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ABSTRACT

The Music of Johannes Brahms in Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century England and an Assessment of His Reception and Influence on the Chamber and Orchestral Works of Charles Hubert Hastings Parry and Charles Villiers Stanford

Edward Luke Anderton Woodhouse

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy within Durham University, 2012

The music of Johannes Brahms currently enjoys popularity comparable with that of Bach, Handel, Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven throughout England. However, unlike composers such as Handel and Mendelssohn who preceded him, Brahms never actually set foot on English soil, thereby making the introduction and eventual acceptance of his music in England long and difficult. This process was eventually engineered principally through the determination and perseverance of several prominent performers, conductors and critics, such as Clara Schumann and August Manns, during the latter half of the nineteenth century.

Aside from a small number of relatively short articles and unpublished lectures, the reception and subsequent influence of the music of Brahms in England, and in particular on the composers Charles Hubert Hastings Parry and Charles Villiers Stanford, has not been the subject of any major or substantial study, yet is still a popular notion in many texts on nineteenth century British music. This thesis attempts to assemble and evaluate all the available information on the subject, from the principal people responsible for introducing the music of Brahms to England, to an assessment of the appearance of his supposed reception and influence in England in historical and biographical texts. Finally, a much needed analytical evaluation of key chamber and orchestral compositions across Parry and Stanford’s relative outputs
concludes the thesis, attempting to bring clarity to the vexed, outdated, but still commonly accepted notion that their works were merely an inferior assimilation of those of Brahms.
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Introduction

In an era in which the music of Johannes Brahms enjoys popularity in England comparable with that of Bach, Mozart and Beethoven, with dozens of recordings available instantly in various media from YouTube to Classic FM, it is hard to contemplate that his works were once regarded a being too intellectual and difficult to comprehend by British audiences. Indeed, the review of the first performance of Brahms in England describes his music as ‘uncouth’, an opinion which is unthinkable today\(^1\). Yet in nineteenth century England, Brahms’s music was seen by many in exactly this way. Until the late 1880s and early 1890s when the composer started to become established in England, reviewers and critics consistently presented somewhat mixed and uncertain opinions on Brahms’s music:

The eighth and last concert of the season was given on the 8\(^{th}\) ult., the performance commencing with Brahms’s serenade in D, for orchestra, a work so unequal in merit as to make us doubt the permanent position of the music of ‘Young Germany’, even where such undoubted marks of genius are shown, unless the representatives of the school can be prevailed upon to believe that the worth of a piece is not to be estimated by its length. A ‘Serenade’ in eight movements is too much for an English audience, however it may be endured in Germany, and in spite, therefore, of the undoubted merit of many of the movements – especially the Minuetos and Scherzos – the last note of the work was unanimously hailed as a relief.\(^2\)

This review is taken from a performance of Brahms’s First Serenade, Op. 11, at the Philharmonic Society in 1872. The somewhat confused and unclear nature of the critical comments is fairly typical of reviews of Brahms’s music during the 1860s and

\(^1\) ‘Madame Schumann’s Recitals’, *The Musical World*, 34 (1856), 395
\(^2\) ‘Philharmonic Society’, *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*, 15 (1872), 564
1870s. The reasons for this are not entirely clear upon first inspection. However, it must be remembered that art and music reviewers of the period, such as J. W. Davison, George Bernard Shaw, and John F. Runcimann, often had their own agendas. For instance, one of Davison’s prime motivations was the promotion of his wife, the famous pianist Arabella Goddard, whom his reviews obviously tended to favour. Therefore, such items, whilst providing a huge amount of insight, must also be treated with a certain degree of caution, as the ultimate motives behind them are unclear. The other central reason for the uncertainty of the reviews is probably related to the fact that, unlike Mendelssohn before him, Brahms never actually set foot on English soil (in spite of a number of requests by various people, including Charles Villiers Stanford), and therefore did not have direct access to the English musical world to justify and support the performances of his works. Many newspaper and journal reviews of the era reflect the gradual uphill struggle for Brahms’s music to become respected and established in England.

In terms of detailed research on the topic, there is relatively little of substance available. The biggest contributor is Michael Musgrave with his preliminary article ‘Brahms and England’, the first in the volume Brahms 2: Biographical, Documentary and Analytical Studies, edited by Musgrave. Whilst the article is very useful as a means of introducing the topic and provides an excellent overview of the successes and challenges associated with Brahms’s music in late nineteenth century England, research for this study has revealed that it fails to pick up on many of the intricacies of the period, an also contains a number of factual inaccuracies related primarily to premier performances of Brahms’s music in England. However, Musgrave introduces and briefly discusses the contributions of the key figures involved in introducing
Brahms’s music to English audiences, including Clara Schumann, Joseph Joachim, Julius Stockhausen, Hans Richter, and Charles Hallé. Through these individuals, Musgrave provides a chronological account of premiers of Brahms’s music in England (with a particular focus on London), recalling with some detail the events surrounding Brahms and Joachim’s honorary degree ceremony at Cambridge. Musgrave marks the turning point in attitudes towards Brahms’s music as being in March 1874, with the premier of the Variations on a Theme by Haydn, Op. 56, in London.

However, he claims that it was the premier of the Alto Rhapsody, Op. 53, in 1877 which was the first piece to be performed without ‘essential reservation’, presumably meaning that it was the first which did not induce the cautious but ultimately unhelpful mixture of positive and negative critical evaluation. This is confirmed by a preliminary investigation of the newspaper and journal articles which covered the event. For example, the reviewer for the *Musical Times and Singing Class Circular* claims that ‘we cannot admire the result too much, whether from a technical or suggestive point of view’ and that ‘Brahms so uses the language of human emotion that emotion responds to it, and whenever music has this effect its great end is attained.’

These comments seem to support Musgrave’s argument, although he does not refer to any specific examples in the article. Another observation of Musgrave’s work is that, whilst he acknowledges the existence of musical activity outside London through Charles Hallé’s famous concerts in Manchester, he does not really discuss the wider performance activity occurring in major cities outside London. The subject of Brahms’s music in England also filters into other research carried out by Musgrave, primarily on the musical activities at the Crystal Palace in Sydenham after the end of

---


4 Ibid., p. 11

5 ‘Cambridge University Music Society’, *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*, 18 (1877), 279-280 (280)
the Great Exhibition in October 1851. However, once again, the articles produced are only short and only really focus on the activity of August Manns, the conductor of the Crystal Palace Orchestra.

There were many changes occurring in England in the latter half of the nineteenth century, many of which when viewed in isolation are not particularly significant, but when considered together suggest that the social and political conditions of the era provided Brahms’s music with favourable conditions to gain in popularity. The European revolutions which started in 1848 resulted in many foreign musicians settling in England, including, most notably, Charles Hallé. As a result, it was perhaps easier for the music of other countries to gain recognition than it had been previously. There was also a visible political desire to improve standards of education in England, including in music, famously encouraged by Prince Albert, whose strict German education regime became the benchmark for the standard he wished to achieve in England. The Great Exhibition of 1851 turned out to be one of the major catalysts in the development of higher standards of music in London, as, once the exhibition was over and the Crystal Palace was used as a venue for musical performances, August Manns revolutionised and improved the standard of the orchestra there, setting up a concert series which rivalled the long-established Philharmonic Society.

Other significant events neglected by Musgrave are the massive contributions of George Grove to the improvement in English musical life, the creation of the British rail network, and the huge increase in music in provincial cities such as Leeds, Birmingham and Edinburgh. Grove was secretary of the Crystal Palace and took an
active role in organising performances there. However, he was also a key figure in the establishment and ultimate success of the Royal College of Music, acting as its principal between 1883 and 1895, following many years of struggle at the inferior Royal Academy of Music. Indeed, such was the Royal Academy’s reputation before this time, that even in 1848, after it had been open for nearly thirty years, the general consensus was that musicians of any significant talent would be advised to study abroad. Grove also managed the production of the first edition of the Dictionary of Music and Musicians, an endeavour which was once again part of the general attempts to improve the standard of musical knowledge and education in England. The establishment of the railway networks in England also helped the cause, because it enabled people who lived in provincial towns and cities to travel to London and possibly experience performances that they would otherwise have been unable to. It also provided performers with a means of travelling outside London, thus enabling them to be involved in performances throughout England. For example, Stanford became closely associated with the Leeds Music Festival, and Hallé performed regularly in both London and Manchester.

In the frenzy of activity in England, musical composition also became the subject of a revised enthusiasm, often referred to as the English Musical Renaissance, led by Hubert Parry and Charles Villiers Stanford. This period of English composition has been the subject of much debate and speculation, with mostly inconclusive results. Since the late nineteenth century, there has existed a notion that the leaders of this resurgence in British composition demonstrate the influence of Brahms in their

---

output. The first indications of this supposed influence occurred in reviews of Parry and Stanford’s music in newspapers and journals. The Brahmsian influence is predominantly associated with performances of chamber and orchestral compositions. For instance, a review of Stanford’s Quintet, Op. 25, in the Musical Times of January 1891, refers to the work as ‘in the style of Brahms’. However, in this instance and many others, the comments are rarely, if ever justified with any kind of analytical evidence.

After a period of neglect, there was renewed interest in English composers of this era in the second half of the twentieth century, which continues to the present day. The notion of the Brahmsian influence, particularly on the music of Parry and Stanford continues to pervade the biographical and analytical literature on the subject, even though on a superficial level, there appears to be little evidence to support the claim. An infamous example is the work of historians Robert Stradling and Meirion Hughes in their text *The English Musical Renaissance 1840 – 1940: Constructing a National Music*. Hughes and Stradling state the existence of this supposed influence numerous times in their text but do not present a shred of analytical discussion with which to support their argument, dismissing such activity as reflecting the outdated methods of musicology. The only musicologists who have presented convincing – although brief – arguments in support of the Brahmsian influence are Jeremy Dibble and Paul Rodmell in their biographical publications of Parry and Stanford. Apart from these, the uncertainty and lack of clarity regarding Brahms’s reception and influence on English composition in the late nineteenth century has never been fully addressed, yet it still remains something of a fashionable musicological idea, which is treated with
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8 ‘Mr Gompertz’s Concerts’, *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*, 32 (1891), 26
great reverence and authority in many publications, not least by Hughes and Stradling. It is the task of this study therefore to re-evaluate the initial reception of Brahms’s music in England in the late nineteenth century and the effect that it was likely to have had on the music of Charles Hubert Hastings Parry and Charles Villiers Stanford.

The study is divided into two principal parts. Part 1, entitled ‘Establishing a Contextual Framework’, encompasses the first four chapters, and examines in detail all of the thus far neglected aspects of musical history which contributed to the ultimate success of Brahms’s music in England. Chapter 1 provides a detailed discussion of the crucial people involved in performing and conducting Brahms’s music in England in absence of the composer. These include all of the performers who formed a brief part of Musgrave’s work, as well as other performers who have come to light during the research for this project, such as Edward Dannreuther and Hans Richter. Chapter 2 is a detailed evaluation of the political and educational changes occurring in England around the time Brahms’s music started to be performed in England, with particular focus on the contributions of Prince Albert and George Grove, as well as the development of music in the University towns of Oxford and Cambridge, and the provincial music festivals of other cities. Chapter 3 provides a much needed literary review and critically evaluates all of the available literature which contains the notion of the Brahmsian influence on Parry and Stanford in the context of the popular ideas of the ‘English Musical Renaissance’ and ‘Das Land ohne Musik’. Chapter 4 explores completely new territory in the form of critical consideration of the numerous theoretical musical writings of Parry and Stanford to ascertain if there is any evidence of any sort of bias toward Brahms and if there is any analytical evidence to support it. Part 2 of the thesis, entitled ‘Musical Analysis’,
encapsulates Chapters 5 and 6, which provide in-depth analyses of select examples of Parry and Stanford’s chamber and orchestral works respectively. The pieces selected are based on the evidence and conclusions resulting from Part 1. Through this detailed investigation, it should then be possible bring adequate conclusion to one of the most consistently under-researched assertions in musicology – the influence of the music of Johannes Brahms on C. Hubert H. Parry and Charles Villiers Stanford.
Part 1

Establishing a Contextual Framework

Chapter 1
The Music of Brahms Arrives in England: Influential and Important People

Chapter 2
Brahms in Late Nineteenth Century England: A Political and Educational Perspective

Chapter 3
Subject of Influence: The ‘Brahms Effect’ in Biographical and General Literature on Nineteenth Century English Music

Chapter 4
Subject of Influence: Brahms in the Written Works of Charles Hubert Hastings Parry and Charles Villiers Stanford
Chapter 1: The Music of Brahms Arrives in England:

Influential and Important People

‘The promised visit of Herr Brahms to this country is, after all, not to take place. Maybe the quiet German musician did not feel equal to taking the lion’s part in a London season.’¹

1.0: Introduction

It is a well known fact that Johannes Brahms never visited England, in spite of several invitations from various people, most notably the offer of an honorary doctorate from the University of Cambridge in 1877. There are a number of factual and speculative reasons why Brahms never chose to honour England’s nineteenth century musical scene with his presence. Michael Musgrave has suggested that Brahms’s reluctance to come to England stems from what he refers to as the previous ‘lionization’ of Mendelssohn by English performers and audiences². Florence May also makes reference to Brahms’s refusal to visit England, referring to his ‘reluctance to decline’ the invitation to Cambridge in 1877 and his apparent ‘dread of English customs and his ignorance of the language’³. In relation to Brahms’s second invitation to England in 1892 (which he also declined), Charles Villiers Stanford said, from his personal correspondence with the composer, that Brahms ‘made it very clear that the long journey was hateful to him’⁴. Moreover, Karl Geiringer elaborates further, believing fear of ‘seasickness’ was probably the most likely

¹ ‘Music’, The Examiner, 3 March, 1877, p. 278
⁴ Charles Villiers Stanford, Pages from an Unwritten Diary (London: Edward Arnold, 1914), p. 278
reason, citing the well known anecdote of Brahms taking the ‘hot railway journey through the whole of Italy to Naples in order to avoid the sea’\textsuperscript{5}. A couple of sources also suggest that Brahms was slightly nonchalant and even dismissive about the Cambridge honour. In his book \textit{Stanford, the Cambridge Jubilee and Tchaikovsky}, Gerald Norris (quoting Jeffrey Pulver) maintains that it was most likely to have been ‘the commercialism and the musical taste in England at the time, as exhibited to him in Joachim’s letters, and his own lack of sympathy with England and English politics that rendered him a little indifferent to the honour offered him’\textsuperscript{6}. However, neither Norris nor Pulver provide any further references to support the assertion. The only apparent reference made by Brahms to the event is in a letter to Joachim dated 13 April, 1876 in which he says:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

I have no further need to explain or excuse myself and I would rather say how extraordinary pleased the thing makes me. Let us hope that it stays without ill feeling. I would have had to include the travel and my Requiem. As I said, Macfarren writes no such thing and invites me in a P.S. very politely to the Requiem. I have naturally responded just on that subject, keeping concealed that I know better.

\textsuperscript{5} Karl Geiringer, \textit{Brahms: His Life and Work} (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1936), p. 124
\textsuperscript{6} Jeffrey Pulver in Gerald Norris, \textit{Stanford, the Cambridge Jubilee and Tchaikovsky} (London, David and Charles, 1980), p. 79
As the excerpt from the letter indicates (translated by the present author), Brahms was certainly not enamoured by the idea of travelling to England, however, there is not any real evidence to support Pulver and Norris’s assertion. The only part of the quotation which might suggest that Brahms was being dismissive is the line ‘keeping concealed that I know better’. However, with a personal letter of this nature, one must be careful not to jump to conclusions regarding interpretation. The ambiguity of the writing means that Brahms may just as easily have been sparing the feelings of the recipient of his rejection. Therefore, the notion that Brahms was indifferent to or dismissive of the degree must be treated with extreme caution.

Recent research by Musgrave on Brahms’s personality and temperament reveals the composer’s ‘frequent reserve in company’, dislike of performances of his own music, and ‘self-deprecating descriptions of his own new works’\(^8\) seem very likely to have influenced his decision to stay away from England. Brahms’s music was therefore introduced to England by various friends, acquaintances, and enthusiasts of the composer in the latter half of the nineteenth century. These individuals fall into three principal categories: first, the German performers who made regular visits to England on concert tours; second, the native European musicians who settled in England; and third, the English musicians and critics themselves. This opening chapter will examine the individual roles of the principal people in these categories involved in introducing and continuing to initiate performances of the Brahms’s music in England. Particular emphasis will be given to première performances, as it is these which tend to receive the

most attention in terms of reviews and general discussion of the composer throughout the numerous critical publications of the period.

1.1: Visiting Performers: Clara Schumann, Joseph Joachim and Hans Richter

Clara Schumann (b. Leipzig, 13 September, 1819; d. Frankfurt, 20 May, 1896) is the ideal starting point for this discussion, as she was not only the first person to perform music by Brahms in England, but was also one of the first people (along with her husband Robert Schumann) to recognise his potential as a composer. Brahms’s long-standing association with the Schumann family is well documented in the plethora of monographs available on Robert and Clara Schumann, and Johannes Brahms, such as in Nancy Reich’s *Clara Schumann: The Artist and the Woman*, and in the opening three chapters of Richard Sprecht and Eric Blom’s monograph *Johannes Brahms*. The timing of his introduction to the Schumanns on 30 September, 1853 in Düsseldorf seems particularly significant in the context of the introduction of his music in England. Nancy Reich comments in her biography on Clara Schumann that ‘Brahms’s arrival coincided with a most difficult period in the lives of the Schumann family. Robert’s position as municipal music director in Düsseldorf was threatened and his mental illness was progressing’. Brahms first became acquainted with Robert and Clara Schumann on 30 September, 1853 with a letter of introduction from Joachim (after an unsuccessful previous attempt three years earlier in Hamburg in which Brahms had sent Schumann a package of his composition which was unceremoniously returned unopened). Brahms played some of his compositions for Schumann resulting in what Marie Schumann

---

described as ‘the most joyful excitement’ from both Robert and Clara. Schumann’s admiration for Brahms was officially documented not long after this event in the famous essay ‘Neue Bahnen’ in his journal Neue Zeitschrift für Musik. The overtly effusive piece of journalism describes Brahms’s compositions in a very poetic fashion: ‘sitting at the piano he [Brahms] began to disclose wonderful regions to us. We were drawn into ever more enchanting spheres’¹¹. Brahms stayed with the Schumanns for a month after their initial meeting and the day after he left, Robert wrote to Breitkopf and Härtel requesting that they publish five of Brahms’s compositions, illustrating how highly Schumann viewed the music of Brahms.

When Robert Schumann was committed to a mental asylum at Endenich in March in 1854, and subsequently after his death on 29 July, 1856, Clara took upon herself the responsibility of earning money to support their large family. Joan Chissell has described Clara’s abrupt but necessary return to professional performance in 1855:

With a family of seven to support single handed, Clara’s return to the platform could not be long delayed. Between October 28 and November 5 she played in Frankfurt, Karlsruhe, Darmstadt and Göttigen (on the last occasion with Joachim) and by the end of November had sufficiently taken the bit between her teeth to return to Copenhagen, at the invitation of Gade, for a series of solo, chamber and orchestral engagements...Though England had yet to be won over, her standing in Europe at this time had been summarized by Hanslick with exceptionally perceptive fairness after her first two concerts in Vienna early

that year: “She could be called the greatest living pianist rather than merely the greatest female pianist, were the range of her physical strength not limited by her sex…”\(^{12}\)

Clara’s first recital in England was on 14 April, 1856 with the Philharmonic Society, a significant achievement when it is remembered that her husband was still alive and suffering. Furthermore, on the morning of the date of her debut, she received a letter from Brahms in which he said that Schumann’s health was deteriorating rapidly. Her extraordinary achievement of that day was recorded in her diary: ‘I could not play a note all day, I could do nothing but weep aloud from morning till night, and then wearied out and depressed I went to the concert. Heaven was gracious, it all went very well, I was quite successful, but I knew that this day, and the many days of tears which followed, would cost me a great part of my health’\(^{13}\). Evidence suggests that understandably, this visit was of more than average significance to the British musical public. The two major musical journals (\textit{The Musical World} and \textit{The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular}) give special attention to the event, as well as reports by several newspapers, which refer to her debut as a ‘novelty’\(^{14}\) and that the performance ‘at once stamped her as a pianist of the highest class’\(^{15}\). That said, there are very few indications as to the audience size of the Philharmonic concerts around this time. Newspapers and journals frequently refer to the interest generated by various performers and composers but do not indicate how many people actually attended the concerts. The only other indication available is in Cyril Ehrlich’s monograph \textit{First Philharmonic} in which he claims that in 1857, the number of

\(^{13}\) Clara Schumann, quoted in Chissell, p. 136
\(^{14}\) ‘The Philharmonic Society’s Concerts’ \textit{The Morning Chronicle}, 16 April, 1856, p. 2
\(^{15}\) ‘Philharmonic Concerts’, \textit{The Musical Examiner}, 19 April, 1856, p. 245
subscribers fell from 411 to 340\textsuperscript{16}. Therefore, in 1856, one can assume that there were 411 subscribers to the concerts, suggesting that the audiences would have been quite substantial, thus giving the music performed there the best possible chance of flourishing with English audiences.

It was a few months after this, in a recital on 17 June, 1856 at the Hanover Square Rooms that she first introduced the music of Brahms to England in the following programme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Composer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variations in E flat, on a theme from the Eroica Symphony</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two divertimentos (Op. 17)</td>
<td>Sterndale Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite de Pièces (No. 1, Op. 24)</td>
<td>Sterndale Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variations on ‘Aus dem bunten Blättern’ of Robert Schumann</td>
<td>Clara Schumann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarabande and Gavotte (in the style of Bach)</td>
<td>Johannes Brahms (spelt ‘Brakens’ in the report in the MT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clavierstück in A major</td>
<td>D. Scarlatti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnaval (scenes mignonnes, Op. 9)</td>
<td>R. Schumann\textsuperscript{17}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The repertoire choices of the programme in table 1.1 are certainly significant. Opening with a piece of Beethoven would be to gain the attention of the audience with a familiar work. The two pieces by Sterndale Bennett were almost certainly chosen as a display of gratitude on Clara’s part, as he had tried to entice Clara to visit London previously, and, more importantly, Clara was staying with him on this occasion. Bennett’s pieces are also likely to have been included as a mark of respect to the British audience. The


\textsuperscript{17} ‘Brief Chronicle of the Last Month’, The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular, 7 (1856) 262-268 (p. 267)
performance of one of her husband’s compositions is hardly surprising, particularly in view of the condition of his health at that point. However, the inclusion of the two small pieces of Brahms so early in her English career, and after knowing the composer for such a relatively short time period, demonstrates further the high esteem in which she and Robert viewed his compositions. Indeed his obscurity and thus increased potential negative ‘risk’ to the programme is highlighted by the fact that The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular actually misspelt his name, referring to him as ‘Johannes Brakens’.

The performance was discussed in several publications. The Standard wrote ‘the programme … contained specimens of pianoforte music from masters, including Beethoven, Sterndale Bennett, Brahms and Robert Schumann’ in its concert review on 19 June, 1856. Nothing further is said about Brahms in the review; however the reviewer goes on to say that ‘some stress was laid in the programme upon the illustration given of the last mentioned writer’ [i.e. Robert Schumann], illustrating Clara’s understandable increasing habit of promoting the works of her husband over those of other composers. The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular provides a similar review to that in The Standard. The only publication which actually proffered an opinion on Brahms’s composition itself was The Musical World: ‘The Sarabande of the “new man” Johannes Brahms, is extremely uncouth, and not at all “in the style of Bach”’. This short and rather terse evaluation of Brahms’s work would seem to confirm a diary comment made

---

18 Ibid.
19 ‘Concerts’, The Standard, 19 June 1856, p. 1
20 Ibid
by Clara in relation to English audiences: ‘They are dreadfully behind the times, or rather they can see only one thing at once. They will not hear of any of the newer composers except Mendelssohn, who is their God’\footnote{Clara Schumann, quoted in Chissell: 1983, p. 136} However, it cannot go without saying at this point that even in the twenty first century, much of Brahms’s early work (such as the piano sonatas and the first version of the Op. 8 Trio) is thematically very dense, elaborate, and quite difficult to navigate aurally and analytically, even with the presence of a full score. One need only look at parts of the 130 bar long development section of the opening movement in the first version of Brahms’s Op. 8 Trio in which the lyrical, easily digestible opening theme is transformed and developed thematically and tonally:

Figure 1.1: The first subject of the first movement of Brahms’s Piano Trio in B, Op. 8 (first version from 1856)

Figure 1.2: The second subject of the first movement of Brahms’s Piano Trio in B, Op. 8 (first version from 1856)

Figures 1.1 and 1.2 demonstrate the first and second subjects of the trio. If one then views some cross-sections of the development, the great complexity of the work becomes apparent very quickly. In figure 1.3 (p. 19) for instance, the violin and the cello are engaged in typical strict Brahmsian counterpoint, using material clearly derived from the
second subject group, while the piano provides a fleeting suggestion of E minor (achieved largely through the flattened supertonic, although there is no perfect cadence or leading note, thereby making the tonality weak and unstable) but simultaneously plays prominent stepwise descending thirds within each group of four quavers, thus providing a concentrated rhythmic inversion of bars 2-3 of the first subject.

Figure 1.3: Bars 184-188 of the development section in the first movement of Brahms Piano Trio in B, Op. 8 (first version from 1856)

The piano is also centred around the lower registers which is again a typical Brahmsian feature and possibly makes the work more difficult to analyse aurally. In figure 1.4 (p. 20), the piano, violin and cello have virtually equal roles in strict canon. The extraordinary feature here is the tonal centre of G major (following on from a section in E major demonstrated by the key signature), which moves rather abruptly back to B major in bar 242 principally through Brahms’s use of the very foreign sounding augmented second in bar 241 in the violin. The aural difficulty and complexity of this development section was probably even realised by the composer when it is remembered that Brahms used virtually none of the developmental material (including that in figures 1.3 and 1.4)
from in the 1856 version in his more logical and significantly shorter 1891 revised version of the work.

Figure 1.4: Bars 235-242 of the development section in the first movement of Brahms’s Piano Trio in B, Op. 8 (first version from 1856)

Therefore, the reaction of the critic of The Musical World (who would certainly not have been following a score during the performance) to Brahms’s Sarabande and Gavotte is
perhaps not altogether as surprising as it may first appear. The evidence discussed in relation to Clara’s preliminary experiences as a performer in England confirms Musgrave’s discussion (mentioned earlier) regarding the ‘lionisation’ of Mendelssohn by English audiences. It also illustrates the somewhat stagnant trends in English musical life at that time, and marks the beginning of a long and difficult effort by a number of individuals over the latter half of the century to establish the reputation of Brahms as a composer in England. The only other pieces known to have been premièred by Clara were the second and third of the Ballades for Pianoforte, Op. 10 on 17 March, 1873. Florence May notes the performance in her biography of Brahms. The Graphic newspaper also notes the performance, referring to the Ballades as ‘scarcely intelligible at first’23. When one listens to and studies the Ballades today, the comment from The Graphic seems ridiculous. However, if one compares the opening 20 bars of the second piece from Mendelssohn’s last set of Lieder ohne Worte, Op. 102 and Brahms’s second Ballade, the differences are significant. Both works are in D major. Mendelssohn introduces a simple two bar theme in the tonic, which reappears three times. Tonally, the music moves through the relative minor and its dominant (F sharp) before returning to D major with the original theme. Brahms, like Mendelssohn, opens his Ballade with a simple arpeggio-based theme. However, from the outset, the left hand is constantly syncopated against the right and by bar 20, the piece has progressed through the much more unusual tonality of B minor, B major, G major and C major which is again aurally much more difficult to navigate than Mendelssohn’s piece, particularly when coupled with the constant syncopation. Furthermore, the theme (in its original form) does not actually reappear until significantly later in the piece, unlike in Mendelssohn’s piece.

23 ‘Music’, The Graphic, 22 March, 1873, p. 278
When comparisons of this type are made between the established British idol Mendelssohn and the young obscure Brahms, the hostility of the British public is perhaps not surprising in that, not only was Brahms presenting ‘unfamiliar’ pieces, but the pieces were also harmonically, thematically and rhythmically very different to the established tastes in England.

