



A Possible Source for a Brahms Ground

For years it was accepted that the subject of the ostinato movement that ends J. S. Bach's Cantata No. 150 was the source of the theme used by Brahms in the last movement of his Fourth Symphony. The relationship of these two themes is based on the well-known account of Siegfried Ochs, who, in his 1922 memoir, *Geschehenes, Gesehenes*, reported that after playing Bach's chaconne movement for Hans von Bülow, Brahms asked, "What would you think about a symphony movement written on this theme some time? But it is too clumsy, too straightforward. One must alter it chromatically in some way." The themes of Bach and Brahms are shown in Example 1.

In his dissertation Kenneth Hull notes that over the years "at least eight models" have been proposed for the Brahms movement. ("Brahms the Allusive: Extra-Musical Reference in the Instrumental Music of Johannes Brahms," Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1989, 164.) Of these proposals, in addition to Bach's Cantata 150, surely of great importance are the same composer's Chaconne in D Minor (the last movement of the Partita for solo violin, BWV 1004), which Brahms transcribed for piano in 1877, and François Couperin's *Passacaille* in B Minor, which Brahms had edited with Friedrich Chrysander in a volume of Couperin's keyboard works. Raymond Knapp has also proposed Dietrich Buxtehude's organ *Ciacona* in E Minor as a model, and although the most notable parallel with Brahms's symphony movement occurs when Buxtehude's theme is inverted, Knapp makes a plausible case that the Buxtehude piece "is more relevant to Brahms's symphony than is Bach's cantata." (See Raymond Knapp, "The Finale of Brahms's Fourth Symphony: The Tale of the Subject," *19th-Century Music* 13 [1989], 3-17.) An exclusive connection to the Bach theme has thus been questioned with some frequency. But whatever the provenance of the ground, one could hardly disagree with Knapp's assertion that, while Brahms's compositional process may remain a mystery, "he clearly began with the careful construction of the subject itself."

Perhaps Brahms had very little construction to do. Example 2 shows the ground from Theone's aria in Act II,



Johannes Brahms in the early 1880s
(Photography by Erwin Hanfstaengle, Stuttgart;
Private Collection, Germany)

Scene 2 of Jean-Baptiste Lully's *Phaëton*. The resemblance of this theme to that of Brahms is striking, and if an A-sharp is inserted between Lully's A-natural and B, altering the theme "chromatically in some way" to make it less "straightforward," the subjects are almost identical. Such a likeness of themes between most composers' works would surely be
(continued on next page)

(A Brahms Ground, *continued*)

coincidental, but with Brahms, who avidly studied the music of the past, the similarity might be more than an accident.

Could Brahms have known *Phaëton*? Brahms was no francophile, but his championing of Couperin's keyboard works as editor and pianist shows that he took an interest in older French music of high quality. According to Virginia Hancock's *Brahms's Choral Compositions and His Library of Early Music*, Brahms did not own a copy of Lully's *Phaëton*, but he regularly sought out older music that interested him in public libraries and in private collections other than his own. *Phaëton* would have been available to him in Vienna in both the Hofbibliothek (which became the Austrian National Library after World War I) and the archive of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde. (I am grateful for private communications from Inge Birkin-Feichtinger of the Österreichische National-Bibliothek, who informs me that its copy of *Phaëton* was acquired sometime between 1826 and 1845, and Dr. Otto Biba, *Archivdirektor* at the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, who notes that the Archiv's copy of *Phaëton* was acquired in 1831 as part of the music collection of Archduke Rudolph, one of Beethoven's most prominent patrons.) Brahms studied so frequently in the archive of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde that librarian Carl Ferdinand Pohl once joked that a footbridge for Brahms's exclusive use should be built across the *Wienfluss* to accommodate his frequent visits. Thus, while it cannot be proved that Brahms knew *Phaëton*, he certainly could have known it, and an examination of Theone's aria will show some parallels with Brahms's Fourth Symphony that may be more than coincidental.

