung sie wieder zum Ganzen vereint'. *ASC*, T57.11.

⁴³ Cook, 'Between Process and Product: Music and/as Performance', [14].

⁴⁴ For another interpretation of this drawing see Severine Neff, 'Schoenberg's Kristallnacht *Fugue*', *The Musical Quarterly*, 86, 1 (Spring 2002), 122-126. I would like to thank Severine Neff for referring me to this article. Note that Schoenberg's piano was an *Ibach*.

musically impotent. One might suspect that the lines that Schoenberg drew near the legs of the pianist imply an obscene gesture.



Fig. 3.1: Schoenberg's caricature of a pianist (1), 1921.



Fig. 3.2: Schoenberg's caricature of a pianist (2), 1921.

The accumulated evidence presented in this chapter up to this point suggests that in this period Schoenberg felt threatened by the possibility that his will would be overridden by performers expressing themselves. In the following I present evidence of Schoenberg having other important concerns.

Positive views on performers

After the discussion above it is surprising to discover that at the very same time, Schoenberg held completely different opinions on performance and performers. These views are usually not mentioned in the literature on Schoenberg (for a discussion see chapter 9). In his copy of the May 1925 journal of *Pult und Taktstock* (vol. 5), Schoenberg annotated an article called 'Mechanisierung: Antwort an H. K.' (Mechanization: Answer to H. K.) by H. H. Stuckenschmidt as follows: 'The difference between instruments and machines is not their size and it is neither that the machine would produce the piece, whereas *through* the instruments the piece can be produced. For there are machines which do produce things, for example cigarette machines. Is a bicycle an instrument or a machine?'⁴⁵ It seems to me that in this vague document, Schoenberg tried to argue that mechanical instruments are not machines that produce music with little human intervention (compare cigarette machines), but instruments that help performers get to their musical goal (compare bicycles and their riders). Schoenberg acknowledged here that the role of the performer is greater than that of a person who operates an instrument that just produces things. This reflects his awareness of the non-automatic nature of performance and the need for human performers.⁴⁶ The Donaueschingen Festival of 1926 presented mechanical musical instruments and music written for these instruments. The value of these instruments was vigorously debated in many journals around the world at that time.⁴⁷ Schoenberg reacted to the phenomenon in the article

⁴⁵ Emphasis added. 'Der Unterschied zwischen Instrumenten und Maschinen besteht ja nicht in der Grösse und auch nicht nur darin, dass die Maschine das Stück fertig macht, während es man mittelst des Instrumentes herstellt. Denn es giebt auch Maschinen, die so angewendet werden. Z. Bs Cigaretten Maschinen. Ist das Fahrrad Instrument oder Maschine?' I would like to thank Eike Rethgeber for the transcription of this.

⁴⁶ Schoenberg's little mechanical gadgets for generating rows from the 1920s, for example in Suite, Op. 29, show his interest in the employment of machines for musical purposes.

⁴⁷ A discussion of the reception of mechanical musical instruments can be found in Trevor J. Pinch and Karin Bijsterveld, "'Should One Applaud?'" Breaches and Boundaries in the Reception of New Technology

'Mechanische Musikinstrumente' (Mechanical musical instruments) published in the same year of the festival. He argued: 'insofar as the mechanization of music ... states as its main aim the establishment, by composers, of a definite interpretation [*Darstellung*], I should see no advantage in it, but rather a loss, since the composer's interpretation can by no means remain the finally valid one'.⁴⁸ This passage reflects a rare moment where Schoenberg openly admitted that the composer's interpretation is not the last word, and that the performer's interpretation also has its place. The reason for this is his view that even the composer's interpretation cannot fully express the abstract musical idea. This suggests that the image in the mind of the composer – the musical idea – is not equivalent to its realization in performance by the composer himself. Any realization in performance, even by the composer, must fall short of the abstract musical idea – a factor which explains the need for many rehearsals (see chapter 2). Schoenberg's concept of mechanisation was influenced by nineteenth-century theories that commonly differentiated between the so-called 'organic form' and 'mechanical form'. August Wilhelm Schlegel described the difference in his influential 'Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature' of 1809-11: 'Form is mechanical when it is imparted to any material through an external force, merely as an accidental addition, without reference to its character... Organic form, on the contrary, is innate; it unfolds itself from within, and reaches its determination simultaneously with the fullest development of the seed'. Schlegel concluded: 'In the fine arts, just as in the province of nature – the supreme artist – all genuine forms are organic'.⁴⁹ Patricia Carpenter and Severine Neff have shown that

in Music', *Journal of Technology and Culture*, 44/3 (July 2003), 536-559. Ernst Krenek argued that the machine-like character of mechanical music had by the 1920s become a recognized element of composition. Ernst Krenek, 'Mechanisierung der Künste', *Internationale Revue i10*, 1 (1927), 380.

⁴⁸ 'Sofern also als Hauptzweck der Mechanisierung der Music ... die definitive Festlegung der Darstellung durch der Autor angegeben wird, könnte ich darin keinen Vorteil erblicken, sondern nur einen Schaden, da die Interpretation durch den Autor keinesfalls die endgültige bleiben kann'. 'Mechanische Musikinstrumente', *Pult und Taktstock* (March-April, 1926), 71. See 'Mechanical musical instruments' in *SI*, 328.

⁴⁹ Quoted from Carpenter's and Neff's commentary in *Gedanke*, 7-8.