Apart from Clara’s performance of these relatively small works, there is very little evidence of many other première performances of Brahms’s music by her in England (although she was involved with a number of later performances of the composer’s music). In fact, she was far outdone in this regard by another of his close friends – Joseph Joachim.

Joseph Joachim’s (b. Kitsee [now Bratislava], 28 June, 1831; d. Berlin, 15 August, 1907) association with music in England was long and fruitful. Surprisingly, there is relatively little scholarly work on this important relationship, especially when one considers his prominence in British musical life between 1844 and his death in 1907. His frequent visits to England are discussed very little in biographical publications, yet, as Jeremy Dibble points out, Joachim was one of a number of individuals who ‘contributed seminally to the mounting tide of Britain’s musical professionalism during the second half of the nineteenth century.’

He first visited England in 1844 with a letter of introduction from Mendelssohn. In his short biographical monograph on Joachim, J.A. Fuller-Maitland has translated the letter:

His manner of playing all modern and classical solos, his interpretation, his perfect comprehension of music, and the promise in him of a noble service to art, will, I am sure, lead you to think as highly of him as I do… and introduce him to those of our friends who will appreciate such an exceptional personality, and in whose acquaintance he, for his part, will also find pleasure and stimulation.25

Mendelssohn’s effusive praise of the violinist in the letter is mirrored in the general tone and opinion of English critics during the latter half of the century. This is not surprising when one remembers the previously mentioned lionisation and idolisation of Mendelssohn by the English public. Another important aspect of Joachim’s association with England which is also often overlooked is that he already had family settled in London upon his arrival in the form of his elder brother Henry who married the daughter of the organist Henry Smart26. Dibble suggests that these ‘family ties’ in London assisted Joachim with his introduction in England – a logical conclusion, for, although he had the support and encouragement of Mendelssohn, the addition of family would have almost certainly provided the young violinist with a permanent base and strong support network in an otherwise completely foreign country.

Joachim made his debut on 27 May, 1844, playing Beethoven’s violin concerto. Several newspapers discussed the event, and are unanimously complimentary: The Standard wrote that ‘Joachim’s performance may be measured by any standard; his style is pure and unaffected; his execution perfect; his feeling artistic and intense’27; The Examiner wrote that ‘to measure him as a youth – to speak of him as a precocious, a wonderful boy,

26 ‘Obituary: Professor H H Joachim’, The Times, Tuesday, 2 August, 1938, p. 12
27 ‘Multiple Arts and Popular Culture Items’, The Standard, 28 May, 1844, p. 1
would be doing him scanty justice; his playing would excite no less astonishment were he thirty years older"\(^28\); and finally, *The Times* highlighted ‘his clear and distinct articulation, his perfect intonation, and a conception of his subject which denotes almost a mind kindred with that of the composer'\(^29\). In light of these reviews, Joachim’s subsequent prominence in, and influence on, British musical life throughout the latter half of the century was almost inevitable. At the beginning of 1853, Joachim became ‘concertmeister’ at Hanover, during which time he came to England in 1858, 1859, 1862, and annually thereafter\(^30\). Barrett Stoll maintains that ‘beginning in his Hanover years, Joachim played an important role in establishing the London Popular Concerts (1858-1904) as a forum for excellent performances of chamber music'\(^31\). By placing his music in the hands of Joachim, Brahms almost certainly had the best possible opportunity to gain recognition and respect as a composer in England. Joachim’s iconic status in England almost certainly stemmed from more than being a child prodigy and subsequent appearances in England. As a performer, Joachim was known for a relatively small, largely classical repertoire, including the Beethoven and Mendelssohn Violin Concertos, Beethoven Quartets and the Bach Chaconne in D minor. Indeed, once could say that the repertoire was all the more conspicuous as a result. The eventual inclusion of certain pieces of Brahms’s music within that small repertoire (most notably the Violin Concerto and the Hungarian Dances) would have almost certainly served to further emphasise Brahms as a composer in England. It is also worth mentioning the often neglected point that Joachim was also a gifted composer as well as a performer, with a small but

\(^{28}\) ‘Philharmonic Concerts’, *The Examiner*, 1 June, 1844, p. 340  
\(^{29}\) ‘The Philharmonic Society’, *The Times*, 28 May, 1844, p. 44  
\(^{30}\) Fuller-Maitland, *Joseph Joachim*, p. 13  
relatively varied known output, which includes several orchestral overtures and works for violin and piano or orchestra. Therefore, Joachim’s musical understanding and sympathy with the works was greater than that of a non-composing performer. Indeed, this is further exemplified by his signing of the famous charter of rejection in 1860, in which himself, Brahms, Julius Otto Grimm and Bernhard Scholtz rejected the so-called ‘progressive’ ‘New German School’ of composition, followed by Wagner and Liszt. Indeed, his rejection of Liszt and subsequent highly critical attitude to ‘new’ music certainly acts as a strong indicator as to why he only focused on a small repertoire as a performer, in that, any new music would have had to meet his exacting standards and arguably reactionary approach to the direction of composition in the second half of the nineteenth century, which (based on his small performance repertoire) was very much focused on ‘absolute music’.

Joachim met Brahms through Eduard Reményi (1830-1898), who was ‘a fellow violinist and Hungarian and former friend from the Vienna conservatory’, for whom Brahms acted as an accompanist. The meeting took place in 1853. Barrett Stoll maintains that Joachim ‘was impressed not only with Brahms’s musicianship and abilities as a pianist, but also by his compositional talents. He and Brahms formed a friendship that was to extend almost half a century.’ Alongside Joachim’s other musical activities, Stoll also says:

32 Ibid., p. 53
33 Ibid.
Joachim had another musical mission: introducing the public to the chamber music of Brahms, which he admired greatly. Throughout his career, Joachim was disappointed in the lack of appreciation by the public and the press for these works. Joachim’s enthusiasm for Brahms’s music extended beyond the latter’s chamber music.\(^{34}\)

Joachim’s admiration for Brahms’s music was reflected not only in the assistance he provided by initiating performances of Brahms’s music, but also in powerful gestures of friendship, such as severing a cordial relationship with Liszt in 1857 and providing his signature on the famous ‘manifesto’ deploring the ‘New German School’, discussed earlier in the chapter. Joachim also continued to promote and perform Brahms’s music even after the rift that developed between the two, as the result of Brahms’s support of Joachim’s wife Amalie after Joachim accused her of infidelity\(^ {35}\). However, this musical loyalty to Brahms is hardly surprising when one remembers Joachim’s performance repertoire and their strong unanimous views on composition.

The first piece of Brahms’s music introduced in England by Joachim was the Sextet in B flat, Opus 18, on 25 February, 1867 (comparatively late in relation to their first acquaintance and Clara’s British première of the Sarabande and Gavotte). There are several accounts of the performance, varying in general tone. Clara Schumann provided a very positive account in a letter to Brahms dated 26 February, 1867:

I am able to inform you that your sextet was produced with great success at the Popular Concert yesterday. Joachim had, of course practised it well and played magnificently. The reception was most enthusiastic, particularly after the first three movements. The Scherzo was encored, but Joachim wanted to keep the

\(^{34}\) Ibid., p. 94

audience fresh for the last movement and so did not respond to the call. I enjoyed it thoroughly, and should love to have been the first violin.36

Other reviews of the performance however, are quite different. The reviewer for The Musical World simply stated that the sextet ‘fell dead’ and did not provide any further comments37. Florence May also states that the sextet made ‘no impression’38. Michael Musgrave suggests that Clara’s positive report was based on ‘loyalty to Brahms’39 rather than providing an accurate assessment of the reception of the performance.

Joachim also premièred several of the Hungarian Dances which Brahms originally wrote for solo piano, but which Joachim famously re-arranged for violin and piano. Joachim first played a selection from the dances on Saturday, 14 February, 1874 at the Crystal Palace. The reviewer for The Examiner stated that numbers 1, 5 and 6 of the dances were played at the concert, which is probably an accurate account, particularly as it is mentioned that number 5 is in F sharp minor, corresponding with all printed editions of the work. Even George Grove’s programme from the concert does not say which numbers were to be played. It merely states ‘Hungarian Dances (adapted for violin by Joseph Joachim) Performed by Herr Joachim and Mr Franklin Taylor’, with a sentence of introduction written by Grove, saying ‘These three dances form a set of ten composed by Herr Brahms for two performers on the pianoforte, and arranged by Herr Joachim, with

37 ‘Monday Popular Concerts’, The Musical World, 46 (1867), 147
38 Florence May, The Life of Johannes Brahms, p. 387
39 Michael Musgrave, ‘Brahms and England’, p. 3
the concurrence of the composer, for violin and pianoforte. The dances were very popular with the audience, so much so that ‘an encore was positively insisted upon’. The Hungarian Dances were always popular pieces in England, and were usually played by Joachim as encores at the end of his concert programmes, as well as by many other performers, notably Madame Wilma Norman Néruda. The answer as to why these small dances were so popular almost certainly lies in their simple structure and accessibility. For instance if one looks at number 5 in the set – one of the ones included in Joachim’s introduction of the work – the piece follows a simple A-B-A-B structure. Brahms opens with a straightforward four bar theme with simple supporting harmony:

As one can see from figure 1.5, the harmony is strongly rooted in the tonic with a conventional melody and accompaniment and although Brahms favours a diminished chord in bar 3 instead of the dominant, the strong leading note of E sharp in the right hand removes any doubt that the music is returning to the tonic in bar 4. Although the piece has plenty of the Brahmsian use of the lower registers of the piano, unlike the earlier examples discussed in this chapter, there is no syncopation throughout the piece and no intricate counterpoint or complex variation. The variation in the piece is of the most basic kind with a couple of changes in octave and a few ornamental additions when

\[\text{Figure 1.5: The opening four bars of Brahms’s Hungarian Dance No. 5}\]

\(\text{\footnotesize{40 George Grove, Crystal Palace Programme of February 14, 1874}}\)
\(\text{\footnotesize{41 ‘Crystal Palace’, The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular, 16 (1874), 415}}\)
A and B return for the second time. Based on the pieces discussed so far, the clearer aural and analytical definition of the Hungarian dances was certainly more akin to what the English concert goers were used to, thereby explaining their acceleration in popularity.

Joachim was also directly involved in the performances of several more significant works of Brahms in England: The First Symphony in C minor, Op. 68 (as conductor); The Violin Concerto in D, Op. 77; and the Clarinet Quintet in B minor, Op. 115. These première performances all merit further discussion at this point as they are relatively evenly spread across the latter half of the nineteenth century, thus providing a good indication of how attitudes to Brahms changed and developed in England during this time.

Brahms’s First Symphony was premièred in England on 8 March, 1877, at a concert organised principally by Charles Stanford at the Cambridge University Music Society. The original intention of the event is well known – a celebration of Brahms and Joachim receiving honorary degrees from the university. Stanford recalls the turn of events in his monograph, Pages from an Unwritten Diary:

On my return to Cambridge in January 1877, I found the organisation of the Joachim-Brahms concert well advanced and everything promised success for the responsible undertaking. We were however to experience a severe disappointment. The rumour of Brahms’s approaching visit got around with disastrous speed, and the Crystal Palace authorities publicly announced that they hoped for a special concert of his works conducted by himself. This ill-timed advertisement reached his ears and effectively stopped his coming. It had been a hard task to induce him to consider the journey at all, and it had necessitated all the pressure of Joachim and the humouring of Madame Schumann to get him within range of an acceptance, so
greatly did he dread the inevitable lionizing which he would have had to face. He intended to visit Cambridge only, and leave London severely alone…As soon as he saw what the Crystal Palace meant to do, he retired into his shell, and the opportunity was lost for good…The two preliminary orchestral rehearsals were held at the Academy of Music in Tenderden St, Hanover Square, Joachim conducting the [Brahms’s] Symphony and his own Overture. The [Brahms’s] Symphony gave a great deal of trouble, partly owing to the short and somewhat jerky beat of Joachim, which his own men followed with ease but which were enigmatical to English players….The performance of the Symphony, as of all the other pieces, was worthy of the work and of the occasion…This performance put the crown in Joachim’s unceasing and loyal efforts to win for Brahms an abiding place in this country.42

Stanford’s account of the event demonstrates Joachim’s evident affinity for Brahms’s music, as well as a reverence for the composer in the academic musical circles of England at this point. Reviews of the symphony were of a similar nature. A reviewer from The Musical Times wrote:

With regard to Brahms’s Symphony, I shall say little, beyond an expression of opinion that it is worthy to rank among classic things. So great a work ought not to be judged with authority and definiteness after a single hearing under exciting circumstances…Enough now that the Cambridge Symphony of the German master made an extraordinary sensation, and sent the audience away with a consciousness that they had just heard for the first time music which the world will not soon let die.43

In a similar vein, the reviewer from The Monthly Musical Record wrote:

In each of the three previous numbers of The Monthly Musical Record, issued during the present year, we have been enabled, by the courtesy of our foreign correspondents, to offer our readers some account of

---

43 ‘Josef Joachim, Mus Doc, Cantab’, *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*, 18 (1877), 170-172 (p. 172)
Brahms’s symphony on several occasions of its being performed in Germany. Though agreeing in the main in their recognition of its noble and poetical character, and in their estimation of it as far surpassing all Brahms’s previous essays in orchestral writing, they have only been able to state their first impressions after one or at the most two hearings. Having been present at a single performance, and the work being still unpublished, we are in no better position for speaking of it in any more detail than has already been done by others in these columns.\(^{44}\)

These are the only two reviews of any significance recording the event. They demonstrate a similar reverence to that of Stanford toward Brahms’s work. However, both reviewers are very cautious about expressing any kind of conclusive opinion on the work demonstrating how difficult and complex the music of Brahms was seen to be in England at this time. No newspapers or other journals published around this date discuss the event in anything other than the most superficial terms. It should be remembered that this was Brahms’s first symphony with only four previous orchestral compositions preceding it: the two Serenades (neither of which were widely known at this point); the First Piano Concerto (which had not been particularly well received); and the Haydn Variations. It is perhaps not surprising that critics were approaching the Symphony with a degree of caution.

As a performer, Joachim premièred Brahms’s Violin Concerto, Op. 77, and the Clarinet Quintet, Op. 115. The Violin Concerto was premièred under August Manns at the Crystal Palace on 22 February, 1879. Reviews of the piece were very mixed. The three principal musical journals, *The Musical Times*, *The Musical World* and *The Monthly Musical Record*, all provided reviews of the event. *The Monthly Musical Record* produced a

---

\(^{44}\) ‘Music at Cambridge’, *The Monthly Musical Record*, 7 (1877), 51-52 (p. 52)
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positive review referring to the piece as one of the ‘most favourable specimens of the
genius of its author as yet heard’\textsuperscript{45}. \textit{The Musical Times} produced an initially positive
review of this performance in their March issue of 1879, but when Joachim repeated the
composition at the Philharmonic Society concert on 6 March, 1879, the tone of the
review was quite different, in which the reviewer states that the performance ‘confirms
our impression that the work gradually deteriorates as it advances… Herr Joachim’s
superb playing, however, lifts the composition into a prominence which an inferior
executant could scarcely hope to gain for it; and the applause with which it was greeted
was certainly due at least equally to the performer and the composer.’\textsuperscript{46} \textit{The Musical
World} provides the most comprehensive review of the work:

Brahms has a distinguished name among us now – a name gained, it must be said, very rapidly after the
hesitancy to accept him caused by the peculiarities of his style… and now the master is known the country
over by his impressive German Requiem, by his Symphonies, and by many things of less importance but
undoubted worth. In short, Brahms has reached that point of fame where a creative artist commands
attention… With regard to the value of the Concerto… Music of such a kind, by such a man, heard only
once, and impossible of access for purposes of study, exacts cautious treatment. But first impressions have
their value, and should not be kept back; wherefore we may say plainly, and at once, that the Concerto was
a disappointment, not, truly, in the sense that it failed to achieve much, but that it failed to achieve enough.
On the strength of what Brahms had done we expected him to do more. We looked for a work to rank with,
if after, the concertos of Mendelssohn and Beethoven, and we find that which, as at present estimated,
belongs to the second order. No doubt the Concerto contains many passages of remarkable beauty and
interest… But on the other hand, a good deal in the work strikes us as wanting the high qualities essential to
greatness… and it was impossible to avoid the consciousness on Saturday that every movement as it ended
left behind disappointment. The solo passages are both difficult and brilliant enough to make the work

\textsuperscript{45} ‘Crystal palace’, \textit{The Monthly Musical Record}, 9 (1879), 46-47 (p. 46)
\textsuperscript{46} ‘Philharmonic Society’, \textit{The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular}, 20 (1879), 209
acceptable to violinists; but that the concerto as a whole will, on its own merits, attain the highest place, we are strongly disposed to doubt.\textsuperscript{47}

This detailed account of the Violin Concerto provides a useful indication of the general perception of Brahms in the late 1870s. The first part of the review presents an overview of Brahms’s achievements, indicating a very high level of respect for the composer. Specific reference is made to the \textit{Requiem} (viewed by many contemporary scholars as the work which changed general perception of the composer in England). However, in relation to the work itself, the reviewer clearly demonstrates significant reservation and blatant remnants of the ‘lionisation’ and adoration of Mendelssohn of which Clara complained when she first came to perform in England. Indeed, the reviewer seems to be in a constant state of struggle throughout the review to demonstrate a profound respect for the composer and his musical output as a whole, but, at the same time, what seems to be a personal dislike of the Concerto. The reasons for the general negative reaction to the concerto are not immediately clear. However, if one compares the opening movements of Brahms violin concerto to Mendelssohn’s concerto in E minor, the comments in the review may not be entirely without foundation:

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure1_6.png}
\caption{The opening solo violin phrase of the first movement of Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto in E minor, Op. 64}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{47} ‘Crystal palace Concerts’, \textit{The Musical World}, 57 (1879), 132
Figure 1.7: The opening solo violin phrase of the first movement of Brahms’s Violin Concerto in D, Op. 77

In Mendelssohn’s concerto, the solo violin enters in bar two of the first movement with the lyrical theme shown in figure 1.6 (p. 33). Throughout the movement, and indeed the three movements of the work, the violin plays a major role in the announcement and development of thematic material (often in antiphony with the orchestra), as well as playing the expected virtuoso passages. In the opening movement of the Brahms concerto, the violin enters in bar 90 (see figure 1.7) with a technically difficult virtuoso passage which is on first inspection very different to the orchestral material which precedes it. Although Brahms does allow the violin occasion moments of lyrical material, much of this is left to the orchestra, leaving the violin with demanding technical passages. There is also much more developmental activity in the orchestral part in the Brahms compared to the Mendelssohn. These factors, coupled with a larger amount of thematic material and a resultant longer movement would seem to be reasonable evidence for the concerto’s initial failure to impress.

The première of the Clarinet Quintet, Op. 115 on Monday 28 March, 1892 (thirteen years later) presents a very different impression of the composer. There were several reviews of the work in various publications, all of which were unanimously complimentary. The reviewer for *The Musical Times* wrote that the work ‘must be numbered not only among his own finest efforts, but among the masterpieces of chamber music by the great
composers\textsuperscript{48}, demonstrating a marked change compared to the review of the Violin Concerto in 1879. Each individual movement is reviewed:

In the first movement the style is somewhat veiled, but the succeeding Adagio in the tonic major is a gem of the purest water, the beauty of the themes and the writing for the clarinet, alone or in combination with one or more of the other instruments, being masterly in the extreme, and at the same time wonderfully fresh and spontaneous. Almost equally effective is the Andantino in D with an alternative Presto, which does duty for a Scherzo, though its prevailing tint is sombre, like the rest of the work. Brahms is adept in the art of writing variations, and he has done nothing better than the set which forms the Finale of this work. In the Coda we have a distinct reminiscence of the opening movement, giving additional consistency to the whole, which, however, it certainly did not need. Each of the movements comes to a quiet close, and in each the method of expression is chastened and subdued, though more suggestive of soft melancholy than tragedy. The clarinet is frequently treated as an orchestral rather than as a solo instrument, and Brahms displays consummate knowledge of its capabilities.\textsuperscript{49}

The principal positive technical point in this review is clearly Brahms’s treatment of the variation form in the final movement and inclusion of material from the opening movement in the Coda. Other reviews of the work also make strong references to these points. For instance Vernon Blackburn of the Pall Mall Gazette maintained that Brahms’s ‘sovereign mastery over the variation form everyone knows, and for these variations his inexhaustible and ever-new art of transformation captivates one from beginning to end.’ Unlike the reviews of the Violin Concerto in which reviewers gave composer and performer equal praise, Joachim is barely mentioned in any of the reviews of the Clarinet Quintet. Richard Mühlfeld, the clarinettist, is given brief acknowledgement, but it is

\textsuperscript{48} ‘Monday and Saturday Popular Concerts’, The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular, 33 (1892) 277
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid.
discussion of the high quality of Brahms’s music which occupies the majority of each reviewer’s attention.

The final key figure who will be discussed in this section is the conductor Hans Richter (b. Raab [now Győr], 4 April, 1843; d. Bayreuth, 5 December, 1916). In the context of performances of Brahms’s music in England, Hans Richter appeared on the London musical scene somewhat abruptly in the late 1870s, seemingly ousting August Manns as the principal name associated with British premières of the composer’s larger orchestral works. Christopher Fifield has carried out extensive biographical research on Richter, including his introduction, and subsequent regular visits to England. The focus of much of Fifield’s work, and indeed the work of other scholars on Hans Richter, is his long association with Richard Wagner and frequent performances of that composer’s music. Richter’s conducting career was, however, extremely varied, particularly in England, although his career undoubtedly relied on Wagner’s influence to gain momentum.

The son of Anton Richter, an organist and choirmaster, Hans Richter studied at the conservatory of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde. After graduating in 1862 and working as a horn player at the Kärntnertortheater for four years, he became associated with Richard Wagner in the summer of 1866, initially as his assistant, copying the score of Die Meistersinger as it was being orchestrated50. Through his association with Wagner, he held various conducting posts in the years between 1868 and 1876, including the Royal Court Musical Director in Munich.

The purpose of Richter’s first visit to England was to rehearse a series of concerts of Wagner’s operatic music (with Wagner conducting the performances), initially proposed and organised by Edward Dannreuther to assist the composer in recovering from the significant financial losses incurred by the first Bayreuth Festival of 1876. British responses to Richter’s abilities as a conductor were unanimously positive. Wagner’s conducting, however, elicited a much more mixed response. This is demonstrated in a first hand account of one of the rehearsals by Hermann Klein:

Most of the preliminary work had been done under Mr Dannreuther… All that remained was to give the finishing touches and for the composer-conductor to accustom himself to the vast auditorium and the huge crescent-shaped phalanx of orchestral players spread before him. From the outset, as it seemed to me, he failed to place himself en rapport with either… The inaugural piece was the ‘Kaisermarsch’… It gave not trouble and the effect was superb. But, unluckily, instead of imbuing Wagner with a little confidence, this preludial essay left him more palpably nervous than before. The second piece on the list was the overture to ‘Fliegende Hollände’. Here, I confess, I looked for something exceptional. I had always understood that Wagner was a fine conductor… Imagine, then, my disappointment and sorrow when it resulted in a complete breakdown! Twice – nay thrice – did he make a fresh start… But it was of no avail… and at last in sheer despair, he threw down his stick and requested Richter do the work for him. Well do I remember the applause with which the band greeted the Viennese conductor as he mounted the rostrum. It was thoughtless – unkind, if you will… But the overture went without a hitch. It was played as I have never heard it before.51

This account given by Klein, was not echoed by the various newspaper reviews relating to the actual concert performances themselves, nor indeed by Hubert Parry who noted various observations of the rehearsals and the concerts in his diary, referring to Wagner’s

conducting as ‘quite marvellous’. However, towards the end of the concert series, further financial problems ‘unsettled Wagner, who snapped and lost his temper at the slightest provocation, and, having handed the baton to Richter at some point during each concert, would sit in an armchair facing the audience and glower at them, as if daring any brave soul to criticise what he was hearing’. In stark contrast, Fifield maintains that Richter ‘endeared himself even more to one and all’ by remaining calm and composed throughout the series, in spite of the difficulties.52

Based on his popularity in England as a result of the Wagner festival, it is unsurprising that Richter’s visits to England became a regular fixture in British musical life, although it was through Stanford, Fuller-Maitland and Joachim’s pupil Hermann Frank that the conductor was brought to London. As well as giving the world premières of Brahms’s Second and Third Symphonies, he also gave the British premières of the Third and Fourth Symphonies, and the Gesang der Parzen, Op. 89, and almost always included pieces by Brahms in his annual British concert series. Appendix IV (Vol. II, p. 50) gives a list of all the pieces of music by Brahms conducted by Richter in England from the start of his regular concert series in 1879 to 1900. The dates are taken principally from review articles in The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular, The Musical World, and The Monthly Musical Record. The list demonstrates a somewhat narrow range of repertoire in the context of Brahms’s whole output, with Richter restricting himself to major orchestral and choral works. Each work seems to have generally been performed between one and three times during the period, with the notable exception of the Haydn Variations (Op.

53 Dibble, Charles Villiers Stanford, p. 98
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which received five performances. Indeed, Op. 56 was a popular piece throughout England in the latter nineteenth century and its prominence will be examined in more detail throughout this thesis.

The first English première of Brahms’s music given by Richter was the Gesang der Parzen, Op. 89 on 5 May, 1884. It received relatively little attention by reviewers, the reason for which is undoubtedly the première of the Third Symphony, Op. 90 a few days later on 12 May. The reviewer in the Monthly Musical Record merely commented that ‘some of the music is very fine, but, as a whole, does not produce a very satisfactory effect’\(^{54}\). The review in The Musical Times was of a similar vein, saying that the piece ‘presents a study in sombre harmonies, all very clever and effective in their way, but wanting the essential element of charm’\(^{55}\). The Pall Mall Gazette and The Graphic acknowledge the performance but pass no further comments. Richter’s première of Brahms’s Third Symphony, Op. 90, on the other hand, receives ample attention across all critical publications in 1884 and provides a detailed indication of generally how positively Brahms’s music was viewed by this point in the century. A typical example can be seen in The Graphic newspaper:

Unlike most composers, whose works of their maturity become more and more complex, Brahms obviously aims to make his third symphony simpler than the second, even as the second was far less intricate than his first. The symphony is in the usual four movements and… The ingenuity of Brahms’s workmanship and the

\(^{54}\) ‘Richter Concerts’, Monthly Musical Record, 14 (1884), 136-137 (p. 137)  
\(^{55}\) ‘Richter Concerts’, The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular, 25 (1884), 335-336 (p.336)
variety of resource displayed, may be imagined by those acquainted with the orchestral music of the man who is now, by general consent, placed at the head of living German composers.\textsuperscript{56}

The two prominent positive themes of simplicity and the ingenuity with which Brahms treats his musical material – the principal subjects of the discussion in this review – appear in nearly every other review of the work in similar critical discussions. In a similar manner to the British première of the Clarinet Quintet discussed earlier, the focus of the reviews of the symphony revolve around positive technical discussion of the music – Richter and the orchestra are barely discussed – further suggesting that towards the end of the century Brahms’s music was generally accepted by English audiences. Another significant discovery in the research of the English première of the Third Symphony is the existence of reviews and notifications of the performance in cities and towns other than London and Manchester. \textit{The Glasgow Herald} (19 May), \textit{The Liverpool Mercury} (21 May), \textit{The Nottinghamshire Guardian} (23 May), and \textit{The Sheffield and Rotherham Independent} (24 May) all contain brief second hand accounts of the performance. However, these reviews are certainly significant in that they clearly demonstrate that by this point in the century, Brahms’s music was definitely known and of obvious interest to cities and towns outside London and the academic institutions of Oxford and Cambridge. They also provide a firm indication of a growing interest in music amongst the British public in more provincial areas, a notion which will be discussed in more depth in subsequent chapters of this study. Regarding the question of which of these two very different accounts (the \textit{Gesang der Parzen} and the Third Symphony) should be viewed as the one which best reflects the general view of Brahms’s music in England at this time, it

\textsuperscript{56} ‘Music’, \textit{The Graphic}, Saturday, May 17, 1884, p. 482
would certainly seem reasonable to view the Symphony as the more reliable indicator. Indeed, the reviews of the symphony suggest significant respect, even fondness, for the composer’s music.