Because Brahms's ground is merely the lower part of the E-Minor scale, at least part of it can be explained as the product of a cycle of descending thirds. Hugo Riemann perceived this in 1897, labeling his illustration of mm. 241–246 of the finale with the notes of the Brahms ground. (See Example 3, reproduced from Kenneth Hull, ed., *Johannes Brahms Symphony No. 4 in E minor* [New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2000], 213.) As Knapp has shown, the cycle is broken at the appearance of the A-sharp—the note that would alter Lully's theme “chromatically in some way.” Lully's ground is also connected to a cycle of thirds, albeit a significantly longer one. As seen in Example 4a, the hopeless Theone bemoans her faithless lover, Phaëton, in motives of gently sobbing thirds as she parallels the ascending ground up to her exclamation, “*O Ciel!*” Example 4b shows that the notes of this passage can be reproduced in a huge cycle of descending thirds that has gaps at significant places: B-G () C-A () D-B () E-C# () and finally, F#-D# (). The “missing” notes that would fill the gaps in the cycle are, of course, the notes of the ground: E, F#, G, A, and B. Similar cycles that “need” the notes of the ground may be seen in Example 6, which presents the complete aria. To return to Brahms, a number of analysts have related the thirds of Example 3 to earlier cycles in the finale, such as mm. 38–40 (Ex. 5a), which, in turn, relate to the opening theme of the first movement (Ex. 5b). This, of course, is because the opening theme of the first movement can be reduced to a

cycle of the same notes (Ex. 5c). Example 5d shows that, except for the difference between the D and D#, the beginning of Theone's first phrase can be reduced to virtually the same cycle.

“Virtually,” of course, acknowledges that Lully's incomplete cycle does not correspond exactly with the complete cycle of Brahms. But is it not characteristic of Brahms to take an idea and develop it to its full potential? In a well-known conversation with George Henschel, Brahms said that when he had the first idea for a theme, he considered it a gift which he had to make his own by hard work. If Lully's theme was in fact one of Brahms's models, he could have recognized the latent possibilities in Lully's incomplete cycle of thirds and, in his own theme, filled in the gaps, constructing a theme whose complete cycle is more in keeping with the prominent cycles of thirds found in a number of his works.

Both Lully's aria and Brahms's Fourth Symphony are in E Minor, but today, after the passing of so many years of music written with little regard to “key,” we may find it surprising that the choice of key was very important in Brahms's era. In his review of the first Vienna performance of the Fourth Symphony (January 19, 1886), Eduard Hanslick remarked that its key was a “distinguishing characteristic” and noted that neither Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, Mendelssohn, nor Schumann had ever written a symphony in that key. A few days later, in a vicious mockery of Hanslick's review, Hugo Wolf called Hanslick's remark a “colossal discovery” and suggested sardonically that modern symphonists might exploit other keys that had not been used by major composers, such as B-sharp Major or E-double-flat Minor. This vitriol, however, had no effect on Hugo Riemann, who, in 1897, reiterated that the key of E Minor as tonic actually seemed to have been avoided by symphonists. He found that it gave a “profoundly melancholic” and “elegaic” character to the Fourth and related its mood to *Messiah*'s “Behold and See,” also in E minor. Riemann's characterization of Brahms's opening theme as an almost “sobbing pleading” suggests the emotional world of the rejected Theone, who sings:

He flees from me, the fickle one; / he takes all hope from me. Oh heavens, / so much coldness follows on so much ardor! / Ah, if only he had avoided seeing me, / how much torment he would have spared my soul.