Schoenberg 'espoused the same distinction' in *Gedanke* in the essay 'Prinzipien des Aufbaus' (Principles of construction) when 'he elaborated on the principle that in art the construct is not a mechanical one, like a clock, but an image resembling an organism in its vital unity'.⁵⁰ For Schoenberg, 'mechanical form', or its presentation as reproduced by machines alone, is in opposition to 'organic form' that may be presented with the aid of machines but must involve human performers. A machine can reproduce a score 'without reference to its character', yet human performers add, and should add, to performance spontaneity and a human character. Eugene Lehner, a violin player in the Kolisch Quartet, wrote about their recordings of Schoenberg's String Quartets: 'In our recording ... [t]here are most disturbing rhythmical inaccuracies... Not that my ideal would be mechanical, metronome-like playing. Quite on the contrary'. Lehner continued to stress: 'Characteristic for the Kolisch-Quartet was, I think, often seemingly improvisatory and spontaneous music-making, which was stimulated by our playing by heart. Our efforts aimed at giving something like human character and gesture to the notes... A masterwork ... has to be newly discovered and felt for each time'.⁵¹ Lehner's idea of giving a 'human character and gesture' to music echoes Schoenberg's conception of organicism. Yet also Lehner does not supply a clear criterion for distinguishing between negative 'rhythmical inaccuracies' and (positive) rhythmical flexibility that is contrary to 'metronome-like playing'.

As mentioned above, Steuermann wrote that Schoenberg's 'picture-puzzle' metaphor suggests that the score 'conceals as well as it reveals'.⁵² The realization of the score is far from being that of execution (as in the performance aesthetics of

⁵⁰ See *Gedanke*, 217-227; and Carpenter and Neff, 'Schoenberg's Philosophy of Composition: Thoughts on the "musical idea and its Presentation"', Julianne Brand and Christopher Hailey (eds.), *Constructive Dissonance: Arnold Schoenberg in Twentieth-Century Culture* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1997), 152.

⁵¹ Eugene Lehner, 'A Statement by Eugene Lehner on the Present Recordings (1991)', in liner notes to Schoenberg, *String Quartets Nos. 1-4* (Archiphon ARC-103/4), 20.

⁵² Steuermann, *The Not Quite Innocent Bystander*, 'The Picture Puzzle', 101.

Stravinsky).⁵³ This puts great responsibility on the performer. Indeed, on 4 July 1929 he wrote in Berlin about the need for a copyright law for the acts of performers (presumably he meant recordings). He objected to assigning to the performer 'Urheberrecht' (right of creator), yet he acknowledged that the performer is doing something of an original nature. Schoenberg wrote: 'the demand of the performer for the protection of original work is justifiable'.⁵⁴ This reveals Schoenberg's ambiguous attitude to performers – on the one hand, acknowledging originality in performance, but on the other, refusing to give them the rights of creators. Schoenberg was influenced by the Romantic notion of the genius. The creative genius, of which Beethoven was the striking example from the Romantic period, was seen as the source of musical creativity. Understanding music as a process of collaboration between performers and the composer, threatens this idealistic view.

Although he did not pursue this so far as to reject the use of mechanical musical instruments instead of human performers, Schoenberg did not include the expression of the performer's will as a component in the presentation of the musical idea. He did claim that the performer may help to clarify the musical idea, yet it already exists a priori to performance and should be extracted from the score. The performers suppress their subjective will, yet perform with certain spontaneity in a manner that was thought to express the objective 'will' of the organic 'art-work'. *Neue Sachlichkeit* influenced Schoenberg to regard as superficial the extensive rubato and other 'exaggerated' manners of performance, common around 1900, and part of his own practice before the First World War.

⁵³ Igor Stravinsky, *Poetics of Music in the Form of Six Lessons* (London: Oxford University Press, 1947), 127.

⁵⁴ 'der Anspruch der darstellenden Künstler auf einen Schutz originaler Leistungen berechtigt ist' ASC, T29.1.

The musical idea (1)

The 1920s and early 1930s is the period in which Schoenberg most extensively developed his concept of the musical idea. I review here his performance writings on this concept in relation to three parameters: time, dynamics and clarity in performance. In a letter from 13 November 1922, Schoenberg demanded from the Copenhagen performers that the durations of his *Kammersymphonie* should be calculated 'mathematically!'⁵⁵ In 'Mechanische Musikinstrumente' (1926) he defined the 'unalterable' musical idea as being manifest in the relationship between pitches and time-divisions. On 4 July 1929 he expressed a similar view in the aforementioned 'expert opinion for the *Akademie*'. He claimed that when 'the composer thinks of sound quality, dynamics and tempo, he is already his own interpreter of his ideas. That is, he employs the means of performance in order to lend his ideas general accessibility'. He concluded: 'Performing artists then become, to a certain degree, interpreters of interpretation'.⁵⁶ Both composition and performance communicate a musical idea that is a priori to these activities.⁵⁷ Yet if we return to 'Mechanische Musikinstrumente' we see that Schoenberg seemingly contradicted himself when he argued that 'So far as rhythmic relationships are concerned ... [the performer of mechanical instruments] will still be able to effect as many modifications as a good musician requires'.⁵⁸ As previously mentioned, in 1909, just when taking his first steps in atonality, Schoenberg wrote to Busoni: 'I never stay in time! Never in tempo!'⁵⁹ How can the musical idea, the 'unalterable', be manifested in the relationship between pitches and time-divisions if Schoenberg himself did not stay in

⁵⁵ *ASL*, 81.

⁵⁶ *ASC*, T35.30.

⁵⁷ If one takes Schoenberg seriously, then the idea is 'a finished product' even before it is notated since, as he himself acknowledges, notation also is a form of interpretation.

⁵⁸ 'In den rhythmischen Verhältnissen wird er immerhin soviel Modifikationen vornehmen können, als ein guter Musiker höchstens bedarf' 'Mechanische Musikinstrumente', *Pult und Taktstock* (March-April, 1926), 74. See 'Mechanical Musical Instruments', *SI*, 329.