Richter’s English première of Brahms’s Fourth Symphony induced somewhat reserved reviews throughout all critical publications. The reviewer for the *Musical Times and Singing Class Circular* observed that ‘the more prudent connoisseurs have avoided giving a definite opinion upon the Symphony, and this reserve we both applaud and imitate. Brahms is a recondite musician who does not carry his meaning on his sleeve, or pretend to purvey “milk for babes”’ 57, giving a definite impression of admiration, but also a definite reluctance to comment on what was seen as a very difficult work to understand. This general overview is reflected in the technical discussions of the symphony, all of which are very cautious and reserved in their comments. For example, the review in *The Daily News* avoids discussing any specific parts of the work. The reviewer merely comments that the first movement ‘is based on a simple melodic theme, which soon develops into discursive elaborations and episodes, comprising many effective passages’ 58. That said, it must be remembered that the reviewers did not have scores to follow and were making their observations based on only aural perception, thereby making this type of comment fairly common in review articles. It is interesting to note that, again, none of the reviewers revert to lengthy discussion of the performers or the conductor in the absence of constructive comment (as in the reviews of the Violin Concerto), providing yet another indication that, even if his music was not fully

57 ‘Richter Concerts’, *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*, 27 (1886), 333-334 (p. 333)
58 ‘Richter Concerts’, *Daily News*, Thursday, May 13, 1886, p. 6
understood by this point, Brahms had certainly earned a considerable amount of respect from British audiences and critics.

The study of Richter’s role in the introduction of later pieces of Brahms has confirmed a general increased admiration and respect for the music of the composer towards the end of the century. However, it was discussed earlier that, in spite of his seeming sudden ascent to the forefront of performance Brahms’s music, his contribution of pieces throughout his series in England was in fact quite limited. In fact, he was very much outdone in terms of variety of Brahms repertoire by August Manns who will be one of the principal foci of the next section of this chapter.

1.2: European Musicians who Settled in England: August Manns, Charles Hallé, and Edward Dannreuther

Michael Musgrave provides the following assessment of the position of Brahms in England at the end of the nineteenth century:

Brahms’s position by the turn of the century as the god of the British musical establishment rests in large part on the fact that so many of its leading figures had received their most powerful early concert experience of Brahms as members of the Crystal Palace audience. For them, Manns and Brahms were inextricably linked.  

Musgrave evidently believes that August Manns’ work at the Crystal Palace significantly influenced Brahms’s eventual acceptance in England. In truth, the massive contributions

of August Manns to British concert life in the latter nineteenth century are not widely known or discussed today, yet he was a crucially important figure. He initiated many première performances of Brahms’s works, particularly the orchestral works. His achievements at the Crystal Palace have been principally documented initially by Henry Saxe Wyndham in his monograph *August Manns and the Saturday Concerts*, published in 1909, and latterly by Michael Musgrave in various publications produced throughout the 1980s and 1990s.

August Manns (b. Stolzenberg, 12 March, 1825; d. London, 1 March, 1907) settled in England in the May of 1854 at the age of 29, initially as the assistant conductor of the Crystal Palace band. Henry Saxe Wyndham provides an illuminating account of Manns’ career at the Crystal palace, using Manns’ personal recollections as a basis for many of his discussions. In particular, he draws attention to the sequence of events leading to Manns’ eventual appointment as principal conductor:

I resigned my military bandmastership early in the spring of 1854. Just at that time, Herr Schallen… my predecessor at the Crystal Palace, came to Cologne, looked me up and engaged me as his assistant conductor…All went smoothly until one day Herr Schallen told me that a great fête would take place at the Crystal Palace in September [it was the 28th October 1854], in celebration of the Anglo-Franco-Turkish Alliance, and that he wished me to write a quadrille on national airs…When the proof-sheets of my arrangement were sent to me for correction I found to my surprise the title: *The Royal Alliance Quadrille… by Henry Schallen…* I being told that Herr Schallen had received £50 for the copyright of this arrangement, remonstrated by pointing out that although I did not object to his name appearing as its author, I felt myself

---

entitled to the £50 which had been paid to him... He simply replied that he considered himself to be the
proprietor of all such work I had to do for the Crystal Palace, and that after my display of dissatisfaction
with that condition my services were not any longer required, and the accountant had received instructions
to pay me a full week’s salary in advance and thus end my connection with the Crystal Palace for good.61

After such an abrupt and relatively unpleasant exit from the Crystal Palace, it is
surprising that Manns even considered returning. However, he was re-appointed by the
secretary of the Palace, George Grove, on 14 October, 185562.

Michael Musgrave has written extensively about the changes (initiated by Manns after his
appointment) to the type of music played at the Palace. His principal publications on this
subject are in the form of a transcript of a lecture given at Goldsmiths College, University
of London in May 1996 and a monograph entitled The Musical Life of the Crystal Palace,
published in 1995:

When the palace opened at Sydenham it had a band of sixty-five instrumentalists: sixty-two brass
instruments, two E flat clarinets and a piccolo… When Manns was appointed… George Grove… told him
he must reduce the number to thirty-six… Manns transformed this unpromising situation by further
adapting the band by requiring some players to double up as string players…The next stage was
augmentation… By 1866 his orchestra was of seventy-six, with thirty violins.63

61 August Manns, quoted in Henry Saxe Wyndham, August Manns and the Saturday Concerts (London: Walter Scott Publishing Ltd. 1909)
Such changes illustrate the extent of Manns’ influence at the Palace. The timing of these events was also ideal for Manns to be able to start giving British premières of the works of Brahms. The first work of Brahms to be premièred at the Palace was the First Serenade in D, Opus 11, on 25 April, 1863. The performance was not noted or discussed by any critical publications. Saxe Wyndham provides the evidence for this performance, giving the date and a comment made by Manns in the programme book in relation to the composer – ‘This Serenade, though recently published, was written some years back, and exhibits perhaps less individuality that his later works… The movements are, however, very pleasing, and will favourably introduce this new composer to the Crystal Palace audience’ 64.

Michael Musgrave has carried out preliminary research on première performances of Brahms’s music in England, and in particular those that took place under Manns at the Crystal Palace. The central difficulty with Musgrave’s work on this topic is that it is scattered across various short publications and has not been consolidated or organised into any sort of chronological order. Research for this project has also revealed a number of inaccuracies in Musgrave’s dates and locations of première performances, revealing a bias in favour of Manns and the Crystal Palace. His two most prominent errors are the date and location of the première of the Second Serenade in A (Op. 16), and the *Neue Liebesliederwalzer*. He maintains that the Serenade was first performed in England under the conductor William Cusins with the Philharmonic Society at St James’s Hall on 29 June, 1874 65. It was actually produced at the Albert Hall nearly a year earlier in October.

64 Manns quoted in Saxe Wyndham, *August Manns*, p. 62
1873, indicated by a brief notice in *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*\(^66\). Similarly, he states in a different article that the *Neue Liebesliederwalzer* were performed for the first time under Manns at the Crystal Palace in 1878. They were actually performed on 25 November, 1877, with reviews given in *The Pall Mall Gazette*\(^67\) and *The Examiner*\(^68\) newspapers, and *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*\(^69\).

Furthermore, Musgrave correctly identifies the première of the orchestral version of the *Variations on a Theme by Haydn* (Op. 56a) under Manns at the Crystal Palace in March 1874 (7 March to be precise, as several newspapers published on 14 reveal). However, nowhere in his research does he acknowledge that the piece was actually first introduced in its two-piano arrangement (Op. 56b) in the previous month by Charles Hallé in Manchester\(^70\). Indeed, in his relatively short articles, Musgrave consistently provides very little information on other crucial people involved in the production of Brahms’s music in England; in particular Charles Hallé is barely mentioned.

Appendix I (Vol. II, p. 1) provides the most comprehensive and accurate current list of Brahms premières in England. As the table reveals, Manns certainly gave the highest number of premières of Brahms’s music compared to all other performers or conductors in England. Indeed, the innovative and forward looking nature of these programmes is likely to have been the result of several factors. The first, and probably the most important, was Manns’ personality and Prussian training:

\(^{66}\) ‘Miscellaneous Concerts’, *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*, 16 (1873), 279-280 (p. 280)

\(^{67}\) ‘Monday Popular Concerts’, *The Pall Mall Gazette*, 29 November, 1877, p. 11

\(^{68}\) ‘Neue Liebeslieder by Brahms’ *The Examiner*, 1 December, 1877, p. 1525

\(^{69}\) ‘Monday Popular Concerts’, *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*, 18 (December 1, 1877), 592

\(^{70}\) Thomas Batley, ed., *Sir Charles Hallé’s Concerts in Manchester* (Manchester, 1896), p. 219
Now after musical art has had a home here for many years, both the people and the press have forgotten that I found neither orchestra, library, concert room or musical audience in 1855; and that I had to battle with strongly rooted prejudices against the so-called classical instrumental music, and that it was really a matter of patience, prudence, perseverance, and pluck on my part by which prejudice could be conquered and the road for high class music could be opened.\textsuperscript{71}

Manns’ training in Prussia explains his strong promotion of Germanic music. The above quotation also provides an insight into his personality and the qualities of patience, prudence and perseverance would almost certainly have been necessary when promoting unfamiliar and new music, particularly to a supposed ‘prejudiced’ audience. Second was the venue of the Crystal Palace itself. The Great Exhibition made a massive profit of £186,000 and after its relocation to Sydenham, the building continued to be something of a novelty attraction until the turn of the century. Therefore Manns’ choice of programme would surely have been required to contain modern elements in order to fit with the public’s perception of the building in the aftermath of the Great Exhibition. The third reason is likely to be related to the support he received from the secretary of the Crystal Palace, George Grove, who, by his own admission in an autobiographical speech in 1880, involved himself as much as possible in the musical activities of the Palace. Indeed it was Grove who created the pioneering ‘analytical’ programme notes with a simple discussion and analysis of each piece to be performed at the concert. It would have surely been support and interest of this nature which encouraged Manns to introduce the music of newer composers at the Palace. Manns also had the advantage of giving first performances of relatively large-scale works, which were more likely to be noticed by

\textsuperscript{71} Manns, quoted in Saxe-Wyndham, \textit{August Manns.}, p. 35
critics. His portfolio of première performances of Brahms in England is impressive by any standards:

**Table 1.2: Complete List of British Première Performances of Brahms’s Music Conducted by August Manns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serenade in D, Op. 11</td>
<td>25 April, 1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Maria, Op.12</td>
<td>Last week in September, 1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Piano Concerto In D Minor, Op. 15</td>
<td>9 March, 1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Variations on a Theme by Haydn</em> Op. 56a</td>
<td>7 March, 1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Schicksalslied</em>, Op. 54</td>
<td>21 March, 1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rinaldo</em>, Op. 50</td>
<td>15 April, 1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Symphony in D, Op. 73</td>
<td>5 October, 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin Concerto in D (played by Joachim), Op. 77</td>
<td>22 February, 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Academic Festival Overture</em>, Op. 80</td>
<td>30 April, 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tragic Overture</em>, Op. 81</td>
<td>30 April, 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Piano Concerto in B flat, Op. 83</td>
<td>Saturday, 14 October, 1882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was discussed above that the Serenade (Op. 11) induced virtually no excitement in England when it was first introduced. The same can be said of the Ave Maria, Op. 12, which was only acknowledged briefly in the *Musical World* on 3 October, 1863\(^{72}\). The First Piano Concerto, Op. 15, was reviewed in several publications, including the *Monthly Musical Record*, *The Morning Post* (London) and *The Graphic* (London). The general attitude to the piece was one of respectful – if slightly bemused – admiration. For example, the reviewer for the *Monthly Musical Record* says ‘the impression produced on ourselves was that it is a work in places diffuse and laboured, yet on the whole of great power and originality.’\(^{73}\) The reviewer does not really express any more opinion than this, defending the ambiguity by commenting that the work ‘is a composition of such novelty, both of form and treatment, as to render it difficult to speak of it decidedly after

\(^{72}\) ‘Crystal Palace’, *The Musical World*, 41 (1863), 637

\(^{73}\) ‘Crystal Palace’, *The Monthly Musical Record*, 2 (1872), 58
a single hearing. The two newspapers are similarly ambiguous although all three were in agreement that the first movement was the least successful.

Manns’ most popular and positively received première of Brahms’s music at the Crystal Palace was probably that of the Variations on a Theme by Haydn, Op. 56a (the orchestral version), which was premièred on 7 March, 1874. Indeed, Musgrave refers to the piece as Brahms’s ‘orchestral breakthrough’ in England. All reviews of the piece were positive. The review in The Monthly Musical Record is an accurate indication of the general attitude towards the piece across all publications:

The novelty at this concert – and an important one – was the performance, for the first time in England, of Brahms’s Variations for Orchestra, on a Theme by Haydn. The introduction here of a work by a living German composer, which was heard for the first time in Vienna so recently as November last, certainly seems to point to the fact that we are less behind in musical matters than not long ago was the case with us… These variations, nine in number, are as interesting on account of the cleverness and ingenuity of their construction as for the originality and effectiveness of their instrumentation, and have the additional merit of being very pleasing to listen to.

This review is revealing for several reasons. First, in view of the nature of the performance, the reviewer deems it necessary to remark on the general forward progress of musical performance in England at this point, suggesting that the efforts of musicians in England to engineer progress in this direction were beginning to be recognised. However, it must also be taken into consideration that there were also still many negative

\(^{74}\) Ibid.  
\(^{75}\) Musgrave, ‘Brahms and England’, p. 7  
\(^{76}\) ‘Crystal Palace’, The Monthly Musical Record, 4 (1874) 59-60 (p. 59)
and what could be termed ‘respectfully neutral’ reviews produced around and beyond 1874 regarding Brahms’s music. Second, the reviewer points out very clearly that he believes that the work is both cleverly and ingeniously constructed, but is also pleasant to listen to. One perhaps senses an element of surprise in the review at this point – that the author was not expecting the successful combination of intellect and a pleasing listening experience. It is almost certainly the combination of these two factors which made this one of the most frequently performed compositions of Brahms in England throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century.

In relation to this study, later première performances of Brahms’s music conducted by Manns worthy of mention are the Second Symphony and the two overtures, Opp. 80 and 81. The Second Symphony was premièred at the Crystal Palace on 5 October, 1878. The reviews present a mixture of opinions. For example the critic in The Standard newspaper wrote:

The Symphony in D of Herr Brahms has been eagerly expected over here… The first symphony of the master, it will be remembered… [obtained] on each occasion a deservedly warm reception. It was felt, however, that in the work in C minor Herr Brahms – albeit he is a champion of the legitimate school of formulated music – had wandered into regions unknown to the majority of men, and at present accordingly beyond general comprehension… Herr Brahms’s “No. 2” is in point of technical workmanship, skilful orchestration, and rigid adherence to the orthodox rules of construction, not a whit inferior to the other; while it possesses the advantage of clearness of plan and an amount of melodic expression which is not generally found in this author’s writings. We have no doubt that the Symphony in D will prove more
popular than the C minor, with the exception of the second movement, adagio non troppo, which, though a veritable marvel of technical skill, is too learned and laboured to prove universally acceptable.\textsuperscript{77}

This review has definite parallels with that discussed earlier in relation to the Violin Concerto. \textit{The Musical Times}, \textit{The Monthly Musical Record} and a number of other newspapers (see Appendix I, Vol. II, p. 13) produce similar opinions on the work. Indeed, as with the première of the Violin Concerto a few months after this performance, one senses that the reviewers are torn between two extremes: on the one hand, a strange desire to maintain the stagnant lack of change in musical performance trends of which Clara Schumann complained when she first began visiting Britain; and, on the other, an obvious desire to be seen to be supporting and positively evaluating new compositions. The same may be said of the reviews of the \textit{Academic Festival} and \textit{Tragic Overtures}, Opp. 80 and 81, both of which were premièred on 30 April, 1881 by Manns at the Crystal Palace (see Appendix I, p. 17). The Academic Festival Overture was described as ‘an elaborate and pompous composition, the workmanship of which is decidedly better than the poor ideas on which it is built.’\textsuperscript{78} Similarly, the \textit{Tragic Overture} is described as a work with ‘a good deal of bold and original writing…but at the same time one feels that the work (despite its title) wants a little brightening up.’\textsuperscript{79}

This section has demonstrated the crucial role of August Manns in establishing the reputation of Brahms in Britain. Unlike Joachim, who gave much publicised first performances at the extreme ends of Brahms’s career, Manns’ principal première

\textsuperscript{77} ‘Multiple Arts and Popular Culture Items’, \textit{The Standard}, 7 October 1878, p. 6
\textsuperscript{78} ‘Crystal Palace Concerts’, \textit{The Monthly Musical Record}, 11 (1881), 119
\textsuperscript{79} Ibid.
performances were all given between 1870 and 1883. They clearly demonstrate a desire – albeit one which was very difficult to set in motion – by performers and critics to accept new music in England. Given his relative prominence and success, it seems surprising that he did not give any first performances of Brahms’s later orchestral compositions. As discussed earlier in this chapter, he seems to have been rather suddenly succeeded in this respect by Hans Richter and his famous ‘Richter Concerts’ series.

The contributions of Charles Hallé (b. Hagen, Westphalia, 11 April, 1819; d. Manchester, 25 October 1895) to nineteenth-century concert life, particularly in the Manchester area, seem to be generally overlooked by musicologists (most notably Michael Musgrave) in favour of the more frequently publicised activity in the southern England, and in particular, London and the university towns of Oxford and Cambridge. In relation to this study, it has been demonstrated that August Manns may have been the dominant force in terms of premièring Brahms’s music in England; however, Hallé’s tireless efforts as a pianist and conductor in initiating performances of Brahms’s music both in and outside of London simply cannot be ignored. In fact, such was his influence on the musical scene in Manchester that The Hallé Orchestra, founded by the conductor in 1858, still exists today. However, a small handful of family members and scholars, including Hallé’s own children Charles and Marie, scholar Thomas Batley, and music critic and writer Michael Kennedy, have compiled a number of detailed biographical and performance publications.

After a musical upbringing which included conducting at the age of 11 and going to Darmstadt to study counterpoint in 1835 at the age of 16, Halle went to Paris in 1836 and studies the Piano under George Osborne. Indeed, Simon Gunn states that ‘Hallé began to establish a reputation as a pianist, alongside Chopin Liszt and others’ in Paris, but ‘the outbreak of the 1848 revolution… put and end to this existence and Hallé, like Berlioz, Chopin and others, moved to London’. Gunn goes on to describe how Hallé finally settled in Manchester and strongly shaped its musical life, stating that ‘in June 1848 Hallé accepted an invitation from a merchant, Hermann Leo, to organise a series of concerts in Manchester’. He goes on to say:

> It is part of the mythology of Hallé that he arrived in Manchester in the guise of artist-missionary, bringing European culture to a benighted populace. In practice, there existed a flourishing musical culture, from popular choral societies to the Gentlemen’s Concert Hall, the most prestigious music society in the city…However, this culture was marked by two features. Firstly, musical forms were inter-mixed and were

---

not associated with distinct social milieux. Concerts were amateur and largely miscellaneous in character, combining choral music, opera, ballads and popular song...Equally, the exclusive Gentleman’s Concerts mixed English and Italian songs with excerpts from Handel and Mozart... Secondly, the most prominent, long standing associations were semi-private subscription societies...The Gentlemen’s Concerts, founded in 1874, had an annual subscription of three guineas in the early 1850s. Applicants were carefully scrutinised by a committee of local notables, composed of German and English merchants and Anglican professionals... Membership thus encompassed a substantial number of the city’s wealthiest and most powerful families.\textsuperscript{82}

Gunn’s research demonstrates that Manchester was rich in musical performance before Hallé settled there. However, the two central musical outlets available in the city at the time of his arrival were almost diametrically opposite each other. On the one hand there were the amateurish productions of the popular choral societies, contrasted on the other hand with the elitist Gentlemen’s subscription concerts. Musically, both these factions seem to have been equally amateurish in the standard of performance, as indeed Hallé describes in Chapter 4 of his autobiography edited by Michael Kennedy, stating that he ‘seriously thought of packing up and leaving Manchester, so that I might not have to endure a second of these wretched performances\textsuperscript{83}’. Throughout the rest of the chapter (entitled ‘Manchester: 1848-1860’), Hallé discusses chronologically the gradual improvements he made to the standard of musical performance in the city, including his appointment as conductor of the ‘Gentlemen’s Concert’ series, dismissal of the original band, and appointment of better players.

\textsuperscript{82} Ibid., p. 210-211 
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Hallé’s breakthrough in assembling a professional quality orchestra came in 1856 during preparations for the ‘Art Treasures Exhibition’, an event which he describes in great detail:

In 1856 Manchester began to prepare for the ‘Art Treasures Exhibition’... the musical part of which was entrusted to me... I was most anxious that music should hold its own, and not suffer by comparison with the other arts. To this end, a first-rate orchestra was absolutely necessary, an orchestra better than the one of the ‘Gentlemen’s Concerts’, which, though a vast improvement upon what it had been before, left still much to desire. Fortunately the committee agreed with my views, placed ample means at my disposal, and I succeeded, not without considerable trouble, in bringing together a thoroughly satisfactory band by engaging competent performers from London, Paris, Germany, Holland, Belgium and Italy, in addition to the best of our local players.\(^8^4\)

When the exhibition ended in October 1857, Hallé was reluctant to dissolve the assembly of players and organised a series of concerts with them at his own risk, starting on 30 January, 1858. His reasoning was as follows: ‘I felt that the whole musical education of the public had to be undertaken’, expressing his disdain for the exclusivity of the ‘Gentlemen’s Concert’ series. Although the audiences for his concerts were initially small – the elitism of the Gentlemen’s series meant that symphonic music as a genre was, in Hallé’s words, ‘terra incognita’ to most of the public. By the end of the series, at the thirtieth concert, the band was performing to a full house\(^8^5\).

In spite of the prominent and popular association with Manchester in biographical work on Hallé, he spent much time performing in London. Indeed, half of Hallé’s British

\(^8^4\) Ibid., p. 136  
\(^8^5\) Ibid., p. 138
premières of Brahms’s music were in London with the violinist Wilma Norman-Néruda (later Lady Hallé). The notable exception was the Variations on a Theme by Haydn, Op. 56b, which was premièred at his concerts in Manchester on 12 February, 1874. This British première is probably the most unusual of all, in that it is one of only two known pieces of Brahms to receive its English première performance outside London, Oxford or Cambridge – the other piece was movements 3 to 5 of the Serenade in A, Op. 16, by Hallé in Manchester on Thursday, 6 March, 1873 – demonstrating Hallé’s innovativeness and forward thinking in terms of programme choices. There are no reviews of the première of Op. 56b in any publications of 1874, which almost certainly explains why it has been missed in current scholarly work on this topic. The reasons for the evident lack of publicity of the performance are not immediately obvious. However, as the next chapter of this study will demonstrate, interest in musical activity outside London, Oxford and Cambridge did not really gather momentum, nor start to be documented in any significant detail until later in the century, hence the apparent lack of interest in the case of Brahms’s variations.

Hallé’s other English premières of Brahms’s music in London on the other hand are very well documented, consisting of the Piano Trio in C, Op. 87 and the Sonata in A for Violin and Piano, Op. 100 (he was the pianist in both performances). Presented for the first time in England at a Monday Popular Concert at St James’s Hall on 22 January, 1883, the Op. 87 Trio received very mixed reviews. All the reviews contain reverential comments towards the composer in a general sense. For example, the reviewer for the Musical Times and Singing Class Circular refers to Brahms as ‘the leading modern representative
of the classical school in Germany’. However, the piece itself is described in the following manner ‘a somewhat hazy idealism, an occasional profundity of thought, combined with an infinity of contrapuntal device and general mastery of technical detail, leading, however, not infrequently to over-elaboration.’ The reviewer for the Pall Mall Gazette presents a similar review of the piece, referring to ‘a thoroughly Viennese spirit, revelling in unrestrained melody and grace’, but then describes the piece as a whole as ‘tedious, vague and restless in tonality, and sometimes positively ugly’. As has been the case with other performances reviewed in this chapter, the reviewer concludes by balancing the negative view of the music itself with a compliment for the performers’ execution of the piece (Hallé, Norman-Néruda and Piatti).

It is clear that Charles Hallé’s role in introducing the music of Brahms to England was crucial, and very different from that of Manns and Richter. Whilst Hallé did not première any major orchestral works by Brahms like those of his London contemporaries, he was instrumental in the initiation of high quality musical performances outside the capital and university towns of England. Indeed, another critical factor which is often disregarded (demonstrated in the muted tone of many of the reviews discussed in this chapter) is that it was often the second and third performances of a work that helped cement its place in the repertoire. The spread of such musical performances – including compositions by Brahms – to more provincial areas like Leeds, Liverpool, and Birmingham is an important historical aspect of British musical life in this period and will be examined in more detail in Chapter 2.

86 ‘Monday and Saturday Popular Concerts’, The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular, 24 (1883) 78-79 (p. 79)
87 ‘Recent Music’, The Pall Mall Gazette, 26 January, 1883, p. 4
The final key figure to be discussed in this section, Edward Dannreuther (b. Strasbourg, 4 November, 1844; d. London, 12 February, 1905) was one of the most famous yet elusive musicians in late nineteenth century England. However, unlike nearly every other musician discussed in this chapter, there has regrettably been relatively little detailed biographical research carried out on Dannreuther. There is also very little work available on his massive contributions to British musical life. Jeremy Dibble is currently the only scholar to have carried out any significant work on Edward Dannreuther. In his article ‘Edward Dannreuther and the Orme Square Phenomenon’ Dibble discusses one of Dannreuther’s principal performing outlets – the semi-private musical evenings at his home in Orme Square. Indeed, London was a thriving environment for such events and gave people the opportunity to hear chamber music and songs, including the vast output in these fields by Brahms.

Jeremy Dibble describes how Dannreuther eventually settled in England:

The all important turning point in Dannreuther’s career occurred with the visit of Henry Chorley (music critic of The Atheneaeum) in 1863. Sent as a talent scout to Germany by George Grove, who was looking for new faces for the Crystal Palace Concerts, Chorley heard Dannreuther play at the Conservatorium and at Breitkopf and Härtel’s piano manufactory (where he gave a performance of Brahms’s ‘Handel’ Variations). Clearly impressed, Chorley invited Dannreuther to his London home… taking the still physically weak 19-year-old under his wing, providing for him financially, setting him up with private pupils, and introducing him to artistic acquaintances\(^8\)

With such a carefully supported introduction to England, it is perhaps unsurprising that Dannreuther’s career was so successful. Dibble elaborates further on Dannreuther’s suitability for the English musical scene stating that he also started to make known his ‘partiality’ for new music, drawing particular attention to his interest in Brahms’s piano music, developed while he was in Leipzig.

Dibble’s work on Dannreuther reveals a massive devotion to Wagner, whom he first observed when he was a student in Leipzig. After his marriage to Chariclea Anthea Euterpe Ionides (the daughter of a wealthy Greek émigré), Dannreuther had the financial security to pursue his musical ambitions, including increasing correspondence with, and visits to see Wagner in Bayreuth during the 1870s. Dibble discusses Dannreuther’s involvement in various performances of the composer’s music, his translation of Wagner’s essay ‘Das Kunstwerk der Zukunft’, as well as his ‘flurry’ of articles on Wagner written for the Monthly Musical Record in 1872, the latter two described as ‘the first serious theoretical assessment of Wagner’s dramaturgical and musical ideas in English’. Regarding his opinion of Brahms, Dannreuther appears to have produced very little written work. The only known inclusion of Brahms in any of his written work is in his contribution entitled The Romantic Period to the Oxford History of Music series published in 1905. Even in this publication, Brahms is mentioned only briefly, usually as an example to emphasise a particular aspect of the thesis such as the division between the ‘Classicism’ of Brahms and the ‘Zukunftsmusik’ of Liszt and Wagner which blighted

---
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German musical life for much of the late nineteenth century. Throughout the publication, Dannreuther remains unbiased towards either composer, further confirming the catholic nature of his musical taste discussed by Dibble.