A great number of commentators have associated Brahms's Fourth with tragedy. Max Kalbeck related it to the tragedy of human life and noted that during the summers of 1884 and 1885, when Brahms composed the symphony, he had read the tragedies of Sophocles given to him in the translation of his friend, Gustav Wendt. *Phaëton*, taken from the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid, whose works in translation were in Brahms's library, also draws on themes of ancient tragedy. Not only does Phaëton reject Theone in favor of the king's daughter, in this *Tragedie en musique*, he also races his father's chariot across the heavens so recklessly that, in order to save the earth, he must be knocked from the sky by Jupiter's thunderbolt. Moreover, *Phaëton* occupies a special place among Lully's dramatic works. Before *Phaëton*, Lully's tragedies had always ended with a happy resolution of

a.

b.

Example 1: a. J.S. Bach, Cantata No. 150, final chorus, "Meine Tage in den Leiden"
 b. Johannes Brahms, Symphony No. 4, Op. 98, movement IV

Example 2: Jean-Baptiste Lully, *Phaëton*, aria, "Il me suit, l'Inconstan," mm. 1-5

Example 3: Brahms, Symphony No. 4, Op. 98, movement IV, mm. 241-246 (from Riemann)

a.

b.

Example 4: a. Jean-Baptiste Lully, *Phaëton*, aria, "Il me suit, l'Inconstant," mm. 21-26;
 b. Gapped cycle of thirds

a.

b.

c.

d.

Example 5: a. Brahms, Fourth Symphony, IV, mm. 38-40; b. Brahms, Fourth Symphony, I, mm. 1-4;
 c. Cycle of thirds from Brahms's Fourth Symphony, I, 1-4; d. Cycle of thirds from Theone's aria

44 mens, à mon a - me! Qu'il au - roit, es - par - né de tour - ments, de tour - ments, à mon a - me! Ah! que n'a - ti tou - jours e - vi - té de me voir? Qu'il au - roit es - par - né de tour - ments, de tour - ments à mon a - me! Qu'il au - roit es - par - né de tour - ments à mon a - me! Qu'il au - roit es - par - né de tour - ments à mon a - me! Qu'il au - roit es - par - né de tour - ments à mon a - me!

45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71

7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38

Il me suit, l'in-constant! il m'a - te tout es - poit. O Ciel! tant de froids, tant de froids, tant de froids! Il me suit l'in-constant! il m'a - te tout es - poit. O Ciel! tant de froids, tant de froids, tant de froids! Il me suit l'in-constant! il m'a - te tout es - poit. O Ciel! tant de froids, tant de froids, tant de froids! Il me suit l'in-constant! il m'a - te tout es - poit. O Ciel! tant de froids, tant de froids, tant de froids! Il me suit l'in-constant! il m'a - te tout es - poit. O Ciel! tant de froids, tant de froids, tant de froids!

Example 6: Jean-Baptiste Lully, *Phaëton*, "Il me suit, l'Inconstant!"

events, but here there is no celebratory *divertissement*. *Phaëton* thus became the first of Lully's operas to end tragically. (See Caroline Wood, *Music and Drama in the Tragedie en Musique, 1673–1775: Jean-Baptiste Lully and his Successors* [New York: Garland, 1996, 250.]) Correspondingly, Tovey notes that Brahms's Fourth is "one of the rarest things in classical music, a symphony which ends tragically," and Felix Weingartner not only finds in the finale the impression of "implacable fate," but that the conclusion of the movement is a "frightful counterpart to the paroxysm of joy" that ends Beethoven's Ninth Symphony. So, in addition to their nearly identical grounds, their similar cycles of thirds that partially spell out these grounds, and their common key of E Minor, both *Phaëton* and the Brahms Fourth break with convention by ending tragically.