⁵⁹ Chapter 4 and part III show that Schoenberg's flexible attitude to time was not limited to 1909 but was also present in the 1920s and 1940s (although perhaps in a more moderate manner).

time when he performed? The degree of modification that a 'good musician' may carry out is unclear; yet the following might give us some idea of what Schoenberg had in mind. Felix Galimir testified that in rehearsal with Webern, Jalowetz and Steuermann the following always occurred:

They were terribly meticulous about rhythms, ... that these sixteenths or the triplets come after the second sixteenth... And when you finally got it and he says, 'yes, but it sounds stiff and ... it has to be free', and that was really very important that one does play the music although very correct but with a certain freedom and not in a strait jacket because of the complication or the expression. I think the paramount thing was that one should not, especially because of the row and the intonation and dissonances, overlook the expressional aspect of the piece.⁶⁰

The criteria for distinguishing between a performance with 'rhythmical inaccuracies' (see Lehner's criticism mentioned about) and one that is 'very correct but with a certain freedom', is not clear. Steuermann testified that Schoenberg's relation to time was one of the most important aspects of the latter's interpretation: 'You may ask, what was so beautiful? ... In Schoenberg's "Musizieren" it was primarily the character of his tempos, especially his ability to make the music move and stay still at the same time, which I will never forget. It was never "tempo" as such – the contrary of "motoric"'.⁶¹ Kolisch seemed to be aware of the contradiction between Schoenberg's demand to obey the score carefully and at the same time to deviate from it with regard to time:

The most surprising thing about Schoenberg's representation of musical works in performance is, however, that this analysis made manifest is at the same time the most lively playing. The liveliness does not result from the customary external vitality (which is indeed merely the over emphasis of the zestful elements of the piece, mostly at the expense of the structural balance of its performance), but rather it results from ... the intensity with which every figure [*Gestalt*] is given its characteristic form.⁶²

⁶⁰ Smith, 112.

⁶¹ Steuermann, quoted in Schuller, 'A Conversation with Steuermann', in Steuermann, *The Not Quite Innocent Bystander*, 174.

⁶² Kolisch, 'Schoenberg as a Performing artist', 35. 'Das Überraschendste an Schönbergs Darstellung ist aber, daß diese demonstrierte Analyse zugleich lebendigstes Musizieren ist. Die Lebendigkeit ergibt sich nicht aus dem üblichen äußerlichen Temperament (das ja nur die Überbetonung der schwungvollen Elemente eines Stückes, meist auf Kosten des Ebenmaßes der Darstellung ist), sondern ... der Intensität, mit der jeder Gestalt die charakteristische Form verliehen wird'. Kolisch, 'Schönbergs als nchschaffender Künstler', 307.

For Kolisch and Schoenberg this 'most lively playing' did not rule out 'giving every figure ... its characteristic form'. Nevertheless, the relation between 'the unalterable' musical idea manifested in the relationship between pitches and time divisions, and the 'many modifications' that Schoenberg allowed the performer in terms of these time divisions, is puzzling. Moreover, Kolisch too, does not explain the criterion for distinguishing between 'zestful elements' of a piece and those that contribute to 'structural balance'. Anyhow, it seems that even if for Schoenberg the musical idea includes time as a binding parameter then a certain 'imperfection' may be admitted in the presentation.⁶³ Accuracy was demanded in order to communicate an a priori musical idea; flexibility and spontaneity were insisted upon in order to express the vitality of the organic art-work.

The role of dynamics in the performance of the musical idea reveals similar contradictions. In 'Mechanische Musikinstrumente' Schoenberg separated two things: the first is 'the unalterable' musical idea that is manifested in the relationship between pitches and time-divisions; the second is 'really no more than the performer's resources'. Schoenberg mentioned dynamics as one of the resources that help to make the musical idea comprehensible and perhaps varied,⁶⁴ and he argued that a performer of a mechanical musical instrument 'has to influence the reproducing apparatus so that in the matter of dynamics the performance attains the degree of clarity and expressiveness matching *his* insight and taste. He is in a position to draw for this purpose upon every means of altering ... the sound'.⁶⁵ He stressed that 'flexibility can be ... achieved by

⁶³ See for example 'Raumton, Vibrato, Radio, etc.' from 5 February 1931 where he wrote on vibrato and ensemble violin playing and choir singing. *SI*, 148-50.

⁶⁴ 'Dynamik, Tempo, Klang und was daraus entsteht: Charakter, Deutlichkeit, Wirkung etc. ist eigentlich nur Mittel des Vortages, dient dazu, die Gedanken verständlich zu machen, und läßt Veränderungen zu.', 'Mechanische Musikinstrumente', *Pult und Taktstock* (March-April, 1926), 71 [trans. 'Mechanical Musical Instruments', *SI*, 326].

⁶⁵ 'Mechanical Musical Instruments', *SI*, 329. Emphasis added. 'daß der Vortrag in dznamischer Hinsicht die siner Erkenntnis und seinem Geshmack entsprechenden Grade von Deutlichkeit und Ausdruckskraft erreicht und wäre in der Lage, hiezue auch alle Mittel ... Klangänderung heranzuziehen'. *Pult und Taktstock* (March-April, 1926), 74.

dynamics'.⁶⁶ Would he accept a performance where the performer's 'insight and taste' contradicted the composer's dynamic indications of the score? This article seems to suggest that if such contradictions were to help the musical idea (whatever that means) to become comprehensible in some way, then the answer to this question is positive. A contrary approach can be found in the following document. In an unpublished manuscript, 'Musikalische Dynamik' (Musical dynamics) from 5 April 1926, Schoenberg argued that it would be preferable if composers indicated the general dynamic needed, because the dynamic of playing changes from one performer to another, and according to the taste of the place and period of performance. However, he noted that this general notation also has disadvantages since it forces the composer to rely on the conductor to provide the player other specific indications for each performance case. Although Schoenberg granted some freedom to the conductor, it is apparent that the dynamic indications that the composer supplies are the instructions that one must obey. Schoenberg did not refer explicitly to the musical idea, yet it is obvious that he fears that the composer would lose control over this parameter. This manuscript was written in the very same year as 'Mechanische Musikinstrumente'. In other words, 'Mechanische Musikinstrumente' seems to suggest that Schoenberg would approve an interpretation that in certain places would deviate from the dynamic markings in order to make the musical idea comprehensible, whereas in 'Musikalische Dynamik' the opposite seems to be true. Adherence to the notated dynamics was insisted upon when Schoenberg wanted to stress the need to communicate an a priori musical idea by eliminating ambiguity in notation. When speaking about the spiritual qualities of the organic artwork, then spontaneity and flexibility in the performance of dynamics were expected.

⁶⁶ 'da, sofern es sich um Plastik handelt ..., diese durch die Dynamik', *ibid.*, 74-75.