Dannreuther’s fondness for Brahms’s music can be seen clearly in the programmes of his private musical evenings series which occurred on an annual basis from 1876 to 1893, covering the principal period in which Brahms’s music was gradually introduced to British audiences. Indeed, such evenings were very common in London during this period and the concept with be discussed in more detail in Chapter 2 of this study. Appendix III of this study (Vol. II, p. 42) uses data from the original concert programmes and reveals all the performances of Brahms’s music which were given in the series. As the table demonstrates, there was at least – although usually more than – one piece of Brahms performed every year. Of the pieces performed, the two most frequent were the Piano Quintet in F minor, Op. 34, which received six performances over the seventeen-year period, closely followed by the Piano Quartets, Opp. 25 and 26, which received four and five performances respectively. These statistics are significant, as they would certainly seem to reflect more general trends in London in the late nineteenth century, as smaller scale performances of these three chamber pieces are noted more times than can be counted across the various critical publications.

The introduction of Brahms’s later works to the Dannreuther series is also discussed by Jeremy Dibble. These are listed in table 1.3 below:

---

Table 1.3: The Later Chamber Compositions of Brahms: Their British Premières versus Their Introduction to Dannreuther’s Concerts at Orme Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>British Première</th>
<th>First Performance at Orme Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano Trio, Op. 87</td>
<td>Monday, 22 January, 1883 at the Monday Popular Concerts with Charles Hallé, Mme Norman-Neruda and Signore Piatti</td>
<td>Thursday 8 February, 1883 with Henry Holmes, Mons. Lassere and Edward Dannreuther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quintet, Op. 88</td>
<td>Wednesday, 24 January, 1883 at Henry Holmes’s Musical Evenings at the RAM</td>
<td>Thursday 22 February, 1883 with Herr Ludwig, Mr Gibson, Herr Jung, Mr Hill and Mons. Lassere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cello Sonata, Op. 99</td>
<td>6 April, 1887 with Mr Hausmann at Prince’s Hall</td>
<td>Thursday 16 February, 1888, probably with Charles Ould and Edward Dannreuther.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Trio, Op. 101</td>
<td>30 April, 1887 with Mr Kwast at Prince’s Hall</td>
<td>Thursday 2 February, 1888, with Gibson, Gompertz, Grimson, Kreutz, Ould and Dannreuther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarinet Quintet, Op. 115</td>
<td>Monday 28 March, 1892, with Mühlfeld and Joachim at the Monday Popular Concerts</td>
<td>Thursday 23 February, 1893 with Gibson, Grimson, Kreutz, Ould and Dannreuther</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dibble speculates that any or all of these pieces may well have been first English performances. It can now be said with certainty, based on evidence from Appendix I of this study, that none of Dannreuther’s performances of these pieces were actually English premières. However, it is interesting to compare the generally relatively small amounts of time between the English première performances and Dannreuther’s introduction of the pieces at Orme Square. With the exception of the Violin Sonata, Op. 78, all of the other
pieces were played at Orme Square less than a year after their original British première performances, providing a firm confirmation of the ‘innovatory’ nature of the series which Dibble is so keen to stress in his writing. Dannreuther was not the only musician hosting such events at this time. Table 1.3 reveals that, in the case of Brahms’s String Quintet, Op. 88, he was beaten to the English première performance by less than a month by Henry Holmes at a similar evening at the RAM.

There is strong evidence suggesting that Dannreuther did give a British première of Brahms’s music in the form of the Two Songs for Contralto with Viola Obbligato, Op. 91. First, there is the concert programme of Thursday 16 December, 1886, at which Op. 91 was performed. Underneath the listing of the piece in the programme, there is a small note in italics saying ‘second performance’, suggesting that the performance on Thursday 5 November, 1885, just over a year before, was in fact the English première of the work. Second, the Musical Times and Singing Class Circular actually contains a review of this concert with the following comment: ‘two new songs for contralto, with viola obbligato, by Brahms (Op. 91), may be numbered among this distinguished composer’s most charming inspirations. They were finely sung by Miss Lena Little, and are likely to be often heard.’ Earlier in the review, the songs are also referred to as a ‘novelty’ (a word used frequently in The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular when discussing any première performance), and with no known previous record of their performance in England, it would seem very likely that this was their English première.
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Whilst Dannreuther may not be able to claim much credit for initiating first performances of Brahms’s music in England, the evidence collated and discussed in this section has surely demonstrated that his contributions in this area cannot be ignored. Indeed, it would seem likely that his relatively regular performances of Brahms’s chamber music (particularly the Opus 25 and 26 Quartets and the Opus 34 Quintet) increased its popularity, thus helping to account for the notable frequency of its performance at other venues. There were countless other foreign musicians both visiting and settling in England throughout the latter nineteenth century, many of whom were involved in performances of Brahms’s music, such as Agnes Zimmerman and Hans von Bülow. However, based on the evidence, it would certainly seem that Manns, Hallé and Dannreuther were three of the most prominent and innovative figures in this field, paving the way for the gradual increase in Brahms’s popularity and respect throughout musical circles in England.

1.3: English Performers and Critics: Fanny Davies and George Bernard Shaw

The final portion of this chapter will examine the role of British performers and critics in the introduction and reception of Brahms’s music in England. Although there were many prominent English performers and critics in the latter half of the nineteenth century – such as Arabella Goddard, Kate Loder (Lady Thompson) Anna Williams, Lena Little, John Runciman, and J.W. Davidson to name a few – there are two names which appear more prominently than others regarding the music of Brahms: Fanny Davies and George Bernard Shaw.
Fanny Davies (b. Guernsey, 27 June, 1861; d. London, 1 September, 1934) is almost certainly the most prominent British performer in relation to this study. Her principal contributions to the introduction of Brahms’s music in England occurred later in the century than many of the other crucial figures, a fact which is not surprising when it is remembered that Clara Schumann presented the first piece of Brahms in England five years before Davies was born and subsequently became her piano teacher for two years between 1883 and 1885. Although a direct and detailed study of Davies’s contributions to British musical life has yet to be made – such a study has not been attempted because of what Dorothy de Val describes as the ‘relatively scarce’ availability of primary sources on the artist – there is limited information about her in the form of articles in various monographs on different aspects of nineteenth century music, as well as one or two late nineteenth and early twentieth century journal articles.

Dorothy de Val has produced the most detailed biographical study of Fanny Davies to date in the form of an article ‘Fanny Davies: ‘A messenger for Schumann and Brahms’?’ Unfortunately, de Val’s thesis is somewhat unbalanced, as she virtually ignores Davies’s concert career. Instead, her focus is interesting but somewhat anecdotal information about Davies’ personal life, using feminist theory and sexuality as a basis for the discussion, thus largely obscuring factual information regarding her concert career. That said, de Val does point out that ‘the programmes she [Davies] played at the Popular Concerts were strongly rooted in the Austro-German Tradition, with an emphasis on Brahms’93. Davies’ association with performances of Brahms’s music has been well documented by George

S. Bozarth in his chapter ‘Fanny Davies and Brahms’s late chamber music’, in which he chronologically collates all her performances of Brahms’s chamber music. Indeed, Davies’ respect and veneration for the composer is evident in an interview given in *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular* in 1905 in which she says:

> I had the good fortune… to see something of Brahms during his later years… By the time we had approached – there was no mistake – “It’s Brahms!” I whispered, and it was… I little thought when I saw the coatless wayfarer that I was that very afternoon going to hear the great master play his (then new) C minor trio with Joachim and Hausmann – besides his violoncello sonata in F; that Clara Schumann would sit by the pianoforte and turn for him; that he would play the trio from my copy on a cottage pianoforte in a little private room in the hotel. What sounds he brought forth from that modest instrument!\(^9^4\)

Davies remained on cordial terms with Joachim even after her rift with Clara and Eugenie Schumann in 1892 – allegedly the result of a misunderstanding between herself and Eugenie regarding the transfer of piano students between the two ladies – which allowed her to stay within this close knit circle.

Davies can also claim credit for the following English premières of Brahms’s chamber music:

---

\(^9^4\) ‘Miss Fanny Davies: A Biographical Sketch’, *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*, 46 (1905), 365-370 (368-9)
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Table 1.4: A List of Fanny Davies’ British Premières of Brahms’s Music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Zigeunerlieder</em>, Op. 103</td>
<td>Monday 26 November, 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin Sonata in D minor, Op. 108</td>
<td>7 May, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarinet Trio, Op. 114</td>
<td>Saturday 2 April, 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Clarinet Sonatas, Op. 120</td>
<td>24 June, 1895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further details of these performances can be found in Appendix I (Vol. II, p. 1). For a single performer, table 1.4 presents an impressive list. Of these performances, it was the Violin Sonata and the works for Clarinet which received the most publicity, of which the former received unanimously positive reviews. For example, the reviewer for *The Daily News* wrote:

The opening Allegro is cleanness itself. The subject matter is interesting, and its treatment, while fully displaying Brahms’s mastery in such things, is never abstruse. With the general public, however, and at any rate at first hearing, the slow movement is likely to be a prime favourite. The beautiful melody of this adagio has, in accordance with illustrious precedent been borrowed by Brahms from one of his own songs, composed we believe within the past few years… The third movement… takes the place of a scherzo. It is extremely brief, but highly effective, and is happily relieved by a delicious little intermezzo. The finale at first hearing appeared diffuse and fragmentary; and it would perhaps be better to reserve judgement upon it until after the second performance, which Sir Charles and Lady Hallé promise us very shortly.95

All aspects of the piece are viewed positively, with the exception of the finale. However, the reviewer seems convinced that any lack of understanding regarding the last

95 ‘Brahms’s New Sonata’, *Daily News*, 9 May, 1889, p. 3
movement would be settled upon listening to the second performance. The chamber works for clarinet also received positive reviews. The Op. 114 trio was described as ‘melodious and winning’, with particular attention drawn to the ‘bright and vivacious’ finale which was allegedly ‘magnificently rendered’ by Fanny Davies. These reviews serve to confirm (as discussed in relation to Joachim and the Op. 115 Clarinet Quintet earlier in the chapter) that by the time this series of late chamber works were written, Brahms was almost definitely a firm favourite in England.

It is clear therefore that Davies’ English introductions of Brahms’s later music are a small but crucial aspect of the thesis, demonstrating the artistic achievement of Brahms’s various champions in England throughout the course of the latter nineteenth century. The reviews of her performances are certainly a far cry from that first noted in The Musical World regarding Clara’s performance of the Gavotte and Sarabande in 1856. It therefore would seem eminently appropriate that she is the last principal performer, and the penultimate person to be discussed in this chapter, as she was one of the last in an inextricably linked line of people throughout this period whose perseverance led to the acceptance and even enjoyment of Brahms’s music by English audiences and critics.

The final figure who will be discussed in this chapter is George Bernard Shaw (b. Dublin, 26 July, 1856; d. Ayot St Lawrence, Herts, 2 November, 1950). In the context of the general trend of this chapter Shaw is something of an enigma in that he was not a professional musician (although he was born into a musical family). However, his notoriety as a music critic across various British publications, particularly his criticism of
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the music of Johannes Brahms, make him an invaluable figure in the context of this study. Indeed, there is probably more literature detailing aspects of Shaw’s creative literary life and political beliefs – including many essays written by Shaw himself – than there is for any of the musicians discussed thus far.

Shaw’s writing on music was undoubtedly influenced by his socialist inclinations. Of the many biographical works on Shaw, Hesketh Pearson discusses Shaw’s route to Fabian socialism in the most comprehensive terms:

As one who has not read Karl Marx… it is a little difficult for me to trace the precise nature of his influence on Shaw; but that Das Kapital had a tremendous effect on him there is not the smallest doubt; it converted him to socialism, turned him into a revolutionary writer, made him a political agitator, changed his outlook, directed his energy, influenced his art, gave him a religion, and, as he claimed, made a man of him… From the moment that Shaw imbibed the gospel according to Saint Marx he began to preach it on every possible occasion, under every sort of condition, though as time went on he corrected the errors in Marx’s economic creed and worked out the distinctively British brand of socialism known as Fabianism.⁹⁷

Shaw joined the Fabian society in 1884, which seems to have been a sort of culmination of his growing political beliefs. It is also significant to remember at this point that Shaw’s existence until the mid 1880s had been one of relative poverty. Pearson describes him as ‘poor’ and ‘frequently unpresentable in the daytime’. Shaw later admitted that this was one reason for ‘adopting literature as a profession’, claiming that ‘the author is never seen by his clients, he need not dress respectably. As a stockbroker, a doctor, or man of business, I should have had to wear starched linen and a tall hat, and to give up the use of

my knees and elbows… You friendly reader, though you buy my articles, have no idea of what I look like in the street. If you did, you would probably take in some other paper. Based on Pearson’s account and Shaw’s personal recollections, it is unsurprising that Shaw’s personal circumstances and beliefs influenced his critical and creative writing, particularly as Shaw gives them such pronounced attention in his work.

Dan H. Lawrence has edited a three volume set of Shaw’s complete musical criticism, thereby making a critical assessment of Shaw’s views on Brahms relatively easy to research. The volumes contain many references to Brahms, most of which demonstrate the widely acknowledged barbed and cynical attitude towards the composer’s work. His most forceful remarks are directed towards the work Ein Deutsches Requiem, Op. 45:

I desire to thank Mr William Stead publicly for getting out the Review of Reviews in time for the Bach Choir concert on Saturday afternoon, and so lightening for me the intolerable tedium of sitting unoccupied whilst the Bachists conscientiously maundered through Brahms’s Requiem. Mind, I do not deny that the Requiem is a solid piece of musical manufacture. You feel at once that it could only have come from the establishment of a first class undertaker. But I object to requiems altogether…A requiem overdoes it even when there is an actual bereavement to be sympathized with; but in a concert room when there is nobody dead, it is the very wantonness of make believe…It turned out that the Requiem was only a clever device of Mr Stanford’s to make his setting of Tennyson’s revenge seem lively by force of contrast.

Several of Shaw’s frequent literary traits are shown in the above quotation. First, he demonstrates a sort of two sided conflict in his writing between a personal dislike of

---

98 Ibid., p. 62
Brahms’s music on the one hand, contrasted with an undeniable respect for its technical merits on the other. This occurs frequently in his writing on Brahms, leaving the reader somewhat perplexed as to the precise nature of his opinion. Second, the comment ‘I object to Requiems altogether’ undeniably demonstrates Shaw’s famous opposition of religion, particularly that of Protestantism which formed a major part of his childhood upbringing. Third, Shaw uses the review of Brahms as a basis to make negative remarks about the music of another composer, Charles Villiers Stanford. This is another prominent feature of his musical criticism, and the position occupied by Stanford in this article is frequently given to Brahms in other articles by Shaw.

Shaw’s reviews of Brahms’s instrumental music show similar contradictions and inconsistency. For instance, his review of the Clarinet Quintet (Op. 115) in May, 1892 is as follows:

Only the other day I remarked that I was sure to come across Brahms’s new clarinet quintet sooner or later. And, sure enough, my fate overtook me last week at Mr G. Clinton’s Wind Concert at Steinway Hall. I shall not attempt to describe this latest exploit of the Leviathan Maunderer. It surpassed my utmost expectations: I never heard such a work in my life. Brahms’s enormous gift of music is paralleled by nothing on earth but Mr Gladstone’s gift of words: it is a verbosity which outfaces its own commonplaceness by dint of sheer magnitude…The presto of the third movement is a ridiculously dismal version of a lately popular hornpipe…the street-pianos went through an epidemic of it; and it certainly deserved a merrier fate than burying alive in a Brahms Quintet.100

---

100 George Bernard Shaw, ‘Brahms’s Verbosity’, in Shaw’s Music, II, 613-619 (p. 613-614)
As the linguistic content and structure of this review exemplifies, Shaw demonstrates an unparalleled, compelling turn of phrase throughout his critical publications. However, the content of the review appears to be solely concerned with propounding a dislike of the music of Brahms rather than expressing a balanced and constructive critical opinion. Shaw himself must have been aware of this propensity, since, a few days earlier in another article (following the lack of invitation to a previous performance of the Quintet) he states within the same paragraph ‘I am not to be trusted on the subject of Brahms’ and ‘If there is one thing of which I am more convinced than another, it is the worthlessness of criticisms that have dislike at the back of them’\(^1\), further confirming that his opinions on Brahms should be approached and interpreted with a degree of caution. Furthermore, the reviews of the British première of the Clarinet Quintet already discussed earlier in this chapter are all positive, and, unlike that of Shaw, actually use basic features and aspects of the music to support the critical argument, thereby further diminishing the potency of the content of Shaw’s critique.

Shaw’s seeming dislike of Brahms’s music appears very strange in the musical climate of the present day, as the composer’s works enjoy immense popularity amongst professionals and amateurs alike. Even at the time of the publication of Shaw’s reviews, whilst Brahms’s music was viewed often with an air of respectful silence, most of the reviews published by other writers do not correlate with the extreme opinions of Shaw. Indeed, the general trend of the reviews, as this chapter has demonstrated, was always one of respect, generally getting more positive as the century progressed. There is no doubt that Shaw’s critique of Brahms contains some of the most beautifully crafted and

entertaining paragraphs in the English language. However, in terms of its usefulness from a musicological perspective, one cannot help feeling that it is the product of an individual who could or would not reconcile the composer’s art with his own impossible ideological beliefs.

1.4: Conclusion
This chapter has demonstrated the crucially important role of various individuals in establishing the reputation of Brahms in England during the late nineteenth century – a lengthy process beginning with members of Brahms’s close inner friendship circle, gradually expanding to include other performers and conductors. The importance of musical critical publications has also become apparent throughout the chapter with the reviews of the first British performances providing an excellent indication of the general increase in popularity of the composer’s work as the century progressed. However, there were many other factors which undoubtedly influenced this trend which have been touched on in this chapter, such as the ‘private musical evening’ phenomenon, the increase in accessibility of musical performance, and the development of more formal British musical training establishments. It is these, along with a review of literature relating to British musical life of this period which will make up the principal content of the next chapter of this study.
Chapter 2: Brahms in Late Nineteenth Century England:  
A Political and Educational Perspective

2.0: Introduction

The second half of the nineteenth century was a very active period in English musical life. Indeed, Chapter 1 of this study provides a small snapshot of some of the events which occurred in relation to the introduction of the music of Brahms to England and the subsequent reception of the performances by various individuals and critical publications. However, the eventual success of his music was not solely down to its mere introduction and continued performances by the various key figures discussed earlier. There were also a number of favourable conditions in England, both in and outside London (and indeed in Europe) which occurred at crucial points throughout the nineteenth century as Brahms’s music was being introduced which require consideration. There were numerous improvements to musical education, both in official institutions and in the concert hall, many of which were related to the strong Germanic links to the British Crown in the form of Prince Albert, between 1839 and his death in 1861, with figures such as George Grove and The Prince of Wales continuing the spirit of his work thereafter. There was also a marked increase in the number and profile of musical performances outside England’s capital, in Leeds and Liverpool for example, and all such areas eventually incorporated the music of Brahms into their repertoires, undoubtedly encouraged by the initial efforts of Charles Hallé, discussed in Chapter 1, as well as by the increased mobility of notable musicians around Britain during this period.
In view of the wide ranging nature of the points requiring discussion in this Chapter, it is divided into several broad focal points. The first examines and evaluates the political situation in Britain and Europe during the second half of the nineteenth century, and specifically the effect of the revolutions in Europe on British musical development in terms of the large numbers of European musicians who settled in England as a result of the unrest in their native countries. The second point for consideration is the Germanic link to the British crown – Prince Albert, who many historians view as a crucially important figure in the development of Britain in the Victorian era, and in particular his contributions to the Great Exhibition and its subsequent musical legacy, with a particular focus on the contributions of George Grove to the British concert scene and education in relation to the music of Brahms. The third part of the Chapter evaluates the developments in musical education discussing the role specific institutions and groups played in promoting and supporting frequent performances of Brahms’s music such as the Royal College of Music, and Oxford and Cambridge Universities. The final portion of the Chapter will examine the increase in musical performances outside London, and the subsequent evidence of the infiltration of Brahms’s music to these areas.

2.1: The Music of Brahms in the Context of Late Nineteenth Century Europe and England

There have been numerous attempts to discuss and define the relationship of music and politics in the nineteenth century which have met with varying degrees of success. The central danger associated with such studies is the constant temptation to become so involved and preoccupied with the intricacies and potential scope for political debate that one actually loses sight of the principal subject of the music itself. There is
no doubt that the mid to late nineteenth century was an extremely politically active
time for Europe and England. Indeed, some of the main political occurrences which
seem very relevant in relation to the current discussion are the well known revolutions
which happened in France, Denmark, Poland, The Austrian Empire, the Italian states,
and, most importantly, the German states. The result of these revolutions was an
influx of people from Europe to England, including musicians such as Chopin,
Berlioz, and one of the principal subjects of Chapter 1 of this study, Charles Hallé.
Many German musicians settled and worked in Britain as a result of the upheavals in
Europe, bringing with them musical values and ideals, and thus providing a native
foundation for the music of Brahms to be absorbed into the British repertory.

There are a number of texts relating to the implications for music of politics in
nineteenth century Europe. The most useful of these is *The Late Romantic Era*, a
volume of essays edited by Jim Samson, in which the specific effects of the
revolutions on musicians, composers and concert life in the second half of the
nineteenth century are critically evaluated. Samson opens the discussions with his
own essay entitled ‘Music and Society’, which acts as an introduction to the
remainder of the book. He wisely points out:

In examining context in nineteenth-century music we are struck at least by parallels in periodization,
suggesting that the threads linking musical life and musical language extended also to wider
movements in political, social and intellectual history. It would clearly be naïve to identify the political
turning point of 1848 as a precise divider of nineteenth-century music history. But it would be equally
misguided to ignore the evidence of a caesura around that time. The revolutions were a milestone of
social as well as political history. They marked the end of a period of turbulence in the underlying
social order of France and central Europe and this in turn was reflected in a consolidation of the
structures of musical life. At the same time, the mid century witnessed significant changes in
intellectual climate, and their influence on musical composition extended even to programmes for renovation.\textsuperscript{1}

Samson is evidently very realistic about the relationship of the political events to musical events in the mid-to late nineteenth century. He approaches the subject with caution, making it clear that it was not solely the political events which shaped the direction of musical trends, commenting later in the essay that there was also a significant division in composition in the middle of the century, in which an ‘old guard of Romantic composers departed or stopped composing (Chopin, Mendelssohn, Schumann), and a new very different generation came to maturity (Brahms, Bruckner, Franck)\textsuperscript{2}. Samson then, disappointingly leaves the discussion hanging in mid-air moving on to the subject of the progression of political events in Europe from 1848 without stopping to consider the stark division he suggests between these generations of composers. This would certainly seem to be a crucial factor in the success of Brahms in England, in that, after Mendelssohn’s death in 1847, there was essentially a gap left in the British musical scene which required filling and, in that respect, the music of Brahms appeared and was introduced in England by Clara Schumann at a very ‘convenient’ juncture in 1856. That said, it has further been suggested by Stephen Banfield that it was in fact Mendelssohn’s music which resulted in the relatively slow rise in popularity of Brahms in England. In his article ‘The Artist and Society’, he maintains that ‘Mendelssohn, through little fault of his own, sterilized British musical endeavour throughout the 1850s and 60s. The weak points of his music – a lack of dramatic confrontation, due to material too classical and continuity

\textsuperscript{1} Jim Samson, ‘Music and Society’, in \textit{The Late Romantic Era: from the mid 19\textsuperscript{th} Century to World War I} (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1991), pp. 1-49 (p. 1)

\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., p. 3
of mood and texture too Baroque and moments of sentimental religiosity – became the norm in England.3

By far the most useful article in Samson’s book in the context of this study is Donald Burrows’ very lucid article ‘Victorian England: an Age of Expansion’, concerning the intertwined nature of music and politics relating specifically to Victorian England. In his opening paragraph, he makes the important points that ‘British society had pursued its own path largely untrammelled by the effects of violent divisions of revolutionary fervour… that were characteristic of other major European societies’ and that ‘many people including musicians, fled to Britain from the consequences of the 1848 revolutions elsewhere’4. With so many refugees from the revolutions settling in Britain, coupled with the frequent visits of high profile German performers discussed in Chapter 1, it is unsurprising that many musicologists have subsequently talked in terms of a strong German influence on British compositional aesthetics in the second half of the nineteenth century. Indeed, this is the case even in the most recent articles on the subject:

It is taken for granted that the musical influence in Britain during the second half of the nineteenth-century was principally German, or more precisely, Austro-German. It was essentially the driving force behind composition, pedagogy, the prevailing yet vain desire to create a national opera, and the summit of historiographical studies which emphasised music’s inextricable link with the intellect. Indeed, German musical art was considered superior to all others, and reverberations of what the Germans themselves termed ‘Das deutsche Jahrhundert’ resounded through our musical institutions and orchestras, abundantly staffed with German musicians.5

5 Jeremy Dibble, ‘British Teutons’, p. 1
The above quotation is taken from Jeremy Dibble’s 2011 paper on the British Teutons Joachim, Dannreuther and Richter. The large number of German musicians in England’s musical institutions is surely as a result, in part, of the European revolutionary activity of 1848. The positive nature of Dibble’s writing towards German music during the period also serves to illustrate the fact that the high professional standard and continuity of German music emerged from the revolutionary period relatively unscathed and uninterrupted in spite of the fact that composers who chose to remain in Germany throughout the period were undoubtedly affected by the activity. Indeed, as Samson points out, most composers, including Berlioz, Liszt and Schumann, adopted radical and reformist views in their early years, eventually culminating in disillusionment whereas long before 1848, their stance had become one of ‘apolitical detachment’\(^6\). This stance, particularly in the case of Schumann, who remained in Germany, was likely to have been responsible for the maintenance of excellence and continuity in the progression of German music, in that any political extremism which may have disturbed their compositional continuity was long gone before the revolutions actually occurred. As a result, the ‘superior’ German aesthetic was subsequently powerful enough to influence British composition, although not without the aid of simultaneous favourable conditions in England.

The remainder of Burrows’ article on the relationship of political and musical activity in Victorian England serves as a useful introductory point for the content of this Chapter. After his brief discussion of the effects of the European revolutions on England, he then makes the point that it ‘is impossible to review the course of music in Victorian England… without considering a few strong and determined

\(^{6}\) Samson, ‘Music and Society’, p. 10
individuals... Prince Albert...Henry Cole, George Grove, and Richard Bowley.\textsuperscript{7} In the context of this study, Prince Albert and George Grove’s contributions to music in England warrant further attention at this point. The Prince Consort and latterly the Prince of Wales were instrumental in the encouragement of excellence in science and the arts, with the successes of the Great Exhibition, and the partial establishment of the Royal College of Music. Grove, meanwhile, was a crucial figure in the development of the Crystal Palace Concerts, and the first edition of the now famous \textit{Grove’s Dictionary of Music and Musicians}. He also developed the ‘analytical’ notes for concert programmes at the Crystal Palace, as well as being the first principal at the Royal College of Music.