The acknowledgement of Lully's theme as a possible model for Brahms's ground would do nothing to contradict what many writers have shown of the important influences of a number of works on the finale as a whole. Certainly, for instance, Brahms would have had little to gain in terms of large-scale structure from Lully's tiny aria. But even if the overall form of Brahms's finale reflects the conventions of the large ostinato movements that he most admired, one may still perceive a palpable relationship between Brahms's symphonic movement and Lully's aria. Perhaps this makes it easier to imagine Brahms examining Lully's operas for the chaconnes or *passacailles* in the *divertissements* that frequently conclude these works. Moreover, even if one feels that this remains an unlikely proposition, this enquiry reminds us that, up to now, no one has even considered the possibility that the finale of Brahms's Fourth Symphony may have been influenced to some extent by smaller grounds in the tradition of the baroque operatic lament. Further consideration of this idea would be worthwhile in itself, and could lead to more acceptance of the possibility that it was after a trip across the *Wienfluss* that the scholar-composer found the model for his subject.

Robert Ricks

ABS News

At its November 12, 2004 meeting, the American Brahms Society's Board of Directors was pleased to elect Dr. Richard Cohn and Dr. Kevin Karnes to membership on the board. Dr. Cohn is Helen B. and Frank L. Sulzberger Professor in Music at The University of Chicago. He has published extensively on the music of Beethoven, Schubert, Brahms, Wagner, Bartók, and Reich. Twice a winner of the Society for Music Theory's Outstanding Publication Award, his work focuses on chromatic harmony, metric dissonance, Schenkerian theory, atonal pitch-class theory, and Lewinian transformational theory. Dr. Karnes, who recently joined the faculty at Emory University, is a past recipient of the ABS's Karl Geiringer Scholarship Award. He has published on Brahms in *19th-Century Music*, has a Brahms-related article forthcoming in *The Journal of Musicological Research*, and is working on a book that explores the intersections of music criticism, analysis, and historiography in the world of Brahms, Bruckner, and Hanslick.

The ABS is pleased to announce the election of Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Sandberger, head of the Brahms-Institut an der Musikhochschule Lübeck, as a Corresponding Director of our society. A number of Prof. Dr. Sandberger's articles related to Brahms appear in the "Recent Brahms Publications" section of this Newsletter and in previous issues. He is currently preparing a *Brahms-Handbuch*, which will appear in the handbook series to be published by Bärenreiter/Metzler Verlag. An editorial project, *Johannes Brahms und die Musikforschung seiner Zeit. Tagungsband zum Brahms-Symposium anlässlich der Jahrestagung der Gesellschaft für Musikforschung 2003 in Lübeck*, is also in preparation.

In addition to his work on Brahms, Dr. Sandberger has made important contributions to the literature about J. S. Bach, Dietrich Buxtehude, Heinrich Schütz, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, and the nineteenth-century Bach scholar and close friend of Brahms, Philipp Spitta. He has also served as editor for *Bach, Lübeck und die norddeutsche Musiktradition: Bericht über das internationale Symposium der Musikhochschule Lübeck April 2000* (Kassel, 2002) and, with Nicole Ristow and Dorothea Schröder, for "*Critica musica. Studien zum 17. und 18. Jahrhundert. Festschrift Hans Joachim Marx zum 65. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart, 2001). Prof. Dr. Sandberger serves on the board of directors of the Brahms-Gesellschaft Schleswig-Holstein and the Internationale Dietrich-Buxtehude-Gesellschaft.

The board also voted to extend the reach of the Karl Geiringer Scholarship Fund to encompass support not only for promising doctoral research about Brahms and his music, but also for other awards and special projects which address these subjects. Accordingly, the board agreed to change the name of this fund to The Karl Geiringer Fund.

Tradition (YES) and Innovation (well, maybe)

Review of *Die Kammermusik von Johannes Brahms: Tradition und Innovation*, ed. Gernot Gruber. Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 2001. 331p.

The twenty essays in this collection were originally presentations at a 1997 symposium in Vienna that explored tradition and innovation in Brahms's chamber music. "Tradition and Innovation" appears as a subtitle to the published volume, and this dichotomy was evidently of foremost importance to the conference attendees, since each of the articles specifically addresses it. The participants included a number of European scholars, such as Imogen Fellinger, Otto Biba, and Christian Martin Schmidt, whose contributions to the study of Brahms have long been acknowledged, as well as others, including Peter Kuon, whose expertise lies outside of music. The first nine essays are historically oriented, while the subsequent ones are analytical discussions of Brahms's Opp. 8, 16, 36, 38, 40, 51, 100, 101, 111, 115, and 120, No. 1. The volume concludes with a transcription of the symposium's closing discussion concerning some of the papers and the topics they raised.