One of the most important issues that occupied Schoenberg in the 1920s was the demand for 'clarity' in performance.⁶⁷ In the 1918 prospectus of the Society for Private Musical Performances, written by Berg in order to introduce the Society to the public for the first time, a concern was expressed that the public has an 'unclear' impression of contemporary music since the performances are usually 'unclear'.⁶⁸ The ideal of clarity is expressed most distinctly in Schoenberg's aforementioned letter from 6 December 1920 to his students and friends, sent via Berg, where he wrote: 'we now envisage a truly polyphonic performance [*Vortrag*] ideal: to make each voice (based on a conceptual understanding of all voices) absolutely clear! That rests on a truly polyphonic approach characterizing our school... And our goal: to make everything audible, graduated according to significance, and at the same time obtain a 'homogeneous' sound'. If in 'Zur Vortragslehre' (1923 or 1924) Schoenberg wrote that the highest principle of performance is 'clarity', in 'Mechanische Musikinstrumente' he declared 'clarity' as 'the performer's resource' whose degree may be manipulated and changed. Was Schoenberg ready in 1926 to compromise what three years earlier had been the 'highest principle' of performance, and six years earlier the performance ideal of the Second Viennese School? 'Zur Vortragslehre' was written with the experience of the Society for Private Musical Performances fresh in mind (the Society ceased to exist in Vienna about a year before this manuscript was written). In this document Schoenberg was trying to express a performance ideal that was central for him. Yet one should not underestimate Schoenberg's other ideal, that is, the need for a human performance that would express the vitality of the organic art-work. After all, when trying to promote this ideal in 1926, he recruited the concept of 'clarity' for this purpose.

⁶⁷ This is connected to his demand for many rehearsals (see chapter 2).

⁶⁸ Reich, 120.

One could try to reconcile the contradictions that I have pointed out by assuming that Schoenberg was merely trying to say in these documents that tempo, dynamics and clarity are things that can contribute to the communication of the musical idea in different manners. However, the fact that the contexts and content of the various documents greatly varies, suggests that he was not trying to formulate a systematic performance theory, as much as reacting to local concerns that he was facing in each case. If one seeks to find a well-formed theory in the various fragments that Schoenberg wrote on performance, then one is destined to be disappointed. The looseness of his technical definitions contribute to the notion that his performance aesthetics is based more on personal guidance (as done between teachers of musical instruments and their students) than on any clear method that can be explained in a *Vortragslehre*. Yet, from a technical point of view, even this might be an exaggerated statement. Eugen Lehner said: 'I couldn't put my finger on one single technical fact that I ever got from him, except one word which was constantly repeated by him – clarity, clarity, clarity'.⁶⁹

In summary, Schoenberg's writings on performance from this period show a concern in communicating an a priori musical idea. Schoenberg's demand that the performer would adhere to the score reflects his fear that performers would misuse the musical work in order to express their own subjectivity. However, various commentators failed to observe that unlike Stravinsky, Schoenberg simultaneously stressed the significance of human performers and their contribution to musical performance. The recognition of the role of performers became a major issue in his post 1933 writings.

⁶⁹ Smith 114. Lehner argued in similar lines in Pasztor, 'Playing Schoenberg to Schoenberg', 173.

Writings on performance, 1933-51

In 1934 and 1936 Schoenberg wrote the aforementioned *Gedanke* manuscript. Julie Brown argues in an unpublished paper that Schoenberg, by now a Jewish refugee from Nazi Germany, rethought his compositional aesthetics in this manuscript.⁷⁰ Such rethinking can also be found in the section of this manuscript from 1934 entitled 'Vortrag und Gestalt' (Performance and Gestalt). Schoenberg compared the function of the score to that of a telegram where brevity, he argued, is an important aspect. He wrote 'Perhaps this [i.e. the score's brevity] even suggests that performance [*Vortrag*] is also a part of presenting an idea [*Gedankendarstellung*]'.⁷¹ The thought that that the musical idea is not solely manifested in the score, brings Schoenberg to consider whether performance is not a mere addition that helps the musical idea to be varied (as argued in the 1920s), but an integral part of it (this contradicts, for example, the aforementioned manuscript from 1929 where he wrote that 'the idea is a finished product, without any interpretation, as soon as it is notated'.⁷²) In 1934, therefore, Schoenberg raised in a more explicit manner his thoughts concerning the overlap between the activities of composing and performing in the presentation of the musical idea. He seems to be rethinking his previous views here concerning the role of the performer, suggesting that there is a process of collaboration between the two activities. The original manuscript reveals that Schoenberg wrote first: 'Vielleicht ist hiemit schon angedeutet, dass der Vortrag zum Teil der Aufgaben der Gedankendarstellung ist', but then he crossed the word 'zum' and wrote above it the words 'auch ein' (in English: 'also'). This gives a different meaning to the sentence since it emphasizes that performance is *also* part of presenting a musical idea; the additional words 'auch ein' indicate that composition is the first thing that has this function. Indeed,

⁷⁰ I would like to thank Julie Brown for sharing her paper with me.

⁷¹ 'Vielleicht ist hiemit schon angedeutet, dass der Vortrag ~~zum~~ <auch ein> Teil der Aufgaben der Gedankendarstellung ist' ASC, T65.03. See also *Gedanke*, 292, 293.

⁷² 'Aber der Gedanke ist fertig, ohne jede Interpretation, sobald er notiert ist'. ASC, T35.30.

Schoenberg writes immediately after: 'only insofar as performance [*Vortrag*] is not included in the composition does the right exist for the interpreter to help out'.⁷³ This is a slip of the pen, where Schoenberg admitted for a moment that performance has a significant part in the presentation of the musical idea, and he immediately corrected himself to give the composer higher importance.⁷⁴ One should not underestimate this historical moment, where Schoenberg rethought the role of the performer and considered (not unlike Busoni) to elevate it to that of the composer.

Judging by the handwriting, the manuscript 'EXPRESSION' dates from the late 1930s or early 1940s.⁷⁵ In it Schoenberg wrote:

Problem
interpretation
or
true to notation

How much of which?