\textbf{2.2: Prince Albert and his legacy: Music at the Crystal Palace}

Prince Albert’s association with England has been well documented in a large number of monographs and articles, including an entry in the current edition of \textit{The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians} in relation to his musical talent as a composer and a performer. Albert’s musical talents were undoubtedly the result of the strict educational regime he received in his early years. Born on 26 August, 1819, he became Prince Consort of England in 1840. When the prince was only four, he was removed from the care of his nurse and began his education under the guidance of Christoph Florschutz:

\begin{quote}
For the Prince it was a relentless, mechanical timetable, starting with one hour a day when he was six, three hours a day when he was seven, four hours a day when he was nine and rising to a crescendo of five and more hours a day when he was twelve...This formidable curriculum taught the prince two things – to go to the root of every subject and to deal with everything methodically – lessons for which
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{7} Burrows, ‘Victorian England’, p. 267
his temperament, at once thorough and courageously unflagging, provided suitable ground. Throughout his life he was to tackle weighty problems, both political and personal, which faced him, with the weapons of study and system which he had learned in the high small school rooms of Coburg and the Rosenau dominated by the stern, solid form of the Rath [the name given to Florschutz], who was ready as the occasion demanded, to praise or pinch.\footnote{Roger Fulford, \textit{The Prince Consort} (London: Macmillan, 1949), p. 26-27}

This account is a typical analysis of Albert’s educational regime. It was likely to have been his natural intelligence coupled with his educational credentials which led to the question of whether he would be an appropriate consort for the then Princess Victoria in 1836 when she became Queen (as a result of no living legitimate issue from William IV). However, nearly all of the discussions of Albert’s early education, whilst acknowledging that it was very broad, neglect to mention the importance placed on music. The only item which does devote specific attention to the Prince’s musical education is a monograph published in 1867, under the direction of Queen Victoria herself with Lieutenant General The Hon C. Grey, in which it is said that ‘though not neglected, classics and mathematics did not hold the prominent, not to say exclusive place in their system of education which these branches of study occupy in England. The study of modern languages, of history, of the natural sciences, of music, and generally of those accomplishments which serve to embellish and adorn life, had many hours in each week devoted to them\footnote{C. Grey and Queen Victoria, \textit{The Early Years of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort} (New York: Harper Brothers, 1867), p. 88}. Albert’s broad and varied education is almost certainly an important contributing factor to his success in England, and in particular reference to this study, his assistance in the organisation of The Great Exhibition and its subsequent musical legacy.
The Prince Consort’s interest in the arts was matched by that of Queen Victoria, demonstrated by their substantial collection of art works and enjoyment of planning musical and theatrical evenings. Their artistic endeavours have recently been documented by Leah Kharibian in her 2010 monograph *Passionate Patrons: Victoria and Albert and the Arts*. Kharibian points out early on in her studies that Victoria and Albert were both artists themselves, both finding time amid the duties of state to ‘paint, etch, sculpt, design, compose and perform music’\(^{10}\). Indeed some of Prince Albert’s compositions still survive today, including a charming song, written in 1839. Appendix V (Vol. II, p. 52) is a transcription of the song from the original autograph manuscript. Generally speaking, the song is quite simple texturally and tonally, staying around the tonic (E flat), the dominant, and the relative minor, with a simple arpeggio-based accompaniment in the piano. That said, it must be remembered that this song was written by a man who was essentially an amateur musician, thereby making the evident awareness of form and harmony very impressive. For instance, the modulation to the relative minor in bars 27-28 is prepared from bar 21 in both the voice and the accompaniment, thus making the eventual cadence fit seamlessly and easily into the fabric of the piece. Both Victoria and Albert had a talent for singing with Albert being known to have taken the bass solos in oratorio performances. Albert also enjoyed a cordial friendship with Mendelssohn, attributed to the similarity of their German education.\(^{11}\) Indeed, the English lionisation of Mendelssohn is very likely to be related to this friendship. With music playing such a large part in the lives of both Albert and Victoria, the increase in musical performances and the subsequent inclusion of music in the educational reforms toward the end of Victoria’s reign was almost inevitable.


\(^{11}\) Burrows, ‘Victorian England’, p. 267
Albert’s involvement in the rich and long history of the Crystal Palace and the Great Exhibition has been attributed to his supposed exclusion from any formal participation in the work of the sovereign by Queen Victoria coupled with an interest in ‘educational questions’\textsuperscript{12}. The creation and opening of The Great Exhibition occurred at a time when, according to Jeremy Dibble, under the influence of the Prince Consort, ‘Britain welcomed German innovation and scholarship at a time when our own institutions, not least the universities, required reform and an injection of new thinking’\textsuperscript{13}. Music played a part in the exhibition from the day of the opening ceremony:

Announced by a flourish of trumpets, the short opening ceremony on 1 May included the National Anthem… with the choirs and orchestra of around 600 performers and many others both foreign and English, accompanied by the Gray and Davidson organ…After the speech from the Prince Consort, reply by the Queen, and prayers from the Archbishop of Canterbury, the full cast gave the Hallelujah Chorus from Messiah… and the royal party made a progress of inspection round the building, during which the larger organs, of Willis, Walker, Hill, Ducroquet and Schulze, were performed upon by leading players.\textsuperscript{14}

The above quotation is from an extensive paper by Michael Musgrave, dealing with the musical performances of the opening and closing ceremonies, as well as the numerous musical instruments which formed parts of the exhibition. The choice of Handel’s Hallelujah Chorus is a logical one, reflecting the well known strong British choral tradition. It is this small musical event which Musgrave believes ‘was destined to play a crucial part in the development of…the large scale Handel Festivals at the

\textsuperscript{12} Hermione Hobhouse, \textit{The Crystal Palace and The Great Exhibition} (London: Continuum, 2004), p. 2
\textsuperscript{13} Dibble, ‘British Teutons’, p. 3
Sydenham Crystal Palace”. Musgrave describes the events of the opening ceremony as well as the subsequent use of the palace at Sydenham in great detail. However, he does not seem to address the supposed link between the two events. Indeed, by his own admission, music was certainly not at the forefront of the minds of the directors of the Great Exhibition, demonstrated by the fact that the first suggestion of including music in the opening ceremony was made by Dr Henry Wylde of the Musical Instruments Committee on the 31 March 1851.

Whether or not the musical element of the opening ceremony had an effect on the subsequent use of the palace is unclear. It would seem more likely that it was a combination of the opening ceremony and the numerous musical instrumental exhibits available to view at the exhibition. Records from the exhibition indicate that the total number of musical instruments exhibited was 1857 and included organs, pianos, and a full range of orchestral instruments. More importantly, as well as Henry Wylde, there were a number of important musical figures on the subjury for musical instruments at the exhibition, such as Sterndale Bennett (who, as demonstrated in Chapter 1 of this study, was indirectly responsible for the first performance of Brahms in England through Clara Schumann), Cipriani Potter (who was at that point Principal of the Royal Academy of Music), Berlioz, and organist Sir George Smart. Such figures would surely have ensured that the musical portion of the exhibition itself was of a comparable standard to the rest. The performances on the various organs at the opening ceremony as detailed by Musgrave may also have contributed to the subsequent use of the building for musical events.

---

15 Ibid., p. 45
16 Ibid., p. 57
17 H.R. Bishop and others, ‘Report on Musical Instruments’, in Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations, 1851: Reports by the Juries on the Subjects in the Thirty Classes into which the Exhibition was Divided (London: William Clowes and Sons, 1852), pp. 324-325 (p. 324)
The success of the exhibition is famous and undisputed with in excess of six million visitors to the Crystal Palace during the exhibition and an impressive profit of £186,000 (approximately £16 million by today’s standards). However, it was the relocation of the Crystal Palace to Sydenham after the exhibition which was to prove invaluable in the musical development of England, and in the introduction of the music of Brahms to the country in the second half of the nineteenth century. Contrary to the apparent suggestion in Musgrave’s article, after the close of the exhibition on 15 October, 1851, there was no immediate plan for a subsequent use for the building.\footnote{John R. Davis, \textit{The Great Exhibition} (Gloucestershire: Sutton, 1999), p. 205} Initially Prince Albert wished that the profits and building be used only for purposes related to the original exhibition. Albert’s principal idea for the use of the palace was that of a ‘cosmopolitan industrial university’ with four institutions corresponding to the four main sections of the exhibition (Raw material, machinery, manufactures and plastic art)\footnote{Ibid., p. 205-206}. In spite of high public support for the building manifested in the concerts and promenades that subsequently took place there, in 1852, the decision was made that the building had to be taken apart. However, Joseph Paxton, the principal designer of the building apparently anticipated the outcome and by forming the Crystal Palace Company and selling shares in it, he and a consortium of influential figures (including Samuel Laing, Francis Fuller and John Scott Russell\footnote{Davis, \textit{The Great Exhibition}, p. 209-210}) made the decision to buy and reconstruct the palace in Sydenham\footnote{Michael Musgrave, \textit{The Musical life of the Crystal Palace} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 10}.

The subsequent musical activities at the Crystal Palace are very well documented. The famous Handel Festivals were held there from 1857-1926, as well as the Saturday
Concert series from 1855-1900. Therefore, the introduction of the music of Brahms under Manns’ influence, detailed in Chapter 1 coincided very well with the changes to the function of the Crystal Palace in the aftermath of the Great Exhibition. The reason for Manns’ massive success at the Crystal Palace warrants further attention at this point. It was briefly suggested in Chapter 1 that one of the reasons behind Manns’ success with ‘new’ music at the Palace was largely as a result of the input and support of George Grove. However, Grove’s contribution to the flourishing musical life of the Crystal Palace (and thus the subsequent success of Brahms’s music) was actually an indispensible aspect of Manns’ success and indeed of the promotion of musical performance and education in general during the latter half of the nineteenth century.

2.3: The Non-musical Musician: George Grove

A study of Brahms’s reception and influence in England would not be complete without discussion of George Grove’s (b. Clapham, London, 13 August, 1820; d. Sydenham, 28 May, 1900) contributions to the British musical scene in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Grove’s early life was one of comprehensive education, culminating in his graduation from The Institute of Civil Engineers in 1839. Until the age of eight, he was taught at home principally by his sister Bithiah in comfortable surroundings in Clapham. This was followed by attendance at a weekly boarding school on Clapham Common kept by a Mr. Elwell, eventually moving to Clapham Grammar School. Like his mother

---

(a proficient amateur pianist\textsuperscript{24}), he studied music on an amateur basis. In the decade following his graduation, he worked on various projects related to his apprenticeship with Alexander Gordon\textsuperscript{25}. His association with the Crystal Palace began on 6 February, 1850 when he was appointed secretary of the Society of Arts, one of the major forces behind the organisation of the Great Exhibition\textsuperscript{26}. After the exhibition ended, he became secretary of the Crystal Palace Company in May 1852 and thus involved in the musical developments with August Manns. After Manns was dismissed by Henry Schallen in 1854, it was Grove who ‘kept him warm’ with the directors of the company, resulting in his reinstatement in 1855 and the subsequent establishment of the Saturday Concerts series\textsuperscript{27}.

2.4: The ‘Analytical’ Programme Note

It was this relationship between Grove and Manns which resulted in the creation of Grove’s famous programme notes, many of which contain references to the music of Brahms performed at the Palace. There has been much research carried out regarding the history and development of the analytical programme note in England. Musicologist Catherine Dale has carried out a detailed study of this tradition, citing lack of musical education outside the concert room in England as Grove’s principal reason for its development as an attempt to match the more ‘systematic’ musical education outside the concert room seen in other countries (notably Germany)\textsuperscript{28}. Dale compares the less publicised attempts, from 1841, of Scottish scholar and composer


\textsuperscript{25} Parry, Sir George Grove, p. 5

\textsuperscript{26} Charles L. Graves, The Life and Letters of Sir George Grove (London: Macmillan, 1903), p. 34

\textsuperscript{27} Saxe-Wynham, quoted in Musgrave, The Musical Life, p. 68

John Thomson, with that of John Ella for the Musical Union, before going on to describe the development of Grove’s notes:

Although many of the items performed at the Crystal Palace were of a decidedly popular nature, nowhere were the management’s aims to inform and to educate the audience more apparent than in the provision of increasingly specialized and scholarly programme notes and in the thematic unity that lay behind much of the programme planning, demonstrated by the series planned for the summer of 1874…It was not until the mid 1860s that these programme notes became a regular feature…Biography featured prominently in all these early programme notes which were often written by Manns himself, but as Grove began to assume greater responsibility for their provision, the music itself received fuller treatment. In comparison, Manns’s notes are relatively short.29

Dale’s research reveals a close association between Manns and Grove in the creation of the programmes. In relation to the music of Brahms, the noticeable reference given by Dale is the time period – the ‘mid-1860s’, in that Brahms’s music increased in performance from the late 1860s throughout the 1870s (see Appendix I, Vol. II, p. 1). With the programme notes being a regular fixture by the mid-1860s, Brahms’s music would have been subject to helpful consistent analyses, thus increasing its chances of success at the concerts. On first inspection, it is surprising that Grove - ‘the amateur’- provided more detailed musical observations in his attempts than Manns - ‘the professional’. Dale attributes this to Grove’s position as ‘a practical musician, an amateur whose own wish to obtain a greater understanding of the musical repertory led him to wish to make other amateurs see it in the same way.’30 Upon closer examination therefore, this conclusion would seem then to be a sensible one based on Manns’ and Grove’s respective educational background, in that Manns, as a professional musician, may have taken the knowledge of musical features for granted

29 Ibid., p. 206-207
30 Ibid., p. 213
in contrast to Grove, whose amateur status probably made him more suited to explaining basic musical features that the general public could relate to and understand. One thing Dale neglects to do is offer an explanation as to why the efforts of Manns and Grove were so successful compared to earlier attempts. In relation to John Thomson, the principal reason is surely because he was not alive long enough to make the practice a regular one – he died on 6 May, 1841, three months after his first set of notes were produced. In the case of Ella, on the other hand, whilst his notes contained numerous musical illustrations, Dale points out that he would only devote a sentence to describe entire movements, and miss most of the key harmonic progressions in his illustrations. As a result, therefore, the notes would not have been particularly useful, especially to people who did not read music.

Grove’s original personal copies of the programmes are in the library of the Royal College of Music. The collection is incomplete, particularly in the earlier years of the concerts. However, they do give an excellent indication of Grove’s approach and attitude towards the music of Brahms and his encouragement of musical education through the music at the Palace. The first noticeable aspect of the programme notes is their similarity to the newspapers and journals in their favouring discussion of larger scale orchestral and chamber pieces. Songs are given virtually no attention at all other than their title and the name of the performer(s). A typical example of Grove’s work can be seen in the programme of 7 March, 1874, in his analysis of the Variations on a Theme of Haydn (Op. 56a). The actual analysis itself is of the most basic nature, using simplistic language and basic one-line musical examples providing essential thematic material, which is unsurprising given that Grove was not a professional theoretical

31 Ibid., p. 205
musician and that the notes would be read in many instances by amateurs or non-musicians. Grove’s most interesting comment comes towards the end of the analysis:

But it is only fair to say that the difficulty of the work is enormous. Where several independent melodies are going on at once, each with its own rhythm and own definite intention, it is all but impossible to make both details and ensemble satisfactory, and to convey the meaning of the composer exactly. And in such cases a miss is as good as a mile, and a hairbreadth of imperfection will make all the difference between confusion and clearness, weariness and gratification. The malady – or the vice – of the orchestration of our day, is that everything must be put in and defined, nothing left for the imagination, no chance of an additional part or an independent figure neglected, no possible gap in the score left unfulfilled. The thin clear scores of the older composers are a thing of the past, which have disappeared in the rage for fullness of detail, which besets the art of our days. Mr. Brahms, eminently a man of the day, partakes naturally of this tendency, and we only mention it to bespeak in some respect the indulgence of the audience on our first presentation of a work of more than usual complexity and difficulty.32

In a similar manner to many of the newspaper journalists discussed in Chapter 1, Grove seems to be treating the work with extreme caution, appearing to use the notes as an opportunity to warn the audience that they may not like or understand the work upon first inspection. He highlights the ‘difficulty’ of the piece at the beginning and end of the paragraph, inserting the reasons of imperfections in playing and the then recent development of thematically highly complex orchestral scores as reasons why the audience might not necessarily be able to engage with the work. Other reasons for Grove’s caution are not immediately clear, as this analysis is the first one of any detail in relation to the music of Brahms available in the incomplete set of programmes with no earlier analyses available for comparison. The answer here is likely to be twofold. First, as outlined above, Grove’s musical education, although aided and encouraged

32 George Grove, Crystal Palace Programme of 7 March, 1874, p. 470
by his professional activities and his association with professional musicians, was largely amateur, and, as Dale points out ‘the notes contain only the most basic recognition of tonal relationships between a key and its closest relatives, and although he observes such devices as modulation and enharmony, he makes no attempt to explain how these are achieved.’ In the case of the music of Brahms, which is notoriously tonally and thematically complex, Grove was probably somewhat intimidated and uncomfortable with the task of analysing such complex work in layman’s terms. Second, earlier performances of Brahms’s music, and in particular his orchestral compositions in England, were not particularly favourable. The First Piano Concerto, for instance, is well known for its disappointing British and native German premières. In Germany, the first performance at Hanover on the 22 January, 1859 (with Brahms at the piano and Joachim conducting) was received ‘respectfully but without enthusiasm’, with the audience at the Gewandhaus in Leipzig on 27 January, 1859 making their dislike of the concerto known by ‘hissing’. In England meanwhile, there are ample review articles, such as that in the *Monthly Musical Record*, in which the piece is referred to as ‘in places diffuse and laboured’ with the first movement being ‘the least successful’. If one looks at the first movement of the concerto, such analytical conclusions are not altogether unjustified. Another product of Brahms’s ‘difficult’ early years, the work bears the evidence of Brahms’s challenge regarding the eventual medium of the work (it started as a sonata for two pianos, then was intended to be a symphony before Brahms reached the final medium of the concerto). The opening movement is a massive 480 bar long sonata structure, with the piano remaining silent until bar 91. The second subject is also left initially to the soloist without contribution from the orchestra at all. There is harmonic ambiguity.

---

33 Dale, ‘The Analytical Content’, p. 212
35 ‘Crystal Palace’, *MMR*, 2 (1872), 58
from the outset, initially through the use of the D pedal with a 6/3 chord over the top, mirrored even more intensely at the same point in the recapitulation by Brahms placing a 6/4/2 chord over the D instead of B flat (the dominant of the dominant), as well as an avoidance of cadence in the tonic during the first subject group. If one compares this with Mendelssohn’s first Piano Concerto in G minor, although Mendelssohn eschews the traditional orchestral tutti at the opening, there is an almost constant harmonic dialogue between I and V in the opening bars, followed by a typical modified sonata form. It is therefore easy to see how Brahms’s movement may have been viewed as being ‘diffuse’ by the British public. Based on reviews and attitudes of the type seen for Brahms’s Piano Concerto, Grove’s hesitancy and caution in the programme notes were an understandable and possibly even wise preparation for the audience of the *Haydn Variations*. As demonstrated in Chapter 1, any doubt regarding the variations was unfounded as they were massively successful, so much so that they were repeated a few days later ‘by special request’\(^\text{36}\) on 21 March, 1874.

The First Piano Concerto of Brahms also serves to illustrate difficulties with Grove’s notes. When it was performed in the Crystal Palace under Manns with Mlle Marie Krebs at the piano on 20 February, 1875, Grove printed the following in the programme:

> Its opus number – 15 – would indicate an early work; but the style and the treatment are too full of practice and character to allow for this supposition; and it is difficult to perceive any want of maturity about the concerto, even when compared to the Variations on a theme of Haydn’s, which we recently heard in this room, and which profess to be a much more recent composition.\(^\text{37}\)

---

\(^{36}\) George Grove, Crystal Palace Programme of 21 March, 1874, pp. 516-524 (p. 516)

\(^{37}\) Ibid., 20 February 1875, pp. 469-477 (p. 469)
Such an evaluation seems rather strange in light of the long time period between the appearance of the concerto and the variations, as well as the difference in genre. The concerto was completed in its current form in 1858, which is very early in Brahms’s output (when one remembers that he only met the Schumanns in 1853). Grove’s assertion that it is ‘difficult to perceive any want of maturity’, highlights his rudimentary understanding of formal and structural features, particularly in relation to the first movement of the concerto, which certainly bears the imprints of Brahms’s struggle to decide between the genres of the symphony and the concerto. When one compares this to the sophisticated fluid variations of Op. 56a, his comments are not really analytically viable. However, it must also be remembered that, at this point, Brahms had not actually produced any other concertos or symphonies, so Grove essentially had very little means of comparison with regard to Opus 15. Indeed, one wonders, had this programme been produced in 1886 after all four of the Brahms symphonies had arrived in England, whether his opinion may have been different. Nonetheless, Grove’s Crystal Palace programmes are an extremely interesting resource and undoubtedly made the music of Brahms far more accessible to lay audiences than it would have otherwise been.

2.5: Brahms: ‘One of the greatest living German composers’ in the Dictionary of Music and Musicians

Grove’s other principal achievement in the realm of musical publications which further enhanced the reputation of Brahms in England was, of course, the first edition of the famous Dictionary of Music and Musicians. With the success of the current edition of the dictionary (renamed The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians
in 1980, now in its second edition in this form, published in 2001) and its online
counterpart oxfordmusiconline.com, it is hard to believe that Grove’s first edition was
not viewed as a publication which was going to enjoy any serious degree of success
by its publisher (Macmillan). The evolution and creation of the first edition of the
dictionary has been examined in detail by Leanne Langley in her article ‘Roots of a
Tradition: the First Dictionary of Music and Musicians’. In the article, she points out
that tracing the exact path of the original publication is virtually impossible as there is
a lack of original editorial materials and references to the work. However, she has
uncovered the original intention of the work by Grove and Macmillan when
preparations for the work began in 1874:

> There is no one work in English from which an intelligent inquirer can learn, in small compass and in
untechnical language, what is meant by a Symphony or Sonata, a Fugue, a Stretto, a Coda, or any other
of the terms which necessarily occur in every description or analysis of a Concert or a piece of Music;
or from which he can gain a readable and succinct account of the history of the various branches of the
art, or of the rise and progress of the Pianoforte and other instruments, or the main facts and
characteristics of the lives of eminent musicians.\(^\text{38}\)

From this quotation, Langley isolates the phrases ‘Small compass’, ‘untechnical
language’, ‘readable and succinct’ to best sum up Grove’s intentions, which, in a
similar manner to the analytical concert programmes, seems to be directed at
providing the non-musician or amateur with basic essential and accessible information
regarding form, history and composers. The project is also likely to have come about
as a result of Grove’s resignation of his Crystal Palace secretarial duties in order to
enter a generous working agreement with Alexander Macmillan and G.L. Craik,

---

\(^{38}\) ‘Preparing for Publication: the Dictionary of Music A.D. 1450-1874’, Quoted in Leanne Langley,
‘Roots of a Tradition: the First Dictionary of Music and Musicians’, in George Grove: Music and
editing *Macmillan’s Magazine* and assisting Macmillan and Craik in their establishment.\(^{39}\) There are a number of different explanations regarding how the project came to fruition by various authors. Charles Graves maintains that the editorship was ‘entrusted’\(^{40}\) to Grove, after the publication of their prospectus for the work, implying that the plans were mutual and organised. On the other hand, Rosemary VanArsdel states that the creation of the dictionary was something Grove merely worked on in his spare time, essentially as a by-product of his employment with Macmillan and Craik\(^{41}\). Whatever agreement existed between Grove and Macmillan regarding the project, the simplistic nature of the paragraph suggests that neither editor nor publisher considered how large scale and ambitious such a project might turn out to be. Indeed, the original size of the publication was supposed to be two volumes of not more than six hundred pages each.\(^{42}\) The actual work is four volumes with a total of 3,125 pages, and a 188 page index. The extreme length of the work is mostly due to the rather unbalanced approach in terms of the length of each article, which in turn seems to be characteristic of the individual contributors. For instance, Grove’s article on Schubert runs from page 319 to 382 of volume III, in contrast to Franz Gehrig’s article on the *Lied* which occupies only page 133 of volume II. The work was the subject of numerous critical evaluations. *The Musical Times*, for instance, provided reviews as each section was published and tended not to make very many specific critical comments on the actual content, stating that to do so would be ‘invidious’ because all the articles were signed.\(^{43}\) The reviewers in the *MT*
do not seem concerned about the uneven lengths of the articles – they actually seem to encourage it, stating ‘the editor of this work, although pledged to complete it within a couple of volumes, is resolved not to grudge space for those who are worthy of it’\textsuperscript{44}.

Other reviewers were not so forgiving:

The biographical notices form to the generality of readers, the most interesting portions of such a dictionary. Taking a glance first, then, at this portion of the new dictionary, we are struck by the excellence of some of the biographical articles taken separately, and equally so by their want of proportion when taken collectively and as parts of a whole work. The mere statement of the space occupied respectively by some of the principal biographical essays will indicate what a curious disproportion there is in this particular.\textsuperscript{45}

Statham fairly acknowledges what he sees to be the better aspects of the work before he moves on to be more critical. His most scathing comments are in relation to Parry’s lengthy articles on various aspects of musical form, whom he describes as one of the ‘irrepressible class of writers, inclined to be wordy and diffuse’ and ‘a very strong advocate of some theories which have as yet at least only commanded partial acceptance, and an enthusiastic believer in “progress.”’\textsuperscript{46} Statham’s comments regarding the lengths of the various parts of the dictionary are somewhat harsh, particularly in reference to Parry. Statham seems to have no sympathy with the fact that the work was essentially experimental and that its editor was not a professional musician, and thereby may have had difficulties in prioritising article lengths as well as not possessing the necessary credentials to be able to evaluate the more technical articles (such as the lengthy ones by Parry). That said, Grove would certainly have

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., part II, 336-337 (p. 337)
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., p. 225
had the ability and knowledge to be more forceful with the editing of some of the larger biographical articles, so perhaps in respect of his own interests he was being a little overindulgent in some cases.

In terms of the music of Brahms and how he was perceived by various contributors, the dictionary is an absolute wealth of information. As well as an article relating specifically to the composer, there are a further forty articles across the four volumes which make reference to Brahms, with many using his music for examples illustrating formal and structural musical features. Appendix VI of this study (Vol. II, p. 55) provides a list of articles in which Brahms is referred to. A total of 14 known contributors make references to Brahms, with a further two in the appendix section. The first striking feature about the list is the wide range of articles in which Brahms’s name appears in terms of subject matter, ranging from contributions on form, such as ‘Sonata’ to biographical articles like that of ‘Julius Stockhausen’, indicating that throughout the period of the creation of the dictionary from 1874 onwards, Brahms was clearly seen as a figure worthy of consideration in various aspects of music. The second noticeable aspect of the Brahms entries is the musical education of the principal contributors. Of the British writers, Franklin Taylor, Parry, Rockstro and Frederick Corder all produced some form of compositional output during their careers. Furthermore, all the contributors, with the exception of Ebenezer Prout had some kind of educational link with the Austro-German musical tradition. For instance, Franklin Taylor was educated at the Leipzig Conservatoire from 1859-1861, and Fuller Maitland and Parry both studied with Dannreuther. Such educational links would have undoubtedly affected their judgement and appreciation for music of the
Austro-German tradition and consequently the content of their contributions to the
dictionary.

In terms of the actual content of the dictionary, the natural starting point is to analyse
the article on Brahms as a composer, followed by the ‘second hand’ references in
other articles (the articles by Hubert Parry will be given special attention in Chapter 4
of this study alongside his other musical literary output). The entry specifically on
‘Brahms’ was written by Alfred Maczewski, of whom little is now known other than
his contributions to the first edition of the dictionary. His most famous article in the
first edition of Grove’s dictionary was that on Telemann, which is cited by many
researchers on the composer, such as Steven Zohn and Christine Klein. The article on
Brahms opens with the statement that he was ‘one of the greatest living German
composers’\(^\text{47}\), demonstrating that in spite of some of the negative reviews seen
throughout the 1870s, Brahms was seen by many as a respected composer. However,
it is Maczewski’s comments later in the article which are more interesting:

No comparison between him and Wagner is possible, for Wagner’s fame is entirely founded on his
dramatic works, in which department Brahms has yet done nothing… Brahms takes his stand upon
systematic principles of musical form, upon which indeed his individual characteristics a good deal
depend… He never allows himself to be drawn aside from his main idea, in spite of all the wealth of
episode and secondary thoughts he always has at his command. To this we may refer many of the
prominent peculiarities of his style, such as its formal intensity, and certain original terms of harmony
and modulation… His… abstraction from external things, absorb him so completely in his idea that he
sometimes loses his feeling for beauty of sound… There is an unapproachable asceticism about his

by George Grove (London: Macmillan, 1900), I, pp. 270-271 (p.270)
genius which is opposed to all that is merely pleasing to the ear. He does not court the understanding; he rather demands from it arduous and unwearied service.\textsuperscript{48}

Maczewski seems to be at pains to point out that there should be no comparison between Brahms and Wagner, undoubtedly fuelled by the division between the ‘new German school’ of Wagner and Liszt and the more traditional approach of Schumann Brahms and Joachim, started in Germany by the Brahms-Joachim manifesto which was discussed in the previous Chapter of this study. In terms of a technical evaluation of Brahms’s music, his most astute observation is that of Brahms’s total focus on the ‘main idea’ in his work from which he is never distracted. One assumes that Maczewski is referring to Brahms’s constant reference to his principal themes throughout his compositions in various guises, a feature which becomes more pronounced from around Op. 25 onwards, and would certainly be being displayed in his output arriving in England during the 1870s (e.g. the \textit{Haydn Variations}, Op. 56a; the C minor String Quartet, Op. 51/1; the Schumann Variations, Op. 9; and the Second Symphony, Op. 73). Maczewski’s reference to Brahms’s ‘abstraction’ from external factors is surely an early reference to Brahms’s compositions being categorised as ‘absolute music’ (presumably in contrast to the programmatic music of Wagner). He also rightly observes the difficulty of Brahms’s music aurally and intellectually in his comment about its ‘arduous demands’ upon the human understanding and intellect. Indeed, this is possibly the most accurate evaluation of Brahms which was available at this time, and actually partially confirms the conjectures put forward in Chapter 1 of this study, regarding exactly why the British public did not readily accept the composer’s music. Maczewski concludes with a ‘current’ list of Brahms’s published compositional output, which at the point the

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.
article was published in July 1878, finished at the Second Symphony, Op. 73 (premiered in England a few months later on 5 October 1878). By the time the original dictionary was complete in the spring of 1887, an update on the composer was required and thus provided in the appendix (edited by Fuller Maitland and published between 1888 and 1889), listing subsequent compositions and further biographical information.