(continued on next page)

(Tradition and Innovation, *continued*)

The historical essays offer a surprisingly broad range of approaches. Wolfgang Röd, Moritz Csáky, and Peter Kuon tackle the pairing of tradition and innovation in disciplines other than music. Röd takes a philosophical approach to these concepts, and explores how they interact with the concepts of continuity and discontinuity. This idea of continuity and discontinuity is also taken up by Kuon, who compares the break with tradition in literature at the beginning of the twentieth century with that in the Middle Ages. He considers such writers as Dante and Joyce, and although he attempts some analogies with music, the emphasis here is on literature. Csáky describes the historicity of the nineteenth century and compares the social and intellectual environment of this century to earlier ones. Wolfgang Gratzner's essay is somewhat more closely related to the topics of Brahms and music and, after discussing various synonyms for tradition and innovation (e.g., conventional and progressive), he unfolds definitions of the roles of tradition in music.

The other historical essays are less abstract and concern Brahms and the nineteenth century. Imogen Fellinger describes the significance of chamber music in Brahms's life, as demonstrated by the scores in his library, the works he cited in his study of octaves and fifths, and the repertoire he performed. This commitment to chamber music is even evident in the composer's youth, and may have been influenced by his study with Eduard Marxsen. Hartmut Krones takes a wider view and traces the changes in the concept of chamber music up until Brahms's death. Three of the essays deal with Vienna: Friedrich C. Heller writes on Brahms and the Ringstrasse area, including information on the changing demographics and buildings of Vienna; Manfred Wagner describes the theory and aesthetics of music in nineteenth-century Vienna, placing Eduard Hanslick's aesthetics in the context of Viennese traditions and comparing them with those of Richard Wagner; and Otto Biba explores the role of chamber music during Brahms's time in this city. Biba's essay is the most detailed, encompassing the venues where chamber music was performed (including the role of music-making in private homes) and the emphasis on chamber works in the classical style in publishers' catalogs, especially prior to Brahms's rise to prominence. Biba also compares some of the similar stylistic elements in Brahms's Piano Quartet, Op. 25, and Cello Sonata, Op. 38, and works by such contemporaries as Robert Volkmann and Carl Goldmark. Along with Fellinger, Biba briefly describes the importance Brahms placed on trial performances of his new works. The essays on Vienna, along with those by Fellinger and Krones, provide the context in which Brahms's works were written and performed, and as such they tend to emphasize nineteenth-century traditions of chamber music composition and performance. By contrast, the analytical essays in the second half of the volume play Brahms's work off against eighteenth-century, classical compositional techniques, especially sonata form.

The analytical essays are arranged by opus number, beginning with the Piano Trio, Op. 8, and, like the historical