Schoenberg indeed expected the performer to be creative and not merely to be true to notation. Here he wrote explicitly about music as an expression of the performer. Under the title 'EXPRESSION' he annotated: 'music was from the very beginning not only a game with sounds, but an expression of the soul or character of the player or of such persons of whom the player acted like an impersonator'. Schoenberg's choice of words was usually not accidental.⁷⁶ Note that he mentions here the performer before the composer, and he does not mention the composer explicitly but through the performer.

⁷³ 'Und nur insoferne, als der Vortrag nicht auskomponiert ist, besteht das Recht des Interpreten, nachzuhelfen'. *Gedanke*, 292-3. The performer, according to Schoenberg of the early 1930s, has the licence to influence the performance only if he does not contradict any of the score indications.

⁷⁴ Note that the published translation by Patricia Carpenter and Severine Neff in *Gedanke* 292, 293 is inaccurate since it does not include the deleted word 'zum'. This misses the nuance in meaning discussed above which can be found in the original, ASC, T65.03.

⁷⁵ ASC, T69.06. The manuscript is a notebook with relatively small handwriting in English. After 1945 Schoenberg's handwriting became much larger due to eye problems.

⁷⁶ This manuscript was written in English. In German Schoenberg's expression was more nuanced. See *SR*, xxii.

By speaking about an expression of 'the player', Schoenberg tried to reconcile the expression of the a priori objective 'will', external to the performer, with the expression of the performer's will. One can find *espressivo* in Schoenberg's early performance practice, yet in this document, deviations from the score signify not only the 'will' of the art-work, but also the expression of the performer's own will and personality. The most significant thing in this manuscript is that Schoenberg wrote on another page in the notebook the answer to the 'Problem' stated above: 'Performance must be based on interpretation'. In other words, faithfulness to the score is not the most important requirement for performance. This is a striking change compared to the 1920s where he gave the score the highest priority and scorned performers who did not follow it faithfully.

Schoenberg's new approach to performance is revealed in the following story. In a panel discussion in 1992, Louis Krasner, who premièred the Violin concerto on 6 December 1940, told about an argument he had with Steuermann, who helped him prepare the piece:

There was one place ... where Steuermann said: '... you play the notes too long, I think that's not the character'. So I tried it shorter ... [and said:] 'I have to play it the way I ... think. Well, we'll go and play it to Schoenberg, we'll ask Schoenberg'... I played it to Schoenberg and he was very pleased, and Steuermann could not resist [and] he asked Schoenberg: '... Isn't it too long the way he plays these staccato places...?' Schoenberg said, I didn't notice, play it again'. I played it [and said:] 'I like it like that'. Steuermann said: 'But there are dots ... there'. Schoenberg looked at me: 'Shall I erase the dots?'⁷⁷

I mentioned in chapter 2 letters from 1949 and 1950 where Schoenberg explicitly criticized Steuermann's strict faithfulness to the score. This quotation shows that in the last decade or so of his life he indeed preferred the will of the performer who interpreted the music to the ideal of being 'true to notation'.

⁷⁷ The Schönberg Violin Concerto: A Panel Discussion in Tanglewood [V023; 43:00], John Harbison, Rose Mary Harbison, Louis Krasner and Leonard Stein. Non-commercial, 1992. Can be found in ASC.

In the manuscripts 'Koussevitzki-Toscanini' of August 1944 and 'Today's Manner of Performing Classical Music'⁷⁸ of 1948 Schoenberg argued against the over-expressive 'romantic' (Schoenberg's term) style of performance of many performers around the turn of the century which continued into the 1920s. This included exaggerated rubato/vibrato/portamento-legato and the mixing of synchronous and asynchronous attacks.⁷⁹ In the manuscript 'Vibrato' from about 1940 he wrote: 'Vibrato has degenerated into a mannerism just as intolerable as portamento-legato... But I find even worse the goat-like bleating used by many instrumentalists to curry favour with the public'.⁸⁰ In 'Koussevitzki-Toscanini' he referred to Wagner who blamed singers of the then predominant Italian 'virtuoso' style for 'ignoring dramatic requirements in favour of their own vocal effects'.⁸¹ In the same documents, Schoenberg also castigated the opposite performance styles of non-expressivity of the 1920s such as the *Neue Sachlichkeit* style of performance. In 1944 he attacked the so-called 'Takt-beating' of conductors such as Koussevitzki and Toscanini whom Schoenberg blamed for not using enough tempo rubato: 'The beat is not the master of music, but its servant. The beat's measure is taken "by the eye" so to speak'.⁸² By this Schoenberg argued against what he saw as over-accentuation of strong beats. He criticised Koussevitzki's and Toscanini's 'mechanic-like' way of conducting meter and suggested that this manner of conducting originated from popular dance music. In 'Koussevitzki-Toscanini' Schoenberg claimed that the classic masters up to Brahms used a beat which was flexible. The size of the beat would change according to phrasing, mood, character, contrast and expression. Schoenberg contrasted

⁷⁸ SR, 'Koussevitzki-Toscanini', August 1944, 301-8; and 'Today's Manner of Performing Classical Music' 1948, in *SI*, 320-2. ASC, T42.03.

⁷⁹ See *SI*, 'Mechanical Musical Instruments', 329.

⁸⁰ *SI*, 'Vibrato', 346. 'Das Vibrato ist zu einer ebenso unausstehlichen Manier ~~worden~~ <ausgeartet>, wie das Portamento-Legato ... Noch ärger aber ~~scheint~~ mir <finde ich> das an Ziegenböcke gemahnenede Gemecker, ~~das~~ mittels welchen viele Instrumentalisten um die Gunst ihres Publikum werben'. ASC, T64.07.

⁸¹ SR, 306. See Richard Wagner, *On Conducting*, trans. Edward Dannreuther (New York: Dover, 1989).