The remainder of the articles referring to Brahms can be divided into two categories. The first is those in which Brahms is mentioned briefly in passing as an exponent of a particular type of composition (e.g. the Part-Song) or in relation to his links to particular musicians or institutions (e.g. Eduard Marxen and the Gesellschaft der Musikfreund respectively). Second, and more important, are the articles in which the authors subject Brahms’s music to more substantial analyses in order to clarify their discussion, or discuss his compositional style in relation to the aesthetics of the period. Excluding the contributions of Parry, these articles are:

1) ‘Accent’ (Ebenezer Prout)
2) ‘Magyar (Hungarian) Music’ (J.A. Fuller Maitland)
3) ‘Romantic’ (Mrs Wodehouse)

In the first article, ‘Accent’, Prout discusses the different methods by which composers draw attention to ‘prominent’ notes, likening music to the rhythms and inflections of speech in his initial definition. He then discusses various means of achieving particular musical effects through the use of accents. Brahms is discussed in relation to displacing meter through accents:

Another displacement of accent is sometimes found in modern compositions, bearing some resemblance to these already noticed. It consists in so arranging the accents in triple time as to make
two bars sound like one bar of double length; e.g., two bars of 3-8 like one of 3-4, or two of 3-4 like one of 3-2... Of the modern employment of this artifice the following examples will suffice:-

Brahms 'Schicksalslied'

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Wie Wasser von Klippe zu Klippe ge worden} \\
&\text{Wie Wasser von Klippe zu Klippe ge worden}
\end{align*}
\]

Brahms’s passage is constructed on a sequence of three notes, giving the effect of 3-2 time...

In terms of analytical standards today, Prout’s example and discussion are very brief, although it must be remembered that this work was intended for non-musicians, so simplicity and brevity were almost certainly likely to be desirable features. However, it does illustrate a common Brahmsian musical trait of displacing meter through accent and/or syncopation, a feature which is prominent from his earliest compositions, for example in the opening of the second of the Opus 10 Ballades, and in the central section of the third.

It is the notion of accent and metrical displacement which forms the basis of Brahms’s entry in Fuller Maitland’s article on Hungarian Music. Maitland identifies two principal features of the Hungarian style worthy of inclusion in the article: rhythms, and turns and embellishments, of which Brahms’s music is the central focus in the former. The author maintains that ‘the great distinctive feature of the bar rhythms is syncopation, generally consisting of the accentuation of the second quaver in the bar of 2-4 time… but sometimes extending over larger spaces, as in No. 2 of the Ungarische Tänze of Brahms, bars 1-2, 5-6 etc., where the syncopation extends over

\[49\] Ebenezer Prout ‘Accent’ in Dictionary of Music and Musicians, I, pp. 12-17 (p, 14)
Figure 2.1 demonstrates exactly what Maitland is referring to. The two areas of the score in bars 1-2 and 5-6 encased in the squares, demonstrate an emphasis on the final quaver of bar 1 and 5 respectively, as a result of it being tied to the first beat of the next bar. Maitland’s observations are further emphasised by the more conventional, simpler syncopation in the left hand in bars 3 and 4, thus meaning that the technique is employed constantly across the opening 6 bars. Therefore Prout and Maitland have independently and through different means, demonstrated the association of metrical displacement with the music of Brahms. It may well have been the composer’s regular habit of using such techniques which was partially responsible for his initial lack of popularity, as the syncopation and metrical displacement would certainly have made the music aurally much more difficult to follow, particularly when used in conjunction with Brahms’s often dense thematic development and unusual harmony (both of which are discussed by Parry in relation to Brahms in his own contributions to the dictionary). One must also remember that the listener would probably not have had the luxury of a score. Indeed, Mrs Wodehouse’s article entitled ‘Romantic’ suggests exactly that. She maintains that ‘Brahms’s romanticism generally lies too
deep to be discovered without attentive and sympathetic study’, and that ‘its presence would wholly escape the unpractised eye and ear’. Whilst Mrs Wodehouse does not refer specifically to any compositions by Brahms, her words put into context the general comments seen in the reviews of performances of Brahms in England, and when coupled with the analyses of Prout and Fuller Maitland, the long period of time which it took for Brahms to gain acceptance with British audiences in the nineteenth century is certainly not as difficult to comprehend as it is upon first glance.

2.6: Grove, the National Training School for Music, and Brahms at the Royal College of Music

The final aspect of George Grove’s achievements which cannot be ignored in the context of this study is the establishment and subsequent success of the Royal College of Music. Whilst the developments in musical education may not seemingly be directly linked to Brahms’s arrival and reception in England, the timing of the developments, principally in the establishment of the RCM alongside the redevelopment of music degrees in the universities would seem to have created yet another instance of favourable timing and resultant conditions for the acceptance of Brahms in British musical circles, as well as the potential for his music to have influenced the subsequent increase in British compositional output in the second half of the nineteenth century. The education system in England until the second half of the century was inconsistent to say the least (particularly in schools). However, the inconsistencies in the provisions of musical education extended to the universities and conservatories as well. The first serious attempt to set up a national training school for music in Britain first occurred in 1822 with the founding of the Royal Academy of

50 Mrs Edmond Wodehouse, ‘Romantic’ in Dictionary of Music and Musicians, III, pp. 148-152 (p. 152)
Music by aristocratic amateur music lovers, led by Lord Burghersh\textsuperscript{51}. The RAM encountered many obstacles from its foundation. Giles Brightwell has produced substantial work on the development of the RAM and RCM and proffers the following explanation for the RAM’s initial lack of success:

Bedevilled from its inception, the RAM had been founded without any consultation or cooperation from leaders of the musical profession. As an indifferent amateur composer, the qualifications of the Chief founder, Lord Burghersh, to head an institution which claimed to afford facilities for attaining perfection in music was questionable. Indeed the inclusion of not a single musician on the Board of Directors or any of the committees did little to endear the RCM to the profession or the general public.\textsuperscript{52}

As well as the lack of trained musicians involved in the organisation of the RAM, the institution was entirely reliant on student fees for its survival, and, as a private institution, it was apparently ‘ridden with bureaucracy’, which thus limited its ability to provide a secure solution to Britain’s musical profession.\textsuperscript{53} In light of Brightwell’s research, the lack of success of the RAM should not really have been unexpected, particularly as its ambitious original intention was to create an environment ‘to train indigenous musicians to compete successfully for employment with foreigners\textsuperscript{54}, as well as ‘to provide Britain with a worthy successor to Purcell.\textsuperscript{55} The evidence of the failure of the institution is abundantly apparent in the fact that the subsequent generation of England’s prominent musicians largely studied in other countries or

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{51} Bernarr Rainbow, ‘Music in Education’, in \textit{The Romantic Age} (pp. 29-45), p. 35
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., p. 11
\textsuperscript{55} Brightwell, ‘In Search of a Nation’s Music’, p. 253
\end{flushleft}
privately with foreign musicians (for example, Parry, Stanford and many of the contributors to the first edition of *Grove’s Dictionary of Music and Musicians* discussed earlier in the Chapter), and had virtually nothing to do with the RAM during their early years.

That said, in spite of the troubled fortunes and the seemingly laughable reputation of the RAM, it is well known that the first performance in England of Brahms’s *Requiem* was obtained by one of the teachers (Lady Thompson) on 10 July, 1871, demonstrating that the institution was not entirely without momentum, although by 1871, the Liberal victory in the general election of 1868 had meant that government financial support was restored to the RAM, thus giving it a more solid foundation.\(^{56}\) Furthermore, several major British premières of Brahms’s music had already occurred and the Crystal Palace concert series was well established, so the private performance in question was probably not very difficult to organise.

The establishment of the Royal College of Music ultimately changed the fortune and quality of music teaching, composition and performance in Britain. The idea for a national training school for music in London, originated as early as 1854, whilst Britain was still basking in the huge success of the Great Exhibition.\(^{57}\) The endeavour was ambitious and very difficult. The awkward nature of the project seems to have been brought about by several factors. The first was Prince Albert’s death in 1861, with the subsequent responsibility of the venture being transferred to Henry Cole, whose plan was initially to use the ailing RAM as a starting point for the new school. As Brightwell logically suggests, ‘Cole remained committed to the idea that any new

---

\(^{56}\) Brightwell, ‘One Equal Music’, p. 22

\(^{57}\) Rainbow, ‘Music in Education’, p. 38
school of music should be formed as an ‘outgrowth’ of the senior institution.\textsuperscript{58}

Second, after the RAM refused to accept the inevitable restructuring of their complex administration and management organisation that such a project would entail, Cole was forced to ‘establish the national training school as an independent venture.’\textsuperscript{59}

Indeed, such plans were discussed in a meeting on 29 May, 1873 at Clarence House, and the National Training School for Music (effectively the predecessor of the RCM) was opened in 1876 with Arthur Sullivan as principal, essentially as a five year project:

The School opened in 1876, its premises rent-free and its scholarships endowed only for the next five years. By that time, it was believed, the Academy would agree to merge with the flourishing new conservatory. But that aspiration was disappointed in 1878 when Macfarren… refused to relinquish the Academy’s Charter. Immediately the future of the National School was itself placed in jeopardy; and new plans were formed to replace it with a more permanently endowed Royal College of Music distinguished by the presidency of the Prince of Wales.\textsuperscript{60}

As previous research on the topic demonstrates, the RAM was not particularly co-operative with regard to the NTSM and refused all attempts to merge with it. Grove’s association with the new RCM concept was at the instigation of the Prince of Wales, who saw his potential primarily as a result of his abilities as a fund raiser, which were demonstrated at fund raising meetings for the venture in the couple of years leading up to the eventual opening of the RCM\textsuperscript{61}. Unlike the NTSM, the RCM was to accept fee paying students. The College eventually opened officially on 7 May 1883 with Grove as the first principal. The opening event is recalled in the June 1883 edition of

\textsuperscript{58} Brightwell, ‘One Equal Music’, p. 25

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., p. 26

\textsuperscript{60} Rainbow, ‘Music in Education’, p. 38

\textsuperscript{61} Brightwell, ‘One Equal Music’, p. 90
the *Monthly Musical Record* and the August 1883 edition of the *Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*.

In terms of the music of Brahms, the fourth chapter of Brightwell’s thesis on the RCM is suggestively entitled ‘The RCM at work: a “Brahms Cult”?’, immediately suggesting a bias of the institution not mentioned in any other publications on the subject. In his introduction to the chapter, he maintains that ‘Grove’s visits to Germany and Austria during the vacations and his appointment of respected European pedagogues as examiners, whose sympathies were attuned to the Brahmsian idiom, ensured the RCM’s reputation for excellence soon spread across the Continent.’

Indeed, Grove’s appointment of Joachim as one of the examiners is almost certain to have been the principal factor which cemented the reputation of Brahms into the lives of the scholars at the College. Furthermore, a concert series was implemented from 1884, in which works principally from the Austro-German canon were selected for performance.

The initial curriculum at the RCM under Grove was strict and broad, with all staff apparently embracing ‘the concept that the students’ education should be as broad as possible and not merely restricted to their individual instruments.’ The weekly timetable of lessons was as follows:

---

62 Ibid., p. 150
63 Ibid., p. 151
64 Ibid., p. 150
Within this curriculum, the disciplines of composition and performance crossed over at the instigation of Stanford:

Stanford’s ethos in ensuring that student compositions were performed as part of the RCM fortnightly concerts was allied to the principle that the students in the College orchestra should be exposed to ‘everything old and new (provided that it was genuine music), irrespective of all individual likes and dislikes, and so to make themselves competent to join any orchestra after completing their studies with a fair measure of knowledge of any music they would be called upon to play’ was a conscious decision.66

As well as providing the players with the skills that they would need to compete with players from foreign conservatories (which the RAM initially failed to do), such practices would also have the advantage of ensuring that the players were more receptive to a variety of new music.

Indeed, the evidence from the concert series itself is very revealing. The success of the concert series seems to have been its accessibility and flexibility. As Brightwell suggests, the series ‘was to become the RCM’s shop window’ and was open to subscribers, music critics and the general public. The concerts were also free for

---

65 Report to the Council to the First Annual General Meeting of the Corporation (28 May 1884), RCMA, p. 39, quoted in Brightwell ‘One Equal Music’, p. 152
66 Stanford, Pages from an Unwritten Diary, p. 220, quoted in Brightwell ‘One Equal Music’, p. 155
students, thus providing a cheaper alternative to many of London’s ‘prohibitively expensive’ concert venues. The concerts were reviewed regularly in both specialist musical publications such as the MT and the MMR, as well as mainstream publications, which, according to Brightwell, ‘allowed those who might have had reservations about attending performances at the RCM to sample the prevailing view before committing themselves to a live performance’. Brightwell has catalogued all the content of every concert from 1884 to 1895 (i.e. during Grove’s time as principal while the College’s identity and reputation was developing). The music of Brahms was a firm favourite from the outset. In the first series for instance, between June 1884 and December 1885 the following pieces of Brahms were included in the series:

1) Brahms Piano Trio (Allegro) – 12 November, 1884
2) Ballade in D major (Op. 10, No. 1) – 18 December, 1884
3) ‘O versenk’ dein Lieb’ (Op. 3, No. 1) – 5 February 1885
4) Hungarian Dance in G minor, arranged by Joachim – 2 July, 1885
5) Serenade in D, Op. 11 – 21 December, 1885

The inclusion of such pieces as these is impressive for several reasons. First, at this point, the RCM was still a new institution and the inclusion of such ‘new’ works indicates the forward thinking and confident mindset of the teaching staff. Furthermore, to expect students to tackle pieces of this nature and complexity (particularly the Piano Trio and the Serenade) is impressive by any standards, and further indicates the exacting standards which Grove expected from the students, scholars and teaching staff. Throughout the 1880s, the Brahms works included in the series became more ambitious. They included the full Piano Quartet, Op. 26 (17 March, 1887), Academic Festival Overture, Op. 80 (21 December, 1887), the Piano
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Quintet in F minor, Op. 34 (10 December, 1888), and the Fourth Symphony, Op. 98 (13 December, 1888). Even though the performances were considerably later than the original British premières of the pieces, they serve to show that as a result of the staff at the RCM, and particularly Stanford, the music of Brahms was cemented in their concert repertoire from the outset. The effect of this is likely to have been significant. As well as giving performers the technical ability and experience to compete for work with their foreign counterparts, it is also likely to have affected the composition students, particularly those studying under Stanford. Indeed, there is much evidence in favour of this notion available in Stanford’s written works, which will be examined in detail in Chapter 4 of this study. These performances would also have been accessed by subscribers and the general public, thus exposing a large number of people to the music of Brahms, providing an invaluable opportunity for the composer to gain recognition in England.

The other crucial figure whose association with the supposed ‘Brahms cult’ at the RCM is inevitable is Joseph Joachim. As Chapter 1 demonstrated, Joachim was a tireless advocate of Brahms’s music in England throughout his career and this extended to his work at the RCM:

Joachim’s polarised Brahmsian view soon reared its head when he and Ouseley were invited to examine the student composers at the College. ‘Joachim none too agreeable’ Parry wrote irritably in his diary, ‘Got it into his head that McCunn was influenced by Wagner and said “he has been subjected to pernicious influence.”’

---

Other than this particular incident, there is not really much more similar evidence of a supposed bias toward Brahms. However, as discussed earlier, the concert series certainly reveals a fondness for the composer. Appendix VII of this study (Vol. II, p. 58) isolates from Brightwell’s work the performances of Brahms’s music at the College during this period. As the tables demonstrate, many of Brahms’s major orchestral and chamber works were performed during this time, most notably the four symphonies and the larger scale chamber works, such as the Op. 25 and 26 Quartets, the Op. 34 Quintet and the Clarinet Quintet Op. 115. Of these specific pieces, one of the most notable is the Clarinet Quintet which was performed at the RCM on 30 June, 1892, only three months after its British première on 28 March, 1892, demonstrating and confirming that the 1890s was a period of ‘consolidation’ for the institution, reflecting Grove’s success in establishing the College as a ‘formidable presence in the music profession.’ However, it was not just the RCM that was instrumental in its encouragement of the performance of Brahms’s music. Outside London, the university towns of Oxford and Cambridge also provided excellent opportunities for performances of Brahms’s music.

2.7: The University Challenge: Oxford and Cambridge

Musical education at Oxford and Cambridge seems to have been non existent until the nineteenth century. Bernarr Rainbow describes how the initial ‘un-musical’ situation developed at Oxford and Cambridge:

At Oxford, the William Heather Chair of Music was established in 1626. By the eighteenth century, however, the invariable practice was to appoint one of the college organists as professor, with debilitating results. Apart from playing at university ceremonies, the professor’s only duties at a
meagre, unchanging salary of £12 per annum, were to compose choral odes marking particular occasions and to examine degree exercises. Applicants for degrees in music until the middle of the nineteenth century were required only to submit as an exercise a choral work with orchestral accompaniment and undertake its public performance at their own expense...The situation at Cambridge during the period under review was roughly similar. The chair of music was founded in 1668, and in the eighteenth century had generally been occupied by organists; the position carried no salary.  

In relation to the standards of musical education available in the university sector today, such a situation is unthinkable. Rainbow goes on to discuss how the situation changed in Oxford and Cambridge, principally thanks to the work of William Crotch at Oxford and Thomas Attwood Walmisley at Cambridge. Rainbow’s thesis is based on the premise that the Victorian era was one in which musical education was regained after it had been lost at the Reformation, coupled with the desire of optimistic Victorians not to be outdone by their European counterparts. Oxford and Cambridge subsequently went through a period of change, with a number of crucial figures holding their positions as chair of music, including Frederick Ouseley (1855-1889), John Stainer (1889-1900) and Parry (1900-1908) at Oxford, and Sterndale Bennett (1856-1875) Macfarren (1875-1887) and Stanford (1887-1924) at Cambridge. All of these figures contributed to the improvements of music teaching and examination in the universities. At Oxford, however, the principal improvements appear to have been carried out by Ouseley, with a new examination scheme implemented in the late 1850s, which included a viva voce examination for all degree candidates. In 1871, the B.Mus degree syllabus was expanded and divided into two parts. The first was in harmony and counterpoint held in the Michaelmas Term, which

---
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acted as a preliminary to the second part held in the Easter term, which tested advanced harmony and counterpoint, music history, forms, and set works.\textsuperscript{73} A similar situation developed at Cambridge, with Bennett’s appointment occurring a year after Ouseley’s, with a similar system of examination being implemented, Bennett’s justification being that the degrees conferred by Cambridge ‘should be equal in reputation to those of the sister university’\textsuperscript{74}. Under Stanford, further reforms were made, the most notable being compulsory residency for all Mus.B candidates for a minimum of nine terms, the introduction of the new Master of Music (Mus.M) degree, and a new set of regulations for the Doctor of Music (Mus.Doc) degree, placing it on a par with Doctorates in Science and Letters\textsuperscript{75}. Admittedly, these changes in themselves are not necessarily directly related to the advancement and progress of the music of Brahms in England. However, the changes must be viewed in conjunction with the advancements in musical activity across the country in the late nineteenth century, as well as the strong Brahmsian devotion of two of the chairmen of each university department – Parry and Stanford. Indeed, nowhere was this more apparent than in the Cambridge University Music Society Concerts.

There is only a limited amount of research available on the CUMS concert series in the nineteenth century. Gerald Norris has produced work which focuses on the jubilee celebrations of 1877 when Joachim and Brahms were invited to receive honorary doctorates from the university. The central difficulty of Norris’s monograph \textit{Stanford, The Cambridge Jubilee and Tchaikovsky} is that he does not indicate any sources for his research throughout the publication and merely presents a selective bibliography
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at the end, thereby making the reliability of his work very difficult to evaluate. As a result of this publication, nearly all of the small amount of research regarding the performance of Brahms as CUMS tends to focus on this event. For instance, Michael Musgrave in his article ‘Brahms and England’ only discusses this event with regard to the performance of the composer’s music at Cambridge, and notably Stanford’s disappointment when he discovered the Brahms would not be attending the celebrations. Jeremy Dibble also provides an account of the jubilee events in his monograph on Stanford. However, as the monograph is a biographical one, Dibble is unable to reflect on the repertoire in anything but the smallest detail.

Research for this project has revealed that as well as the music selected for the jubilee celebrations, there was a very wide variety of Brahms’s music performed at Cambridge from 1870 onwards. The university has archived all the surviving concert programmes of the society from the nineteenth century. Appendix VIII of this study (Vol. II, p. 61) provides a comprehensive list of all known performances of Brahms’s music at the CUMS concerts. There are some gaps in the archive, the most substantial being from 1869 to 1872, in which there could well have been performances of Brahms’s music. However, performances of his music really began to gather momentum during the late 1870s and 1880s. The first definite performance of his music was the Ungarische Tänze (WoO 1) on 27 November, 1873, the year in which Stanford became conductor of the society.

The Brahmsian repertoire performed at Cambridge varied greatly and probably more so than any of the other concert venues discussed thus far. Part of the reason for this is

76 Programme of CUMS 139th concert, 27 November, 1873
certainly that of the available archives, the CUMS programmes are one of the most complete, which allows one an often uninterrupted study of the repertoire performed at the concert series. If anything, Appendix VIII reveals a bias towards chamber music and *lieder*. The programmes also give some insight as to who the performers were, although this information is not always given throughout the series. Information of this nature only seems to be given when the performer was someone of international standing, such as Joachim’s performance of the Violin Concerto at the 172\textsuperscript{nd} concert on 7 March, 1882\textsuperscript{77} or Fanny Davies and Joachim’s participation in the F minor Quintet, Op. 34 at the 224\textsuperscript{th} concert on 27 February, 1896\textsuperscript{78}. The ability of the society to attract such world class performers was undoubtedly due to Stanford’s connections in London. Coupled with the improvements being carried out to the degree courses, it is perhaps not as surprising as it may first appear that the society was attempting such demanding repertoire on a regular basis.

It is also interesting to note from study of the archive that some of the programmes contain analytical notes in relation to certain pieces. Notes were nearly always provided for symphonic pieces. In some cases (but by no means all), the authors name was provided at the end of the notes. One of the most interesting of these is the appearance of ‘G’ and ‘A.M.’ in certain programmes, suggesting, of course, Grove and Manns, whose programme notes were discussed earlier in this chapter. For instance, Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony was performed at the 162\textsuperscript{nd} Concert on 20 May, 1879, with an analysis of over thirty pages and bears the initial ‘G.’ The lengthy nature of the analysis coupled with the timing of the concert coinciding with work on the first dictionary suggest that its author is unlikely to have been anyone other than
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Grove. Furthermore, the analytical note of the Tragic Overture (Op. 81), performed at the 181st concert of the society on June 10, 1884, bears the initials ‘A.M.’. It is a logical assumption that the society may have used analyses by Grove and Manns, based on their successful London performances of the same pieces. The other orchestral analyses were probably written by Stanford.

The universities place and progression within the context of the British concert scene as a whole can be seen in the reports in the musical journals of the period. During the 1850s, 1860s, and indeed a large portion of the 1870s the journals did not pay any specific attention to the institutions. If either Oxford or Cambridge were mentioned, it was within larger articles detailing musical activities outside London. A typical example can be seen in *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular* in an article entitled ‘Brief Summary of Country News’, in which they provide the following report: ‘Oxford – on 17th ult. The University Club gave a morning concert in Wadham College hall. The programme comprised instrumental compositions by Mendelssohn, Beethoven, Mozart… and vocal pieces by Brahms and Schubert’. The brevity of the report is typical of the treatment of such concerts at this point by the musical journals, not venturing to provide any opinion on the chosen repertoire, or the quality of the performance. By the 1880s however, the musical publications evidently deemed the universities – and in particular Cambridge – worthy of their own articles when discussing concert news across England. The bias towards Cambridge is almost certainly to have been in part the result of the success of Joachim’s honorary degree ceremony and subsequent performance in 1877. For example:

---
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Brahms’s motet consists of a chorale, first given in free five-part harmony, and then announced phrase after phrase as a kind of plain-song by the first basses, while the other parts accompany with the same theme contrapuntally treated. All this is scholarly and interesting, but the greatest charm of the piece lies in its coda which may be described as simply beautiful.\footnote{Cambridge University Musical Society, The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular, 21 (1880), 28}

As the quotation demonstrates, by this point, the reports on performances of Brahms’s music at Cambridge were of a similar calibre to those that one might witness in a review from a programme of music at the Crystal Palace or other similar institution in London. The most noticeable difference between the two MT reviews presented in this portion of the chapter is that the author of the latter was obviously present at the performance in Cambridge, based on his specific references to the motet. Whereas the indifferent tone earlier article relating to the performance at Oxford, merely states the composers whose music was played at the concert, strongly suggesting that the author was not present at the performance. This provides further evidence of the improvements in musical performance and education at Cambridge itself, as well as throughout the country as a whole which helped Brahms’s music to flourish. Indeed, the move in the focus of the discussion to areas outside London leads very conveniently on to another crucially relevant aspect of British musical life of this period in relation to Brahms reception – the English provincial musical festival.

**2.8: Brahms in the Provinces**

There has been a depressing lack of research carried out on the influence of provincial performances and festivals on British musical life, apart, of course, from the activity by Hallé in Manchester. The research for this project has revealed that provincial musical performances, other than those initiated by Hallé in Manchester played an
important role in the promotion of the performance of the music of Brahms outside London and the university towns. The only available publication specifically devoted to the topic as a whole is Pippa Drummond’s monograph *The Provincial Music Festival in England 1784-1914*, published in 2011. Drummond also produced an article in 2008 which seems to act as an introductory piece to the more detailed content of the book. Aside from Drummond’s work, there are a scattering of articles across various journals by authors such as Catherine Dale and David Russell, which are case studies of festivals in individual towns such as Bradford and Bridlington. Whilst neither of Drummond’s publications mentions the music of Brahms in anything other than the briefest terms, her work does give a very useful indication of how the major festivals evolved:

The extraordinary growth of the music festival in the nineteenth century cannot be viewed in isolation for it was obviously dependent on the wide ranging economic and social changes taking place over the country as a whole. Among the factors creating a suitable environment for the development of festivals was the rapid industrialisation of larger towns (particularly in the Midlands and the North) with their resultant increase in population. Even improved transport systems in the shape of new railway networks played an indirect role in facilitating the movement of performers from London to the provinces and vice versa. On the social front, the singing school movement and the rise of choral societies provided and important stimulus for the establishment and continuance of festivals. Another factor contributing to the success of the festival movement was the emergence of civic pride which led to the building of monumental town halls (often launches with a ‘Grand Musical Festival’) and the development of a culture of constructive competition between cities. Finally, the so-called Victorian ethos with its emphasis on self improvement, education and philanthropy may also have played a part.81

Drummond’s comprehensive overview of the reason of the success of festivals in the
nineteenth century is logical in view of the developments which occurred in Britain
throughout the century. She draws particular attention to the fact that the festivals
played an important role in the ‘promotion and dissemination of new music’\textsuperscript{82},
including many second, third and fourth performances of Brahms after the London
premieres. Indeed, the forward looking nature of the programmes at the festivals is
almost certainly related to the fact that improvements to the British transport network
enabled London based performers and conductors to go and perform in smaller towns
(for example Stanford’s famous association with the Leeds festival). Her monograph
is divided into two principal sections, the first of which deals with the evolution of the
festivals chronologically, and the second examines the more technical aspects of their
production such as engagement of performers, finance and programming. The
evolution of the festivals, she argues, dates back as far as 1784 with the London
Handel commemoration concerts twenty five years after the composer’s death\textsuperscript{83}. From
that point developed the important ‘Three Choirs’ festival which was the earliest of
the provincial meetings, leading on to significant city festivals such as those of York
and Birmingham towards the end of the eighteenth century. By the end of the
nineteenth century, almost every town of any importance or pretention was promoting
its own music festival\textsuperscript{84}.