essays, they include various methodologies and topics. Many are accompanied by copious music examples—a few of which, however, lack headings—and some include diagrams of the form of specific movements. The structural issues described in these essays will already be well known to those familiar with Brahms's chamber music and to those who have ventured into the corresponding research. Marie-Agnes Dittrich (on the Piano Quintet, Op. 34), Peter Revers (on the Horn Trio, Op. 40), Josef-Horst Lederer (on the Piano Trio, Op. 101), Gernot Gruber (on the String Quintet, Op. 111), Christian Martin Schmidt (on the Clarinet Quintet, Op. 115), and Rainer Boestfleisch (on the Clarinet Sonata, Op. 120, No. 1) offer the most detailed analyses, addressing harmony, motives, and the form of specific movements and/or passages and examining the various ways Brahms blends both traditional and innovative treatments of these parameters. For example, Dittrich sketches the importance of half-tone motives in the themes of the first movement of Op. 34, the harmonic characteristics and relationships of the outer movements (which account for some of the work's more novel features), and similarities between this piece and chamber works by Schubert. In some instances, the authors seem uncomfortable with the concept of "innovation," preferring to describe Brahms's technique as "individualistic." This slight stepping-away from rating Brahms's achievements as being on the cutting edge usually occurs in discussions of his chromatic harmonies and their effect on classical forms and phrases (see, for example, Siegfried Mauser on the Violin Sonata, Op. 100). By contrast, those who discuss Brahms's works in terms of developing variation offer more emphatic claims for Brahms as an innovator. Boestfleisch, for example, uses Schoenbergian concepts to analyze the first movement of Op. 120, No. 1. He describes Brahms's treatment of small motives, rhythmic and metric structures, non-traditional aspects of the development, and the varied reprise. (He expanded these comments to include observations about the thematic relationships between the movements of this work in "Innovative Techniken in der Klarinettensonate Op. 120 Nr. 1 von Johannes Brahms," *Ostinato rigore: Revue internationale d'études musicales* 13 [1999], 169–92.) Boestfleisch and Revers also stand out because they are among the few authors to compare Brahms's work with specific pieces by Schoenberg. Nevertheless, it is Schmidt's essay that is the most provocative. Previously he had published a number of detailed analyses of Brahms's treatment of motives (see, for example, *Verfahren der motivisch-thematischen Vermittlung in der Musik von Johannes Brahms, dargestellt an der Klarinetten-sonate f-Moll, Op. 120, 1* [München: Katzbichler, 1971]), and in his short essay for this symposium he asks whether Brahms's manipulation of motives is really the same as Schoenberg's; that is, whether Brahms's technique is developing variation as Schoenberg himself practiced it.

Not surprisingly, most of the authors make connections between Brahms and earlier nineteenth-century composers, such as Schubert, as well as the classical masters. Some cite similarities between specific earlier compositions and those by Brahms. For example, Gernot Gruber, who focuses

on three passages in the first and fourth movements of the String Quintet, Op. 111, makes specific comparisons between Brahms's work and passages in the quintets of Mozart (K. 515) and Mendelssohn (Op. 87). Gerold W. Gruber discusses the numerous allusions to precursor works (including those by Bach) that commentators have heard in the Cello Sonata, Op. 38 and concludes that, while other composers might mix idioms, Brahms is much more eclectic—his allusions are not mere window dressing; rather, they demonstrate the diversity of musical speech. Other symposium participants, however, deal with tradition in more general ways. For example, Mauser contrasts Brahms's treatment of sonata form in the first movement of the Violin Sonata, Op. 100 with "conventional models." Although these types of comparisons certainly have their place, given the numerous publications that have already used similar generalizations, it might have been more profitable to pursue Brahms's relationships with specific predecessor works. Margaret Notley's dissertation, for example, provides an insightful discussion of the relationship between the movement that Mauser describes and the works of Beethoven, including his first symphony ("Brahms's Chamber-Music Summer of 1886: A Study of Opera 99, 100, 101, and 108," Ph.D. diss., Yale, 1992, chapter 4).

Of all the authors of the analytical papers, Lederer is perhaps the least concerned with the concepts of tradition and innovation: his essay explores the influence of a triadic motive on the melodic and harmonic structures in the first movement of the Piano Trio, Op. 101. In some passages this motive appears as a succession of falling thirds. This type of motive can be found in many of Brahms's other compositions, and in songs such as "Feldeinsamkeit" (Op. 86, No. 2) it is often associated with death. Despite the numerous discussions of the significance of this motive for Brahms, Lederer makes no mention of works such as the Fourth Symphony that also use falling-third motives, nor of the related literature. (Siegfried Kross gives a concise overview of some of these pieces in "Die Terzenkette bei Brahms und ihre Konnotationen," in *Die Sprache der Musik: Festschrift Klaus Wolfgang Niemöller zum 60. Geburtstag am 21. Juli 1989*, ed. Jobst Peter Fricke [Regensburg: Bosse, 1989], pp. 335-46.)