⁸² SR, 'Koussevitzki-Toscanini', 308.

popular dance music to the Italian style of singing from the first two decades of the twentieth century. The Italian temperament, he explained, was of 'very refined sensibility ... expressing the slightest shades of a mood, illustrating the most delicate changes'. Another example that Schoenberg elicited is that of the recitative in opera. He wrote that in the secco-recitative all musical elements change according to the text. Harmonic progressions may settle down in a key for only a very short length of time. The tempo also varies according to the text. In 1947, Schoenberg added to his 1933 lecture 'Brahms the Progressive' the following: 'A wise performer, one who is indeed a "servant to the work", one who possesses the mental elasticity of a rank equal to that of a musical thinker – such a man will proceed like Mozart or Schubert or others. He will systematize irregularity, making it a component principle of the organization'.⁸³ The performer is expected to act like the great German composers, and contribute to the organic work or art. This is achieved by systematizing irregularity, no matter whether it is in the creative act of composition or performance.⁸⁴ In an appendix to the post-1945 'Theory of Performance' (judging by the hand writing, this manuscript was written after the Second World War)⁸⁵ Schoenberg claimed: 'Art music's inclination was always toward metrical freedom. Even when it surrendered to the bar line *it left to the performer* some ways of escaping annoying regularity by admitting caesuras, phrase discrimination, little rests for breathing and a tiny little time necessary to produce accentuation of the phrasing'.⁸⁶ In an appendix to this manuscript Schoenberg connected the concepts of a 'well-balanced' performance with that of 'musical prose'. He complains, once again, that there are

⁸³ ASC, T45.3. *SI*, 413-4.

⁸⁴ As in the 1934 'Performance and Gestalt', Schoenberg referred (in a quotation quoted above) to a similar overlap between composition and performance in the paper 'Gustav Mahler' of 1912 (revised 1948). What unites the activities of the so-called 'productive' performer and composer is that both have a very clear image of what they want to represent. He claimed that the act of performing is only 'slightly different' from that of composing, 'virtually, only the approach is different'. *SI*, 464-5.

⁸⁵ ASC, T75.01

⁸⁶ ASC, T75.02.A. It was written on both sides of an envelope. Emphasis added.

conductors like Toscanini or Klemperer who believe one can play music metronomically without ever deviating from this mechanical regularity.⁸⁷ He claims that ‘the measure is certainly not the master, but the servant of the idea’ and concludes that ‘classic music, though it had made it a point to be as popular as dance music, did not cease to aim away from that toward a new goal: musical prose’.⁸⁸ Musical prose in performance is achieved by what Schoenberg saw as a ‘well-balanced’ performance⁸⁹ - one that does not veer towards either of the two extremes mentioned above (the over-expressive ‘romantic’ and that of the *Neue Sachlichkeit*).

The following view expressed in the aforementioned post-1945 ‘Theory of Performance’ seems to echo his earlier anti-performer writings: ‘Is performance necessary? (not the author but the audience only needs it)’.⁹⁰ In another place in this manuscript he claimed that

interpretation aims at comprehensibility in the best case of the ideas of the composer. Generally it is more the idea of the interpreter what he [the performer] can offer. The best he can do is aim for lucidity. Sometimes he helps a work by replacing the high tension of the inspired mind ... of a composer through the interpreter’s more commonplace and relaxes status of thinking and feeling.

That often helps, as I once wrote to Mahler, when I had enjoyed his First Symphony when played in the more comforting and *gemütlich* manner of Ferdinand Löwe. ‘You cannot stand two high tensions, that of the work and that of the conductor’.⁹¹

Unlike many of the documents in the 1920s where Schoenberg attacked performers for not adhering to the score, here the score is not the focus. It goes without saying that this quotation contradicts the aforementioned ideas in ‘Vortrag und Gestalt’ and ‘EXPRESSION’. Yet, it is clear from this quotation that he sees the performer on a lower level of inspiration compared to the composer.

⁸⁷ See Schoenberg’s footnote there.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*; musical prose is a key term in Schoenberg’s famous article ‘Brahms the Progressive’ (*SI*, 398-441), where he argued that Brahms, and not Wagner, who stretched the tonal system to its limits, was the truly progressive composer thanks to his technique of developing variation. See also Kerman’s argument mentioned in chapter 2.

⁸⁹ *SI*, ‘Today’s Manner...’, 320. ASC, T30.4.

⁹⁰ NeffP, 30.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 29.

Table 3.1 summarizes Schoenberg's score-focused, anti-performer and pro-performer tendencies in the different manuscripts that he wrote on performance. There is a thick line that separates the writings before and after his emigration to America. Before 1933 the vast majority of the writings contain score-focused ideas (marked in grey). This suggests that Schoenberg was influenced by *Neue Sachlichkeit*. The table also shows that Schoenberg had pro-performer writings in the 1920s (this distances him from Stravinsky's performance aesthetics of 'execution'). In the American period, all manuscripts contain pro-performer conceptions (marked in grey).⁹² There are no radical score-focused ideas and only one writing that is anti-performer. Both the quantity of the writings of each tendency and their content reveal a major change in Schoenberg's performance aesthetics after he emigrated.

Manuscript name	Date	Score focused	Anti performer	Pro performer
'Gustav Mahler'	1912	On Mahler: 'I force the musicians to play exactly what is in the notes'.		
Preface to <i>Pierrot lunaire</i>	1914	Actions originating with the interpreter, which are not included in the score, have a negative effect.		
Schoenberg's copy of <i>Entwurf einer neuen Ästhetik ...</i>	post-1917	'The more interpretation respects the written symbols ... the higher it must be rated'.		
Letter to Erwin Stein	December 1920	'Didn't you know that I am against this "doing-music-by-heart" ...'		
Letter to Marya Freund	16 August 1922	'I cannot allow any will but mine ... realising the musical thoughts that I have recorded on paper'.		
'Zur Vortragslehre'	c. 1923-24	'every note is really heard ... all stand out clearly from one another'.		
His annotated copy of <i>Pult und Taktstock</i>	May 1925			'The difference between instruments and machines [:] ... <i>through</i> the instruments the piece can be

⁹² The value of 'well-balanced' performance appears in both the score-focused and pro-performer since it promotes a balance between both tendencies.