In terms of specific references to the music of Brahms in the British provinces and the
increasing importance of provincial music making throughout the nineteenth century,
the answers, yet again, lie in the newspaper publications and specialist musical journal
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articles published throughout the period. During the 1850s and 1860s, long after the establishment of festivals in places such as Chester, York, Bristol, Bath, Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, Newcastle upon Tyne, Halifax, Hull, Sheffield, Leeds, Norwich and Derby, the musical publications (particularly the *MT* and the *MW*) adopted the habit of discussing musical activity anywhere outside London under single ‘umbrella’ articles with titles such as ‘Brief Chronicle of last Month’ or ‘Brief Summary of Country News’, without devoting very much attention or time to the details of the events and not really providing any sort of opinion on the events. For example, in the article ‘Brief Chronicle of Last Month’ in *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular* in the issue dated October 1, 1854, several musical events in provincial towns are recounted, with the following being a typical example: ‘Leeds – a complimentary concert, by the members of the Madrigal and Motett Society was given last week in the Leeds Music Hall, to Mr J.L. Hatton, the talented composer. The audience was a large and respectable one’. On the other hand, if one compares this to a review from the same journal later in the century, there is a marked difference:

The symphony was a comparative novelty to Liverpool, being Brahms’s No. 4 in E minor, and the palpable effect which its rendering left upon the minds of the audience, was that it would be premature to pronounce a definite opinion without a further hearing. The work is classical and interesting, but whilst capable of minute analysis, does not contain those dashes of fire and inspiration which we naturally look for in Brahms productions. It, however, does not lack variety, as it abounds in rhythmic changes, modulations, and variations of themes, and the third movement, Allegro Giocoso in the Rondo form instead of the conventional Scherzo is an interesting and effective innovation.

---
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The differences between these two reviews of provincial music are substantial. The first notable difference is the title of the second article which is called ‘Music in Liverpool’. At this point in the late 1880s, musical performances in the provincial towns and cities were obviously deemed of sufficient importance for larger towns to have their own specific articles in the publications. The principal reason for this is almost certainly related to Drummond’s assertion that as time progressed, the festivals became a vehicle for the display of new music. In relation to Brahms’s music, the only known provincial British première was that of the *Haydn Variations*, Op. 56b in Manchester. However, provincial areas became quite prominent in securing the second, third or fourth performances of his works. The above review of Liverpool is a case in point, as this is the first recorded performance of the Fourth Symphony outside London, occurring nearly two years before Hallé’s first performance of the work in Manchester in 1889. As the review demonstrates, the performance was reviewed critically in a similar manner to the type witnessed in relation to Crystal Palace, the Richter Concerts or the Philharmonic Society, demonstrating that from a musical journalistic point of view, the provinces at this point were viewed as being almost equal in importance to London concert venues. Indeed, by the 1890s, performances of Brahms’s music were happening every month across Britain. For example, in the month preceding the April 1890 edition of *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*, the following performances of Brahms outside London were deemed worthy of review in the journal with separate entries:
1) Violin Sonata in D minor (Op. 108) and Ungarische Tänze (WoO 1) – Birmingham
2) Unnamed ‘instrumental’ works - Dublin
3) Trio in E flat (Op. 40) – Edinburgh
4) Violin Sonata in A (Op. 100) – Oxford
5) Unnamed songs – Yorkshire
6) Second Symphony in D (Op. 73) - Cambridge

As this list demonstrates, along with the review of Liverpool, a wide variety of Brahms was being played in the provinces towards the end of the century. Furthermore, performances such as these would have enabled people outside the confines of the British capital to become acquainted with Brahms’s music, which would have undoubtedly played a massive role in its wider acceptance into the general canon of British musical repertoire which can be seen in abundance by the end of the nineteenth century.

2.9: Conclusion

This chapter has provided an examination and explanation of the crucial political, educational and contextual points which led to the introduction, continuation and eventual acceptance of the music of Brahms into British musical life in the nineteenth century. As demonstrated, the political situation in Britain and across Europe was far from straightforward. However, certain elements of this complex web of activity provided fertile ground on which a Brahms repertoire could be established in England, starting with the immigration of foreign musicians to England during the European riots, coupled with the invaluable contributions and encouragement from the ‘German element’ of the British monarchy. The Great Exhibition seems to have acted as a catalyst (albeit an indirect one) for improvements in musical education which then progressed virtually unhindered throughout the second half of the century.
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allowing the music of Brahms to spread and flourish across the country. There was also an increase in writing about Brahms’s music, such as Elgar’s letters to The Malvern Chronicle on Brahms’s chamber music. By far the most impressive factor in Brahms’s success is that unlike his ‘predecessor’ in England – Mendelssohn – one must constantly remember that the elusive composer never actually visited England, and yet towards the end of the century, his music could almost certainly be said to have attained a similar scale of popularity to that of Mendelssohn.

All of the data and information and data discussed throughout this chapter would suggest that it is very likely that the rising new breed of nineteenth century British composers could well have been influenced by Brahms in their own output. Indeed, nearly every book devoted to some form of historical discussion of late nineteenth century British music encourages the idea that Brahms’s music was a dominant influence and driving force behind the country’s compositional output. The next chapter of this study will therefore examine historical literature relating to the period as a whole, as well as individual composers in order to try and shed some light on exactly how musicologists and historians believe this influence is manifested in the British composers’ works.
Chapter 3: Subject of Influence: The ‘Brahms Effect’ in Biographical and General Literature on Nineteenth Century English Music

‘Stanford and Parry were committed to the Schumann-Brahms tradition and for them this was the direction in which English music had to progress.’¹

3.0: Introduction

Perhaps unsurprisingly, based on the plethora of material and evidence available regarding Brahms’s introduction and eventual acceptance and admiration in England, the notion that his music influenced musical trends in England – and in particular musical composition – has infiltrated much of the literature relating to the period. The available material is very diverse. Some authors discuss the contributions of individual people or establishments, whilst others attempt to discuss the activity and subsequent outcome of the period as a whole. The sheer scale and diversity of musical activity across England in the late nineteenth century makes the period very difficult to discuss in singular, all-encompassing terms. A number of authors have attempted such studies with varying degrees of success, most of which are based on the famous and controversial term, ‘English Musical Renaissance’ – something of an umbrella term, which attempts to compartmentalise and define the relatively sudden musical developments (particularly in the field of composition) that occurred in the second half of the century. More successful studies tend to focus on the precise location and contributions of specific composers, performers, or critics within the context of the

period as a whole. Nearly every author is keen to suggest the idea that the music of Brahms somehow influenced English musical composition, especially that of Hubert Parry and Charles Villiers Stanford. However, virtually all musicologists and historians rarely venture beyond the most superficial discussion of the matter without providing any sort of evidence to substantiate their claims.

Based on the lack of any specific attempt to discuss the particulars of Brahms’s influence on English composition, a consolidation and evaluation of the relevant available literature is required. Therefore, this chapter will be divided into three principal sections. The first section will examine exactly where the notion of a Brahmsian influence on English composition may have developed, with an examination of journalistic publications of nineteenth century England relating to their compositional output. The second part of the discussion will comprise an evaluation of Brahms within general musicological and historical texts ranging from the nineteenth-century to present day publications in an attempt to glean exactly what musicologists and critics believe was his influence on the musical developments of the period as a whole. Clarification and evaluation of Brahms within the concepts of ‘the land without music’ and the ‘English Musical Renaissance’, both of which have already been encountered in this study is also needed. The third portion of the chapter will be a critical evaluation of nineteenth, twentieth and twenty first century biographical, analytical and critical texts relating primarily to the two composers who have become particularly associated with the Brahmsian aesthetic in their own composition – C. Hubert H. Parry, and Charles Villiers Stanford.
3.1: The Position of Brahms in Literature on English Music of the Late Nineteenth Century I: Performance Reviews and Critics

The first indications of a Brahmsian influence on English composition in the nineteenth century first appear in concert reviews of preliminary performances of new pieces by English composers during the later years of the nineteenth century, especially Parry and Stanford. They are scattered across a number of publications, and it is debatable whether there can be said to be any kind of ‘Brahmsian trend’ in the review publications. However, there would certainly seem to be enough material in these publications to give historical musicologists a point of origin for the notion that Brahms had some kind of influence on English composers, and in particular, Parry and Stanford.

The first notable review in which the notion is discussed is as early as 1877 in relation to the publication of Stanford’s Six Songs (Op. 4), which are described in the following manner: ‘by their seriousness and earnestness of intention betoken German training and German feeling on the part of their composer, if, indeed, they do not stamp him as a disciple of Brahms.’ As one can see from the quotation, the link between the two composers is a fleetingly brief one. The difficulty with the article is that it is not specific regarding the exact nature of the Brahmsian influence on Stanford, other than what the reviewer calls ‘German feeling’, which is not particularly helpful. The opening of the first Op.4 song, ‘Stern mit den goldnen Füsschen’, is as follows:

---

2 ‘Six Songs of Heine, set to Music by Charles Villiers Stanford’, The Monthly Musical Record, 6 (1876), 144
Figure 3.1 gives a good indication of the general style, melodic and harmonic scope of the first song in Stanford’s Op. 4 set. The lyrics are by Heinrich Heine, a poet frequently used in German lied composition, and by Brahms on a number of occasions. Therefore before one has even discussed the music, it is imbued with a ‘German feeling’ by the simple fact that the text is in German. In terms of musical features, there are several which may be considered Brahmsian. In example 3.1, one of the most noticeable Brahmsian features is that Stanford holds the piece over a strong dominant pedal. Brahms lieder frequently contain extended pedal notes, which are always related to the text in some way. In the case of this piece, the first two lines of Heine’s text refer to the serenity of the stars and the importance of not waking the earth at night. Therefore, the use of the dominant is very appropriate, as it surely represents the stars, with the tonic representing the earth below. Indeed, one need look no further than Brahms’s ‘Die Mainacht’ (Op. 43, No. 2), to find the exact same technique used in the opening bars, in which the text refers to ‘the silver moon’. Furthermore, the contrast of the triplet in the vocal line against the straight quavers in the accompaniment occurs in various forms in a number of Brahms songs (such as ‘Therese’). The seemingly simple folk-like melody line also reminds the listener of
the often folk derived melody lines in Brahms’s lieder. This slight analytical digression serves the purpose of providing a brief glimpse of the possible Brahmsian elements in Stanford’s vocal music, as the remainder of this study will focus principally on chamber and orchestral works.

The next principal instance of a Brahmsian influence is in relation to a review of Parry’s Quartet in A flat, which, according to Parry’s principal biographer, Jeremy Dibble, was first published in 1884\(^3\). This correlates with the two reviews of the piece, both of which appeared in December 1883 and January 1884. The 1884 review is in *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*. The review by and large is quite negative, with its anonymous author claiming that it is ‘inferior’ in comparison to some of his other works, and rather pointedly suggest that the relatively small audience at the concert may have been in part to do with the choice of this work. However, the most revealing comment of the review is the following:

The composer from whom he has obtained most of his inspiration in the present instance is undoubtedly Brahms, but in some respects he has gone beyond his model. Brahms is prone to clothe his themes with accompaniments which render their outline misty and indistinct; but Mr Parry merges subjects and details together with irritating persistence, the ear becoming wearied in the effort to follow the music through all the intricacies of its path.\(^4\)

Again, the reviewer is clearly unimpressed by the Brahmsian influence which Parry seems to have adopted and developed, which seems to be ‘merging subjects and details together with irritating persistence’ thus making the ear feel ‘wearied’.\(^5\) Unlike many of the reviews of Brahms’s music we have witnessed in this study, in this

---
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instance, the reviewer discusses the exact aspect of the work that he does not like, which seems to be the concentration and development of a single musical idea. This is something that Brahms has become famous for in present day musicological discussion. There is also a review of the performance in *The Times*, in which the reviewer describes the piece as one of ‘high aim and serious import, free from any concession to the taste of the vulgar.’ These comments are much more positive than the general tone of the journal reviewer’s comments. The newspaper reviewer also comments that Parry’s works ‘frequently appeal to the mind rather than to the heart, even as do those of his favourite master and model Johannes Brahms’. He then echoes a comment witnessed in many of the Brahms reviews discussed in Chapter 1 of this study by saying ‘efforts of this class cannot be judged after a single hearing’ and that ‘the structure of his [Parry’s] workmanship is always developed from, and pervaded by, one central idea’. There are some illuminating parallels between the two articles, despite their difference in general tone. The first is that both reviewers seem convinced of the influence of Brahms on the composition. However, both authors actually venture a little further to say that it is the manner in which the one central idea or theme is developed which creates the similarity. Obviously within the context of a review, the authors do not have the space or inclination to develop their ideas further with any form of musical analysis. However, these articles do give the analyst a starting point when looking for the influence of Brahms in the works of British composers. Based on the information in these reviews, and the findings in Parry’s own writings in the next chapter, the quartet will be analytically examined in greater detail in Chapter 5 of this study.
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6 ‘Monday Popular Concerts’, *The Times*, Tuesday 4th December, 1883, p. 10
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid.
Unfortunately, the journal and newspaper reviews are not usually as helpful as those relating to Parry’s quartet in A flat. For instance, the next notable comparison to Brahms occurs in 1887 with Parry’s ‘Blest Pair of Sirens’. The world première performance took place on 17 May, 1887. *The Musical Times* merely commented that the piece ‘is a fine and scholarly piece of writing, full of excellent counterpoint, but always clear, broad and dignified. As usual with this composer, the general style of the music reflects that of Brahms, but in this instance it is Brahms in his more genial mood.’ *The Graphic* newspaper also presents a similar review: ‘The composer is doubtless influenced by Brahms, but his Ode is exceedingly well written, and is undeniably effective.’ The reviewers clearly see Parry’s music as being of good quality. However, the assertion that the ‘general style’ of the music is similar to Brahms, in the case of *The Musical Times*, and that the composer is ‘influenced by Brahms’ in the case of *The Graphic* are rather awkward statements, in that there is no hint given as to exactly which aspects of the piece the critics are referring. It almost appears as if the statements have been made in order to categorise the piece, without due care and attention given to analytical justification.

Stanford’s music was also seen as having a Brahmsian influence in the nineteenth century press publications. The piece which was principally discussed in this context was his Pianoforte Quintet in D minor, Op. 25. The piece was written in 1886 and probably published in the same year, with its debut performance in England occurring in 1887. The notion that the piece was influenced by Brahms first appeared in a review of a performance given by Mlle L. Douste de Fortis on 11 February 1890 in the March edition of the *Monthly Musical Record*: ‘Dr C. Villiers Stanford’s fine

---

9 ‘The Bach Choir’, *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*, 28 (1887), 343-344 (344)
10 ‘Music’, *The Graphic*, 21 May, 1887, p. 543
Quintet for pianoforte and strings in D minor, Op. 25, strongly influenced by Brahms, and originally brought out by the famous Heckmann Quartet. A similar review appears in the January 1891 edition of The Musical Times: ‘Professor Stanford’s Pianoforte Quintet in D minor… is a vigorous and effective work in the style of Brahms…’ These reviews are similar to those of Parry’s Ode, in that they are frustratingly brief and do not give any indication of which Brahmsian stylistic features the piece displays. However, two separate reviewers certainly seem to agree that there is some kind of influence in the music which can be attributed to Brahms. For this reason, this piece will also be subject to a detailed analysis in Chapter 5 of this study, in order to ascertain to what the reviewers are referring.

The preliminary concert reviews discussed so far demonstrate that the idea of a Brahmsian influence on English composition extended as far back as the 1870s, not only while Brahms was still alive, but also while his music was still in the process of establishing itself in England. Indeed, it is very likely that this scattering of articles is one of the principal reasons for the continued presence and prominence of the notion throughout English musical literature in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. However, as the remainder of this chapter will demonstrate, the literature which subsequently developed on nineteenth century English music, particularly throughout the twentieth century is very complex and not as straightforward as its authors might suggest. This in turn makes the evaluation of Brahms’s role within the context of the period rather more difficult to evaluate.

11 ‘Mlle. L. Douste de Fortis’s Concert’, The Monthly Musical Record, 20 (1890), 63
12 ‘Mr Gompertz’s Concerts, The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular, 32 (1891), 26
3.2: The Position of Brahms in Literature on English Music of the Late Nineteenth Century II: Monographs and Articles

There have been a number of attempts to provide a comprehensive study of musical activity in England in the late nineteenth century. The first attempts were produced in the last few years of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries with *History of English Music* by Henry Davey (1895), *English Music in the XIXth Century* by John Alexander Fuller Maitland (1902) and *Thirty Years of Music in England* by Hermann Klein (1903). From then onwards, there was a steady stream of publications on the subject, leading to the wider known efforts from the mid 1960s when Frank Howes produced *The English Musical Renaissance* (1966), followed by *The English Musical Renaissance* by Peter J. Pirie in 1979 and, most recently, *The English Musical Renaissance 1840-1940: Constructing a National Music*, by Meirion Hughes and Robert Stradling (2001). There is also a scattering of recent articles across various journals.

John Alexander Fuller Maitland was one of the most prolific musical writers and critics of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As seen in chapter 2 of this study, he produced articles for the first edition of George Grove’s *Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (1878-90) as well as editing the second edition of the work. He acted as music critic for the *Pall Mall Gazette* (1882-4), the *Guardian* (1884-9), and *The Times* (1889 – 1911). He also produced a number of monographs, including *Music in the XIXth Century* and on Brahms and his music in 1911.

*MUSIC in the XIXth Century* is divided into two principal sections entitled ‘Before the Renaissance (1801 – 1850)’ and ‘The Renaissance (1851-1900)’. Characteristically,
Maitland gives a beautifully written, chronological account of general musical activity in England throughout the nineteenth century. Although he refers to many specific compositions produced during this time period, he does not engage in any kind of technical analysis or description of the music. He also continually and suggestively uses the word ‘renaissance’ throughout the text but does not give any particular indication as to its meaning other than commenting that there was a ‘change’ in English music, emphasising the lack of activity in the first half of the century compared to the increase in activity in the second half. He uses the date of the Exhibition of 1851 as the point at which England turned from a relatively ‘unfruitful first half of the XIXth century’\(^\text{13}\) in terms of musical production to the supposed ‘renaissance’ of the latter part. This is a sensible and valid conclusion, particularly when one considers the evidence uncovered in relation to the Great Exhibition and its legacy in the previous chapters of this study.

In spite of the lack of detail in the publication, Maitland does make a couple of significant points. His first appears in chapter III ‘Foreign Dominations’ and relates to the influence of foreign musicians on the English musical scene. He maintains that ‘among European nations the English are far more ready than any other to welcome musicians from abroad’\(^\text{14}\), going on to discuss specific significant visitors:

Certain landmarks may just be mentioned, as the dates of specifically interesting first appearances here. Liszt’s first visit took place as early as 1824, when he was but a boy, and was petted as a prodigy; Paganini came in 1831, Rubinstein in 1842, Joachim and Piatti in 1844, Mme. Schumann in 1856. The last of these three artists exercised on English musical culture an influence the importance of which

\(^{14}\) Ibid., p. 56
could not be exaggerated; through their agency the treasures of classical music were laid before the English public with a completeness and a perfection of interpretation that were of inestimable value.\footnote{Ibid, p. 59-60}

In the context of the previous chapter of this study, Maitland’s discussion at this point serves to further confirm the huge importance of the visits Joachim and Clara Schumann made to England in relation to the introduction of the music of Brahms. The dates of these first visits of the latter three artists – 1844 and 1856 – are also significant as they fall quite conveniently near Maitland’s year of 1851 for the start of the ‘renaissance’, thereby adding some evidence to support this theory, suggesting that the increase in ‘foreign’ performers provided a good starting point for musical progress in England as the century progressed.

Maitland also provides an illuminating paragraph regarding the supposed foreign influence on the English musical scene:

\begin{quote}
A country so receptive as England of everything that came from outside could not fail to come under the influence of foreign music as well as foreign interpreters… I would point out that the manner in which the influence of important music is exercised is twofold. One man’s work may fail at first to appeal to more than a very small circle, but that circle may widen continually till it embraces the whole musical population of the world. In the early days a few enthusiasts will incur ridicule for their devotion, and will quietly gain for their favourite music a tolerant hearing which will gradually change to a wide acceptance. Another man, not less richly endowed with natural ability than the former, will create works which at once appeal to everyone who hears them, and which attain and retain such a powerful influence over the public at large that thenceforward they are made into a standard from which no departure must be made by their successors… the slightest attempt at originality is held as a blasphemous innovation upon the established pattern, and those who dare to express anything beyond what appears in the popular idol’s creations are foredoomed to failure… The works of Bach, of
\end{quote}
Beethoven, of Schubert, of Schumann, and of Brahms are salient examples of the first kind of influence... The public at large has only been slowly converted to them and in all cases the musicians, in ever increasing numbers, have shown the public the way.\textsuperscript{16}

Based on the evidence presented in the previous chapter of this study, Maitland’s comments are very perceptive and an accurate reflection of the way in which Brahms progressed in popularity throughout the last quarter of the nineteenth century. In the second half of the publication, Maitland goes on to discuss the principal aspects of the supposed musical renaissance in England, examining important institutions and composers, as well as a more in depth examination of church music and opera. In terms of ‘renaissance’ composers, Maitland’s discussion focuses on Parry and Stanford, and, to a lesser extent, Alexander Mackenzie. Whilst he refers to many of their compositions, Maitland does not substantiate his discussions with any kind of analytical evidence. For instance, he says ‘In his [Parry’s] treatment of the orchestra, we feel, as in the case of Brahms, that form is more important than the colouring, the musical ideas themselves than their treatment, whether in voices or orchestra’\textsuperscript{17}. Maitland provides no further evidence or discussion to support this claim. Indeed, the whole of the chapter contains many similar assertions. As a result, it is very difficult to make any sort of link between the first half of the monograph in which he discusses the influence of foreign performers upon the renaissance, and the second half in which ‘renaissance’ compositions are discussed. Consequently, the result is an interesting, factually accurate, but ultimately unhelpful historical account of much of the musical activity of the period. However, it must be remembered that the publication appeared in 1902 and was probably one of the earliest texts, evaluating music of the nineteenth century as a whole.

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., p. 60-61
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., p. 202
After Maitland’s initial publication, a string of historical musical texts followed throughout the twentieth century:

Table 3.1: List of Publications of the History of English Music from 1900 to the Present Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thirty Years of Musical Life in London</td>
<td>Hermann Klein</td>
<td>1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Music in England</td>
<td>Ernest Walker</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Music</td>
<td>W.H. Hadow</td>
<td>1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music in England</td>
<td>Eric Blom</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The English Musical Renaissance</td>
<td>Frank Howes</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The English Musical Renaissance</td>
<td>Peter J. Pirie</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The English Musical Renaissance 1860-1940</td>
<td>Meirion Hughes and</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Stradling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music in England 1885-1920</td>
<td>Lewis Foreman</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The English Musical Renaissance 1840-1940</td>
<td>Meirion Hughes and</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Stradling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Walker, Hadow and Blom’s writing is of a very general nature and they attempt to provide a history of English music from c.1200 to the late Victorian Era. As a result, they are unable to discuss developments in English music in anything other than the briefest detail. As a result, they miss virtually all the complex web of musical activity which occurred in England in the late nineteenth century, instead choosing to focus on the composers of the late nineteenth century in the context of a simple historical progression rather than providing any sort of analytical evidence to support the text. However, Walker does acknowledge that there was a ‘renaissance of English composition’ in the last twenty-five years of the nineteenth century\(^\text{18}\). He elaborates slightly further, citing Manns as the primary catalyst for the renaissance, with Grove and Hallé’s contributions acting as an essential supporting role\(^\text{19}\), although at no point does Walker venture to suggest the exact nature of how and why their contributions influenced English composition. Walker also maintains that ‘Bach and Brahms, and to

---


\(^{19}\) Ibid., p. 286-287
a considerably less degree, Handel and Mendelssohn, are the sources out of which Parry has developed his own thoroughly characteristic style…\textsuperscript{20} However, yet again, Walker does not substantiate this assertion by referring to specific compositions of any of the composers in question, thereby making his argument somewhat difficult to justify.

### 3.3: Brahms, the ‘English Musical Renaissance’ and ‘Das Land ohne Musik’

The remaining general texts in table 3.1 all contain references in their titles to the supposed ‘English Musical Renaissance’. At this point, therefore, it is logical to discuss this term further, along with the often simultaneously cited phrase of England as ‘Das Land ohne Musik’. All the authors in table 3.1 attempt with varying degrees of success to provide definitive answers to these rather vague terms within the broader context of nineteenth century English musical history. There have also been a few articles produced which attempt to deal with the problem posed by these phrases.

‘Das Land ohne Musik’ is a phrase which has been applied to English musical history in many publications but as yet has not received any adequate explanation as to its origin and exact meaning. There is even a reference to the term in the current Oxford Music Online, demonstrating its accepted use within the context of English musical development in the nineteenth century. The citation is not very detailed and only fleetingly suggests lack of regional courts with opera and orchestras, and organ music with pedals as reasons for the lack of music. However, in spite of this, the origin of the term is actually rather difficult to trace. It has been attributed to several individuals, most notably, Oscar Adolf Hermann Schmidtz, Hans von Bülow, and

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., p. 299
Johannes Brahms. In the case of Bülow, Michael Steinberg makes the claim that he called England ‘Das Land ohne Musik’ in his monograph *The Symphony: A Listener’s Guide*. However, he provides no reference for the statement and provides little in the way of a contextual framework for its use\textsuperscript{21}. In fact, Steinberg appears to be using Bülow’s supposed use of the phrase simply as a means of supporting his misplaced belief that the stagnant trends in English musical life were caused by the ‘professors’ mutual admiration society’ of Mackenzie, Parry and Stanford, with Elgar as the ‘saviour’ of English music\textsuperscript{22}. Indeed, the only reference to the term in any biographical text on Bülow is in Alan Walker’s 2010 biography, in which he states that when Bülow first visited Britain in 1873, the country was still regarded as ‘Das Land ohne Musik’\textsuperscript{23}. Apart from this, there is no indisputable evidence to link Bülow to the origin of the phrase.

Similarly, it has also been suggested that Brahms was the first person to coin the phrase. However, as with Bülow, there is virtually no evidence to suggest that Brahms had anything to do with the statement. Jürgen Schaarwächter, in his article ‘Chasing a myth and a legend: ‘The English Musical Renaissance’ in a ‘Land without Music’’ cites the only reference to Brahms’s link with this statement which appears in the 2006 edition of *Gramophone*\textsuperscript{24}. However, there is no reference detailing where the author (Philip Clark) actually found the idea. Indeed, there is no evidence in Brahms’s correspondence that he ever said anything of this nature. Schaarwächter goes on to discuss a more likely origin of the statement as being that of Oscar Adolf Hermann

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{24} Jürgen Schaarwächter, ‘Chasing a myth and a legend: ‘The British Musical Renaissance’ in a ‘Land without Music’’, *Musical Times*, 149 (2008), 53-60 (56)
Schmidtz’s 1914 work Das Land ohne Musik: englische Gesellschaftsproblem. One might think that given the title of the work that this is almost certainly the source of the phrase. However, it is widely known now that Schmidtz’s publication actually contained very little discussion of music and is more of a political publication. The only reference to the ‘land without music’ is early in the book. Schmitz simply says: ‘The English are the only cultured nation without their own music (popular songs excepted)’\textsuperscript{25}. Of all the possible origins of the term, this seems the most likely, as it is the only one with enough reasonable and substantive evidence to support its existence.