The remaining essays are more concerned with style. Michael Kube begins his exploration of the sextets by warning of the danger in overemphasizing structural analyses of individual pieces while ignoring the role of genre. He investigates Brahms's compositions in the context of the nineteenth-century sextet, which he contrasts with the string quartet. He compares Brahms's String Sextets, Opp. 18 and 36, to sextets by such earlier composers as Boccherini, and he provides an appendix listing string sextets composed between 1776 and 1919. He notes Brahms's use of motives and, like Revers in his article on the Horn Trio, Op. 40, and anticipating the symposium's closing discussion on the String Quintet, Op. 111, he stresses the significance of texture, which he points out has often been ignored or undervalued by other commentators. His comparisons and analytical observations lead him to assess the innovative potential of Brahms's sextets. Friedhelm Krummacher,

whose earlier essay on the string quartets is much cited ("Reception and Analysis: On the Brahms Quartets, Op. 51, Nos. 1 and 2," *19th-Century Music* 18/1 [summer 1994]: 24-45), similarly explores the status of Brahms's string quartets compared to other nineteenth-century works for this ensemble, including those by Alexander Borodin, Josef Rheinberger, and Carl Goldmark.

Often the analytical essays ignore earlier publications on the same pieces. In his study of Brahms's Piano Trio, Op. 8, Gottfried Scholz acknowledges the more detailed studies of Ernst Hertrich and Franz Zaunschirm, but he does not mention the work of Eric Sams and its expansion by Kenneth Hull. (See Hull's "Brahms the Allusive: Extra-Compositional Reference in the Instrumental Music of Johannes Brahms," Ph. D. diss., Princeton University, 1989, chapter 5.) Scholz attempts the complex task of interpreting Brahms's changes to the first version of Op. 8 in light of nineteenth-century views of tradition and innovation. By contrast, Sams and Hull have offered more convincing interpretations of this recomposition based on Brahms's use of allusions to works by Franz Schubert and Robert Schumann in the original version of Op. 8, and the personal significance that they held for him. Although the symposium venue would have made the frequent citation and discussion of such related publications cumbersome, an appendix listing relevant literature in both German and English would have been a useful supplement to this volume, especially to the student who would otherwise find it a valuable introduction to Brahms's chamber music. Furthermore, in a volume concentrating on tradition and innovation in Brahms's works, one might have expected a greater interaction with the traditions in Brahms scholarship.

Tradition and innovation are not unusual bed partners, and Gratzner notes their common juxtaposition in musicology as well as other disciplines. No doubt, lovers of Brahms's music will already be quite familiar with the frequency with which these terms are applied to his works. Many discussions of his compositions invoke these concepts, as, for instance, Thomas Krehahn in *Der fortschrittliche Akademiker: Das Verhältnis von Tradition und Innovation bei Johannes Brahms* (München: Katzschler, 1998), and David Brodbeck in "Medium and Meaning: New Aspects of the Chamber Music," in *The Cambridge Companion to Brahms*, ed. Michael Musgrave (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 98-132. In his own lifetime, Brahms's use of forms and gestures from previous styles as well as his allusions to works by well-known composers, particularly Beethoven, were more often disparaged than praised, and as a result he was often judged as a mere epigone—especially by Richard Wagner, Hugo Wolf, and their admirers. By contrast, in the last fifty years, partly as a response to Schoenberg's now much-cited essay, "Brahms the Progressive," numerous commentators have emphasized Brahms's innovative manipulation of small themes and its impact on phrase and metric structures as well as form, while others have explored the implications of his chromatic harmonies.

Overall, one could argue that looking at Brahms from the binary opposition of tradition and innovation is quite simply

(continued on next page)