				produced.'
His annotated copy of <i>Pult und Taktstock</i>	March - April 1926	'Should one not also leave pitch and rhythm to the ... conductor...? Who still needs notes today?'		Yet 'the demand of the performer for the protection of original work is justifiable'.
'Zur Metronomisierung'	25 October 1926	'Has not the author at least the right to indicate ... how he imagines his ideas should be realized?'	Complained about memorized performances.	
'expert opinion for the <i>Akademie</i> '	4 July 1929	'the idea is completed, without any interpretation, as soon as it is notated'.		
'Splitter'	c. 1930		'the contortions of conductors ... who will not let us pass by unaffected'.	
'EXPRESSION'	Late 1930s or early 1940s			'music was from the very beginning ... an <u>expression</u> of the soul or character of the player...' and 'Performance must be based on <u>interpretation</u> '.
'Koussevitzki-Toscanini'	August 1944	'well-balanced' performance		'well-balanced' performance
'Vortrag und Gestalt' of the <i>Gedanke</i>	1934			'Perhaps this [i.e. the score's brevity] even suggests that <u>performance</u> is ... part of <u>presenting an idea</u> '.
'Theory of Performance'	post-1945		The best [the performer] ... can do is aim for lucidity.	Art music 'left to the performer ... ways of escaping annoying regularity'
'Today's Manner of Performing Classical Music'	1948	'well-balanced' performance		'well-balanced' performance

Table 3.1: Score-focused, anti-performer and pro-performer tendencies in Schoenberg's writings on performance.

One might wonder why Schoenberg began to grant greater importance to the performer after his emigration to America. The following is one possible explanation. Individualism was important also for the German Romanticism (Beethoven was seen as an example of a genius who expressed his musical individuality). In the 1920s Schoenberg saw the individuality of the performer as somewhat threatening that of the composer. The change in Schoenberg's aesthetics may have been as a result of his feeling that he was rejected by the German tradition and/or it might be a consequence of his confrontation with a new cultural context, after his emigration to America, where there is

a strong emphasis on individuality: that is, the individuality of all people, not only of geniuses. Individualism unites the great diversity that can be found among Americans and helps to give coherence to national thought.⁹³ Alexis de Tocqueville had observed already in the 1830s that the most important aspect of the American character was individualism.⁹⁴ Schoenberg did not write much about individuality in America. He did write, however, the following in a post 1942 manuscript: 'I had long speculated about the more profound meaning of the Nazi philosophy. There was one element that puzzled me extremely: the relationship of the valueless individual being's life in respect to the totality of the community, or its representative: ... the Führer'.⁹⁵ If Schoenberg was influenced by American individuality then it would not be surprising that this concept had percolated into his performance aesthetics, giving more space for the expression of the performer's will.

The musical idea (2)

The following documents give the same picture as in the 1920s: the formation of the concept of the musical idea is unclear. In a letter from 24 July 1950 to Thor Johnson of the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, concerning a performance of the *Gurrelieder*, Schoenberg wrote: 'I confess that many of the tempo-indications in my big score are exaggerated. I would not make all these violent changes today any more, which at the

⁹³ For a discussion of American Individualism see Robert Nelly Bellah et al. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life* (Berkeley and Los Angeles California: University of California Press, 1985), 142-166; and Yehoshua Arieli, *Individualism and Nationalism in American Ideology* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1964), 193-198.

⁹⁴ Tocqueville wrote: 'Individualism is a calm and considered feeling which disposes each citizen to isolate himself from the mass of his fellows and withdraw into the circle of family and friends; with this little society formed to his taste, he gladly leaves the greater society to look after itself'. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, trans. George Lawrence, ed. J. Mayer (New York: Doubleday, Anchor Books, 1969), 506.

⁹⁵ SR, 291.

time when the score was published were not so extravagant'.⁹⁶ Then Schoenberg admitted: 'But we have today a style of performance which rather avoids too violent changes of tempo, and I would say that this asks for some modification. I would say don't take the metronome marks too literally'. Schoenberg wrote in many of his scores that metronome marks should not be taken too literally. This is a result of the shift in performance practice that occurred in the first half of the twentieth century.⁹⁷ The fact that he acknowledged the historical change in the interpretation of time, challenges the a priori status of time as part of the musical idea (as argued in the 1920s).

In the manuscript 'Koussevitzki-Toscanini' of 11 August 1944, as in 'Mechanische Musikinstrumente', Schoenberg distinguished between the 'flexible, *adaptable*, relative elements, [such] as ... dynamic[s]' and the 'static, unchangeable, absolute elements [such] as: pitch'.⁹⁸ However, in May 1949 Schoenberg wrote a text entitled 'For the Radio Broadcast of the String Trio'. He claimed that a previous performance of his trio was with many 'errors, faults and other shortcomings'. He added: 'I am the last to blame the failure of a work of mine on the more or less important shortcomings of a performance. Though they are not entirely uninfluential, especially if they spoil the character and mood by false ... dynamic[s]'.⁹⁹ If the performer can use dynamics in a flexible manner than what is the border between interpretation and misinterpretation? Schoenberg does not answer this question, yet he does argue that certain interpretations of dynamics can harm performance. The reason for the vagueness in the formulation of the function of dynamics is, once again, the different contexts of these writings.

⁹⁶ A similar 'confession' concerning rehearsing is mentioned in his letter to the same person from 20 February 1951. See discussion in chapter 2.

⁹⁷ For a recent study on the change in performance practice during the first half of the twentieth century, see Philip, *Performing Music*, 4-63.

⁹⁸ SR, 301-8.

⁹⁹ ASC, T31.5.

Finally, in 'Theory of Performance' he quoted Mahler regarding a performance of Mozart's *Don Giovanni* where the singer was ill at the last moment and was replaced by another one, with no time for rehearsal: 'From the first beginning I realized that Kr. (a very renowned baritone) whose voice was "heavy", took everything much more slowly than S. There was no way of avoiding imprecision and wavering, so I had to accept his tempi. But this would have ruined the proportion of the whole opera'. Mahler's solution, according to Schoenberg, was to balance 'his tempi by changing also the tempi of all the other pieces, taking some a little more slowly, others a little faster. I had the feeling it was finally very good – though not [what] I was accustomed to'.¹⁰⁰ Schoenberg argued that 'Mahler conceived a whole opera in its totality'.¹⁰¹ Near the passage quoted above where Mahler speaks, Schoenberg added in handwriting: 'Problems begin when you change the tempo'. This contradicts his typewritten argument which implies that changing the tempo (the distance between the parts of the opera) 'does not matter'. What seems to me slightly puzzling here is that Schoenberg explained the changes that Mahler made, as a result of the singer, as achieving organic balance by changing the tempo of different pieces 'taking some a little more slowly, others a little faster'. If the proportions of the total organism should be kept, does it not mean that all the tempos should be either slower *or* faster? It seems that Schoenberg's conception of the musical idea is more mystical than truly calculated (a notion that one also receives from his earlier writings on the musical idea).

Except for these manuscripts and the aforementioned document 'Vortrag und Gestalt', Schoenberg wrote very little on the performance of the musical idea in this period. Performance, as he conceived it after 1934, challenged his previous notion of the

¹⁰⁰ NeffP, 27. Neff noted that "'Kr.'" is the baritone, Felix von Kraus; "S." could be the Leipzig baritone, Hans Schütz'. Ibid., ASC, T75.01.

¹⁰¹ He added later in handwriting the names of the conductors Furtwängler and Mengelberg. Judging by Schoenberg's positive view of these conductors he probably thought that they too had such an organic conception of the musical works they conducted. See Michael H. Kater, *Composers of the Nazi Era: Eight Portraits* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), for information about Schoenberg's views on different conductors.

genius composer who composes musical ideas and is responsible alone for its presentation. Schoenberg betrayed here his early concept concerning the musical idea being revealed into the world in a single act of inspiration by a single persona: the composer-prophet. In Jose Rodriguez's spring 1937 conversation with Schoenberg for Merle Armitage's book,¹⁰² Schoenberg argued: 'I see the work as a whole first. Then I compose the details. ... And it is this idea, this first thought, that must dictate the structure and the texture of the work'.¹⁰³ Yet, since in most of Schoenberg's late writings, the performer has also part in the presentation of the musical idea, and since he or she has access to it despite the limitations of notation, then this means that Schoenberg acknowledged a process of continuous revelation which included more than one persona, notably that of performers.¹⁰⁴ This is a striking change in the concept of the musical idea.

Conclusion

This chapter has important implications for performance, music analysis, and music theory, as well as for the history of music. These writings may leave the performer somewhat puzzled, however. Schoenberg called for great adherence to the score in the 1920s yet advocated a balanced amount of performer's self-expression after 1933. It is very hard to imagine from Schoenberg's writings how he performed his music in different periods or how he expected it to be performed by others. In order to gain a better sense of what Schoenberg had in mind one must turn to other evidence such as recordings (see parts II and III below). This situation puts great responsibility on the performer, who cannot avoid making subjective decisions (more about this in chapter 9).

¹⁰² Merle Armitage (ed.), *Schoenberg*, (Westport Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1977), 147-148. [Original published in 1937 by New York: G. Schirmer.]

¹⁰³ Stuckenschmidt, 419, 420.

¹⁰⁴ This has equivalence to some of the most interesting ideas of contemporary research of performance studies. In music, for example, see Cook, 'Between Process and Product: Music and/as Performance', [14].

Up to 1934, performance was considered external to the organic art-work. It had the role of demonstrating the living aspect of the organism with the help of spontaneity in performance practice. From 1934 onwards, there are several writings that give the impression that performance is not only the blood which gives life to the organism, but it also takes part in the very construction of the organism. In other words, the performer has an irreducible part in the presentation of the organic construction. This has far-reaching implications for the music analyst. If the performer's actions can influence the musical structure and ontology then analysis of the score alone may achieve only a very partial explanation of this structure and ontology. Schoenberg's late performance aesthetics implicitly advocates a type of analysis that was almost non-existent in his lifetime – what would be today termed 'performance analysis'.

Moreover, Schoenberg's changing and at times contradictory views on the role of the different components of the musical idea leave the music analyst in a quandary. The question of which aspects the analyst should pay most attention to remains unanswered. This seems unhelpful for the music analyst who may be looking for guidance in Schoenberg as composer, music theorist and performer. Indeed the music analyst should be cautious when relying on Schoenberg's authority as a writer trying to explain his own music.

Although Schoenberg was a brilliant theoretician, his fragmentary performance writings do not constitute a coherent performance theory. Yet, it is possible to glean many interesting insights from them about his changing views and the issues that confronted him in different periods. Equally, Schoenberg's references to the musical idea in his performance writings support the view that this concept is too unclear to be regarded as a consistent theory.

And yet, for the historian, the performance writings bear special interest. Schoenberg lived through significant cultural changes such as the two World Wars, and his emigration from Europe to America. The effect of these aspects on his performance aesthetics was ignored in the literature. Before 1918 Schoenberg's performance aesthetics was affected mainly by that of Wagner¹⁰⁵ and Mahler,¹⁰⁶ yet possibly also by what he called in retrospect over-expressive 'romantic' style of performance. After the First World War it was the new trends in art, especially that of *Neue Sachlichkeit* that affected Schoenberg's performance aesthetics. In the American period, his rethinking of his previous aesthetics, the performance environment in America, and possibly also the American emphasis on individualism, influenced Schoenberg to reconsider the role of performers in musical performance.

¹⁰⁵ See Reinhard Kapp, 'Theorien über musikalische Aufführung in Wagners "Meistersingern" und "Moses und Aron"', in Christian Meyer (ed.), *Schoenberg und Wagner* (Wien: ASC, 1998), 42-80.

¹⁰⁶ In the case of Mahler it was also his performance practice as a conductor in Vienna that had direct impact on Schoenberg. There is not much evidence on Mahler's performance practice. For a discussion on Mahler's conducting see Paul Banks, 'Aspects of Mahler's Fifth Symphony: performance practice and interpretation', *Musical Times*, 130 (1989), 258-265.