Bennett Zon has produced a suggestively titled article: ‘Histories of British Music and the Land without Music: National Identity and the Idea of the Hero’. Zon provides an excellent brief history of British music histories explaining their importance throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He then goes on to explain the relevance of the hero in British Musical history. Disappointingly, however, Zon does not actually appear to attempt to define or justify exactly why his title contains the phrase ‘the land without music’. In fact, aside from its use in the title, it is barely even mentioned in the text itself, demonstrating another instance of the phrase’s prominent use in the context of nineteenth century British music, but with no substantial evidence in terms of its justification.

The second aspect of ‘Das Land ohne Musik’ which requires consideration is exactly what aspect of English music it refers to. Ruth Solie has produced an article which evaluates the principal works which refer to the term. In it she cites many indications

\textsuperscript{25} Schmitz, quoted in Schaarwächter, 2008, p. 57
as to what particular aspect of the English musical scene the term refers to. Her most succinct and comprehensive reasoning for the use of the phrase is provided in her introductory remarks:

My favourite succinct rebuttal to the popular canard about a music-less England remains Theodore Hoppen’s: ‘the Victorians, it seemed, could do anything with music – except compose it. Nineteenth century Britain was awash with music…’ And therein lay the scholarly problem, at least as far as musicology was concerned: the discipline’s almost exclusive focus on composers – sometimes limited even further to Great Composers – meant that it looked at Victorian England and did not see anything of much interest. There has always been a certain antiquarian attention to some exclusively British phenomena like Anglican church music, and local historians have always documented amateur oratorio societies and brass bands, but as far as the mainstream of musicological scholarship was concerned, attention was firmly fixed on the continent.26

Solie’s argument essentially seems to be that musicological trends have been principally to blame for the acceptance of the phrase ‘Das Land ohne Musik’, but that in terms of musical performance, there was much activity in Britain. This thesis is a logical one, particularly when one considers that the term is not visibly apparent at any point before Schmitz’s publication. Furthermore, as has been demonstrated in the analysis of texts in this chapter (such as those of Walker and Steinberg for instance), the term is not used with any degree of accuracy or detail. It is merely used as a sort of sweeping statement to assist with the justification of the equally tenuous term ‘English Musical Renaissance’, or, as a reason for lack of significant native compositional activity in England before the late nineteenth century. Solie goes on to say that part of the reason for the low profile of the performance activity in England is that music was essentially viewed as a feminine, amateur parlour activity resulting

from trends in the eighteenth century which was not worthy of professional attention from male gentry. This in turn, she argues, affected English compositional output, in that ‘British composers were caught in a perfect double bind: if they were patrician enough to be thought respectable composers, then by virtually the same token they would be judged too respectable to take up music – of all things!’\(^{27}\). Based on Solie’s analysis of the principal texts in which the term appears, it can be said with some justification that ‘Das Land ohne Musik’ is merely a political fabrication invented by Schmitz which has only become an accepted phrase due to the focus of musicology and music history on musical composition as a measure of ‘musical success’ rather than performance. However, it cannot be denied that there was a native increase in both disciplines in the second half of the nineteenth century in England, which has been labelled by many as the ‘English Musical Renaissance’.

As table 3.1 (p. 135) demonstrates, later histories of nineteenth century English music all seem to adopt the phrase ‘English Musical Renaissance’. Unlike ‘Das Land ohne Musik’, the notion of a ‘renaissance’ in British music extends visibly back to the later nineteenth century. Indeed, the word ‘renaissance’ was used very prominently in the structure and organisation of Fuller-Maitland’s history of nineteenth century music discussed earlier in this chapter, although he failed to give an exact definition regarding his employment of the term. The phrase was actually in existence before Maitland’s publication, and is thought to have first been used by Joseph Bennett in his review of Parry’s First Symphony at the Birmingham Festival in 1882 in which he says: ‘Mr Parry’s Symphony … is capital proof that English Music has arrived at a

\(^{27}\) Ibid., p. 262
Therefore by the time Maitland came to use the phrase, it had already been used twenty years earlier. However, Maitland’s work seems to use Bennett’s date as a convenient starting point for the supposed renaissance, citing the first performance of Parry’s *Prometheus Unbound* on 1 September 1880 as the catalyst for the changes. Indeed, this is echoed in the works of Frank Howes, who adopts Maitland’s assertion that the ‘renaissance’ began at the first performance of Parry’s *Prometheus*, whilst Pirie say that ‘his [Parry’s] *Job* has been said in some circles to have started the English Renaissance’. The oratorio *Job* was first performed in 1892 at the Three Choirs Festival, thereby leaving an uncomfortable gap between what Howes and what Pirie believe was the starting point of the renaissance.

The other significant difficulty of both theses is the lack of specific explanation of what the titles of their books actually refer to. In the case of Howes, his thesis covers a large musical spectrum. In his introductory chapter, he indicates what he believes to be the most important constituents of the renaissance in terms of composition:

The rise of the modern school has been in three stages. There was the original impulse to a sturdier kind of writing which is associated with the names of Mackenzie, Parry and Stanford. Their contemporaries, F.H. Cowen, Arthur Sullivan and Edward German (who have however, a distinctive place in the theatrical tradition) belong to the old order, of which Sterndale Bennett has been the leading figure in the previous generation…Technically Parry and Stanford were nurtured on a German training. But the change is associated with all three names, Mackenzie, whose influence was exerted from the Royal Academy of Music, and Parry and Stanford, who worked at the younger rival establishment in South Kensington, the Royal College of Music.

---

31 Howes, 1966, p. 23-24
Howes evidently believes that Mackenzie, Parry and Stanford formed the beginnings of the compositional part of the renaissance. He also later discusses the contributions of Elgar, as well as pointing out that there were also contributors to the period in the areas of ‘education, administration, musical politics, and executive performance’.

On the surface, Howes appears to be presenting a comprehensive introduction to the subject, covering all the areas one might expect on a topic of this nature. However, there are also a number of difficulties with his introduction, particularly regarding musicians of whom he does not have a particularly high opinion. For instance, he refers to Wagner as a ‘social parasite’ and maintains that Sullivan ‘left behind a lot of bad music that by its popularity did a deal of harm’, referring specifically to the works ‘‘Tis a Glorious thing I ween to be a regular royal queen’ from The Gondoliers, and ‘O Gladsome light’, clearly demonstrating his origins as a music journalist (he was musical critic of The Times between 1943 and 1960). However, he does not explain analytically or objectively why he holds such opinions, thereby making them quite difficult to justify. In the main body of the book, Howes advances a little further on these rather brash statements of the introduction, particularly regarding the Savoy Operas of Arthur Sullivan. He again refers to them as ‘bad music’, but attempts to justify his position with phrases such as ‘their appeal is far more to the unmusical than regular music lovers’, and that Sullivan was a ‘market minded’ man who wrote the Savoy Operas for popularity rather than quality. Disappointingly, the discussion ends there, and Howes provides no further justification for his position, other than a

---

32 Ibid., p. 31
33 Ibid., p. 21
34 Ibid., p. 51
36 Howes, 1966, p. 51
short musical example in the form of the opening eight bars of the *In Memoriam* overture. Critical reviews of the publication by and large present similar observations to those discussed here, with Hugh Ottaway of *The Musical Times*, describing the publication as ‘a journalistic survey rather than a scholarly enquiry’.\(^{37}\) However, the publication is divided logically into three parts, entitled ‘Gestation’, ‘Birth’ and ‘Growth’ respectively, and was viewed for a long time as the definitive authority on the subject.

Howes presents a number of indications of how he viewed the position of music of Brahms within the structure of the developments in English music throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The most significant reference appears in chapter eight in relation to Stanford:

The symphonies are usually written off as Brahmsian… But one must be careful. The resemblance of the opening strain of the Lament movement in Stanford’s third symphony in F minor, the ‘Irish’,

\[
\begin{align*}
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To that of the slow movement of Brahms’s fourth was easily spotted, but Stanford took it from a lament in the Petrie collection of Irish folk-songs and according to his account the symphonies were being composed simultaneously.\(^{38}\)

Howes cites the now often used example which supposedly demonstrates Stanford’s devotion to Brahms of the similar phrase of Stanford’s third symphony to that of Brahms’s fourth (see above in Howes’ example). However, even though Stanford’s claim that the symphonies were composed simultaneously has now been widely

\(^{37}\) Hugh Ottaway, ‘Parry and After’, *The Musical Times*, 107 (1966), 775

\(^{38}\) Howes, 1966, p. 153-154
disputed, the claim that he is quoting directly from Brahms’s symphony is also
difficult to justify, as Brahms’s use of the motif begins on the mediant, whereas
Stanford’s does not\textsuperscript{39}. Furthermore, the motif is not very prominent in Stanford’s
work, as it is used as an accompaniment to the more prominent solo oboe, flute and
clarinet melody being played at the same time. The motif in the Brahms symphony is
much more pronounced, actually constituting one of the main thematic elements of
the movement. Based on the evidence, therefore, it would seem that this similarity or
‘quotation’ is probably coincidental, although it has provoked a substantial amount of
discussion in this and other works. Other than this small example, Howes does not
attempt to discuss the notion of the Brahmsian influence on Stanford’s music any
further.

The other references to Brahms in Howes’ work are generally in relation to famous
performances of his music, with the exception of one in chapter 10, in which Howes
says ‘Stanford and Ethel Smyth were descendents and disciples of Schumann and
Mendelssohn through Brahms, Elgar and Bantock and their associates were in the line
through Liszt and Wagner.’ This quotation is very suggestive and directly implies that
Stanford’s compositional output was directly influenced by Brahms, although
frustratingly, the statement is not discussed by Howes any further. As a result, the
reader is left with a fascinating and informative body of writing regarding various
different aspects of late nineteenth century English music (and in particular
composition), but also with many questions and difficulties remaining. Indeed,
Michael Kennedy’s observation that the book might have been more successful had

\textsuperscript{39} Paul Rodmell, Charles Villiers Stanford (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), p. 126
Howes ‘limited his period more severely’\textsuperscript{40} is a particularly potent concluding remark for the publication in relation to the subject matter of this study.

In 1979, Peter Pirie also presented a monograph entitled \textit{The English Musical Renaissance}. The period covered in the publication is principally from 1890 to 1978, compared to Howes text which covers roughly between 1840 to 1960. These time periods are quite different, given that both books have the same title, indicating, once again the lack of general agreement as to exactly what period the term ‘English Musical Renaissance’ refers.

Pirie opens his publication with what may possibly be the shortest history of English music in existence, covering the period between c.1100 to 1890 in approximately twelve pages. Whilst this introductory chapter undoubtedly provides some interesting information, it is somewhat anecdotal and ‘rather forced and redundant’\textsuperscript{41} to quote Stephen Banfield’s review of the publication. The principal reason for this is that Pirie does not indicate exactly how any of this history relates to the rest of his thesis. Towards the end of the chapter, he states:

The sum total of our musical achievement in the Victorian era was meagre, reactionary and undistinguished. Stanford, who lived until 1924, by which time Schoenberg had introduced serial technique, is shrivelled in the blaze of a composer like Richard Strauss. Some of his songs are worth preserving and in an ideal world we might hear one or two of his orchestral works occasionally; but

\textsuperscript{40} Michael Kennedy ‘The English Musical Renaissance (Review)’, \textit{Folk Music Journal}, 1 (1966), 119-120 (119)
most of his choral works are terribly vacuous and devoid of significant invention. Parry’s choral music, with the possible exception of *Blest Pair of Sirens* is dead. ⁴²

This statement alone demonstrates how dated the monograph is by today’s standards. In 1979, the renewed interest in, and research of nineteenth century English music was still very much in its preliminary stages. However, such a statement would seem short sighted even for 1979, particularly as Howes 1966 monograph acknowledges the importance of Parry and Stanford in the ‘renaissance’ of English music in the nineteenth century. Indeed, as previous chapters of this study have indicated, Parry and Stanford’s involvement in the upsurge in compositional activity in the later nineteenth century simply cannot be dismissed in a paragraph like this. On a previous page, he also suggests that ‘in some circles’ Parry’s *Job* was seen to be the work which started the renaissance⁴³, but Pirie provides no reference for this. Furthermore, the assertion is rather contradictory, particularly as two pages later he refers to Parry’s choral music as ‘dead’. Pirie hurries towards the end of his first chapter by saying that as the end of the nineteenth century approached ‘Brahms, Tchaikovsky and Dvořák were lately dead or in their last decade’, implying, based on no research whatsoever, that their old age for some reason excuses him from devoting any attention to them in the context of his discussion.

The remaining layout of Pirie’s work provides the reader with a very good indication of the reason behind the strange and rushed nature of the introductory chapter:

---

⁴³ Ibid., p. 20
The point of the first chapter is to quickly set the scene for the composer that Pirie wishes to herald as the pioneer of the renaissance – Edward Elgar. The remaining pages move chronologically through the period providing information regarding new music that was composed. To provide some clarity to the reader, Pirie provides individual indications of the year under discussion at the header of every second page. However, one does not need to read very much of the publication to realise that Stephen Banfield’s evaluation of the work as ‘superficial’ in terms of the discussion of composers works, is not altogether unreasonable. A typical example of his evaluation is as follows: ‘The opening bars of A Village Romeo are breathtaking in their freshness and sense of spring and the open country. When the characters first start to sing it is hard not to be disappointed. After the glorious, sweeping melody, magically scored, the “rude brief recitative” is an awful letdown as Delius’s solo writing often is’\(^{44}\). This is a very strongly worded evaluation of a musical work, and unfortunately, Pirie does not support such statements with much analysis of any kind. Indeed, there are less musical examples in his work than that of Howes. Such an evaluation certainly justifies Banfield’s assessment of the book as ‘less a general

\(^{44}\) Ibid., p. 43
history than a music critic’s collected opinions on London premières he has witnessed.\textsuperscript{45}

In spite of the book’s unevenness, and lack of analytical criticism, Pirie does make some points which are useful, or at the very least thought provoking in relation to this study. The most interesting of these is in the second chapter of the book:

But to seek a composer without echoes of his contemporaries is to seek a monster; such a composer would be incomprehensible. If we take into account a certain touch of the French composers of the nineteenth century, and just a suspicion of Verdi, we shall see that Elgar was an eclectic whose influences were strongly Latin, while those of Parry and Stanford were largely German, in fact the conservative German music of Brahms.\textsuperscript{46}

Pirie appears to be attempting to justify the notion that one composer can have influence on another’s output, by saying that a composer who does not demonstrate influences of others is a ‘monster’. Such a point does not really require justification in itself, as Pirie seems to believe. On the other hand, if one refers to specific composers, as Pirie does in his next sentence, then some form of analytical justification is required in order to ascertain exactly which compositional features of one composer are visible in the other, even though such influences can be hard to pinpoint and convincingly prove as a result of their often diverse and intertwined nature. Unfortunately, Pirie does not provide justification of any kind for his assertion that the music of Parry and Stanford reflected that of Brahms. Moreover, there is more than one instance of this assertion in the book. Another appears near the beginning of the text. He maintains (as a part of his minute history of English music), that the ‘music

\textsuperscript{46} Pirie, 1979, p. 31
of Charles Villiers Stanford (1852-1924), Hubert Parry (1848-1918) and Alexander Campbell Mackenzie (1847-1935) was conceived … with a very heavy Brahmsian influence …’47 Yet again, one is faced with the famous notion with absolutely no analytical evidence with which to support its use. Furthermore, there is no specific attempt by the author to explain the meaning of his title. Indeed, the term ‘English Musical Renaissance’ appears to act as a somewhat awkward and unjustified method of referring to the general period between 1890 and 1980. If one contrasts this to the date range of 1880-1960 in the case of Howes’ text, the researcher is left with a rather uncomfortable lack of correlation regarding the dates of the period.

The difficulty of providing accurate dates continues into texts produced later in the twentieth century, notably those by Meirion Hughes and Robert Stradling – *The English Musical Renaissance 1860-1940*, published in 1993 and *The English Musical Renaissance 1840-1940*, published in 2001. Indeed, one need only look at the difference in dates between the two titles to realise the difficulty facing musicologists (or in this case historians) regarding this period. The content of the two publications clouds the issue further, with the authors suggesting that the English Musical Renaissance actually ended in 1934 with the death of Elgar, Delius and Holst48. Unsurprisingly, these two books on late nineteenth and early twentieth century music history have been amongst the most controversial ever produced. The main body of the book remains basically unaltered in the second edition, apart from the introduction and the conclusion, as well as the addition of some information principally about Mendelssohn in the first chapter to accommodate the changes in dates.

47 Ibid., p. 20
48 Hughes and Stradling, 2001, p. 193
Hughes and Stradling have produced two very interesting and undeniably well researched documents. However, from a musicological point of view, the texts are both distinctly difficult to digest. First (as is the case with the other books discussed in this chapter), neither of the texts provides a definitive answer as to exactly what the ‘English Musical Renaissance’ actually was. Second, and more important, whilst their discussion of the political and sociological aspects of England’s musical scene in the late nineteenth century is impressive, there is an unfortunate noticeable lack of discussion of musical repertory in the text:

Criticism of EMR1 concentrated on its methodology and, to a lesser degree, on several aspects of its content. Several critics felt deeply uncomfortable with a methodology which insisted that music is subjected to the forces of history just like every other aspect of life. The book insisted that the ‘life and works’ approach to music history has had its day, and that a new way of looking at the subject was absolutely essential to its future vitality…Eight years on, the authors remain convinced that an English musical history that is anchored in the ‘life and works’ paradigm is intellectually exhausted. In this respect, musicology as a discipline has much to do to catch up with other cognate disciplines… Music history in our view, is still being written with too much ‘music’ and too little ‘history’. We welcomed the fact that EMR1 outraged so many of the fundamental orthodoxies of musicology-music history since for far too long these disciplines have been mired in outmoded discourses and tired values. Yet, even in 1993, a bright new world of musicology was already in existence, heralded by later editions of Joseph Kerman’s fundamental introduction to the discipline, and adorned by names like Susan McClary, Lydia Goehr, Larry Kramer, Cyril Ehrlich and Edward Said…49

This passage, taken from the short concluding chapter of the second edition of the work is a ludicrous display of arrogance and short-sightedness on the part of the authors. The first notable fact which is indicated is that both Hughes and Stradling are historians, which would account for their over-pronounced avoidance of any form of

49 Hughes and Stradling, 2001, p. 291
detailed analytical discussion of musical works. To compensate for their evident lack of technical musical knowledge, they make the claim that music history is written with ‘too much music’ and ‘too little history’, even implying that such methods of writing are outdated and possibly even detrimental to the process. This conviction is clearly indicated by their lack of musical analysis throughout the book. The names they discuss at the end of the paragraph are nearly all non-musicians. For example, Lydia Goehr is a professor of philosophy, Larry Kramer is a professor of English at Fordham University, and Cyril Ehrlich is an economic historian. All of these writers are from alternative disciplines. Whilst some of them are musicians and have applied their skills in the discussion of music history, virtually none of their work actually discusses technical aspects of music – hence why Hughes and Stradling are able to identify with their research. Indeed, critics of Hughes and Stradling understandably focus on this lack of emphasis on the repertory. For instance, Alain Frogley summarises their approach in a long article reviewing both editions in *Music and Letters* in 2003. He says ‘They [Hughes and Stradling] evidently believe that the low status they accord music as an independent art form absolves them to a large degree of any responsibility to discuss the technical, stylistic, or aesthetic character of the music they touch upon in anything but the most superficial terms.’

Hughes and Stradling’s response to such criticisms appear to be a simple refusal to accept that there is potential scope for disagreement and discussion regarding their position. This attitude is very evident in their letter to *The Times Literary Supplement* in 1993, in response to a review of their book a few weeks earlier in the same publication. Hughes and Stradling give the following justification for their approach:

In his own words, “if true [this book] would completely change our view of music history”. Macdonald’s problem is that he cannot change his view of British musical history and that (therefore) what we write cannot be true. The reasons he is unable to contemplate change are central to the predicament of musicology. Your readers will understand how natural it is for an established interest to defend the means of its bread and butter… Macdonald seems determinedly unaware of intellectual developments which have taken place in his lifetime, not just in fields cognate to his subject, but those which stand just outside his editorial door… We seek to apply the broad insights of cultural history and critical theory to our subject, because deconstruction is the essential (if not exclusive) practice of both these disciplines, and because it can open up the history of music to expositions of meaning which are both valuable and various. In contrast, traditional English music history is still curled up in self-reflective torpor, appropriate to a gentlemen’s club or a Trappist monastery… The profession he represents is indeed guilty of perpetuating, if not a counterfeit, then at least a hopelessly obsolete currency of criticism.51

As their letter demonstrates, Hughes and Stradling do not seem to understand that at least some form of analytical criticism is necessary when discussing music history. They even continue their tirade on musicology by saying that they ‘are forced to doubt whether Mr MacDonald has every heard of that important method of intellectual process – also patented in Germany – which we professional historians call “research”. Did he think even to consider our sources? – an average of four references per page, a list of twelve manuscript archives, an eleven page bibliography’.52 Such quotations demonstrate the weak justification with which Stradling and Hughes ignore musical evidence. It also demonstrates an almost laughable lack of respect for musicology as a discipline.

52 Ibid.
These fundamental difficulties with Stradling and Hughes’s work unfortunately pervade their numerous comments regarding the music of Brahms and its influence on English composition. All of their comments occur in the main body of the text, which is virtually the same in both editions of the book.

Table 3.3 (p.154) lists the principal quotations relating to Brahms’s music in both editions of Hughes and Stradling’s monograph. In the case of all the quotations, none of them has any musical examples attached in either edition of the work which makes most of them very difficult to accept. In some instances, such as that of quotation number 2, they make sweeping statements without providing any sort of analytical evidence at all. Simply saying that ‘Parry and Stanford were committed to the Schumann Brahms tradition’ and that ‘for them this was the direction in which English music had to progress’ actually creates more problems than it solves. Had Hughes and Stradling provided evidence of which particular aspect of Brahms’s music are present in the music of Parry and Stanford and then discussed them using analytical examples from the works of all three composers, then such a statement might have been more easily justifiable. There is a similar amateurish approach in their discussion regarding specific English musical works, such as the symphonies of Vaughan Williams (quotation 10), in which they say that certain numbers of his output in the genre display ‘obeisance’ to various composers including Brahms. At no point do they attempt to provide an answer as to how and why they have reached such a conclusion. One cannot help but suspect that these assertions are possibly second hand, derived from traditional musicological work which the authors do not understand. Therefore, they make the assertions and fail, through what can only be
Table 3.3: Meirion Hughes and Robert Stradling’s discussions of Brahms’s influence on English music, taken from their monographs *The English Musical Renaissance 1860-1940: Construction and Deconstruction*, and *The English Musical Renaissance 1840-1940: Constructing a National Music*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Quotation</th>
<th>Page (1st ed.)</th>
<th>Page (2nd ed.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bach, Beethoven, Schumann and Brahms were Stanford’s heroes, whereas he found Wagner most uncongenial</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stanford and Parry were committed to the Schumann-Brahms tradition and for them this was the direction in which English music had to progress</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parry considered that the ineluctable laws of musical evolution had produced Brahms as their legitimate modern heir: Wagner was thus and aberrant distraction. Parry was a convinced Brahmin in the Wagner-Brahms controversy which was splitting up German music; yet he knew that to open up this debate in England was potentially disastrous for the future of the Renaissance, in which unity and team spirit were perceived as essential.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Although at one with Parry in veneration of Brahms, his commitment to opera led him to study Wagnerian music-drama for which he developed considerable admiration…His position did not get much more comfortable, for he felt obliged to sit on the fence; as a conservative he valued Brahmsian traditionalism, and as a nationalist, he saw in opera – and Wagner’s example – the potential extension of music to a larger public. Stanford’s contradications in his contemporaries’ eyes were patent – a Brahmsian who wrote mostly ‘programme music’…</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Although he shared the common admiration for the Schumann-Brahms tradition, Elgar was convinced that this should be integrated with a more ‘expressive’ compositional style</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>In the <em>Songs of Farewell</em>, Parry evokes the spirit of Brahms and the <em>Vier Ernste Gesänge</em>, possibly expressing a final faith in the spiritual ‘purity’ of German music, uncorrupted by militarism and hatred.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Whatever else may be said of the music of Cowen, Mackenzie, Parry and Stanford, its fundamental structure and morphology was unmistakably that of the Germanic axes: Beethoven-Brahms and/or Liszt-Wagner.</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>In the generation after Grove, most influential figures were obsessed with the current German masters, Wagner and/or Brahms, who were creating the new musical universe… By the 1880s, the decade in which the creative aspect of the English Renaissance is held to have begun, Germany exercised a control of the present and the past of European music which was for all working purposes absolute.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Grove’s generation was obsessed by the new German masters, Wagner and Brahms, who were creating a new musical universe, and whose influence threatened, unless prophylactic measures were taken, to suppress indigenous development just as rigorously as had those of Handel or Mendelssohn before them</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>In fact, all of Vaughan Williams’s symphonies adopt the basic German scheme of four movements… Several examples employ sonata form in the internal construction of the movements. Others pay specific formal obeisance to Beethoven (Fourth) Brahms (Fifth) or Haydn (Ninth).</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

described as musical ignorance to elaborate on them further, defending themselves by saying that musicology is outdated.
Quotations 8 and 9 in table 3.3 warrant further discussion at this point. They are placed at equivalent places in each book and indeed sound similar in certain aspects. However, they have each been allocated a place on the table because of the quite substantial differences in their meanings. Quotation 8 which appears in the first edition, says that ‘In the generation after Grove, most influential figures were obsessed with the current German masters, Wagner and/or Brahms’\(^{53}\). In contrast, the corresponding sentence in the later edition of the book (quotation 9) reads: ‘Grove’s generation was obsessed by the new German masters, Wagner and Brahms’\(^{54}\). Whilst Hughes and Stradling’s change in generation may not seem a particularly significant difference from a purely historic point of view, when considering musical developments which could potentially have occurred between Grove’s generation and that after him, their argument is significantly weakened. They have fully changed the time period to which they are referring without consideration of the potential subtle changes in musical output by the composers. Furthermore, they make yet another sweeping statement in both quotations by saying that influential figures were ‘obsessed’ with Wagner and Brahms. The authors do not attempt to discuss what exactly they mean by ‘influential figures’, nor do they explain exactly how this supposed ‘obsession’ with Brahms and Wagner manifested itself. Hughes and Stradling similarly change the nature of their argument in the second half of each quotation. In the first edition, they conclude this small section by saying that ‘by the 1880s … Germany exercised a control of the present and the past of European music which was for all working purposes absolute.’\(^{55}\) In the second edition, they say that Grove’s generation ‘were creating a new musical universe, and whose influence


\(^{54}\) Hughes and Stradling, 2001, p. 136

\(^{55}\) Hughes and Stradling, 1993, p. 111
threatened, unless prophylactic measures were taken, to suppress indigenous development just as rigorously as had those of Handel or Mendelssohn before them.\textsuperscript{56} The conclusion in the first edition is one of indifference to the strong Germanic influence on English composers. In the second edition, however, much stronger language is used to create the impression that the German influence was one which stifled any compositional development in England. The authors use the popular general examples of the British adulation of Handel and Mendelssohn to support their argument, instead of discussion of musical works created during the period, yet again demonstrating their inability to analyse a musical score. Consequently, one is left with an excellently researched document, but unfortunately one which is of very limited use in any musicological discussion relating to this period.

The texts discussed in this section have demonstrated the considerable difficulty facing musicologists when discussing this period in British musical history. The popular terms ‘Land without Music’ and ‘English Musical Renaissance’ are not particularly viable when they are properly dissected. The term ‘Land without Music’ does not appear to have any justification whatsoever. Indeed, the study of performance trends across England discussed in earlier chapters of this study demonstrate that there was indeed a huge amount of performance and compositional activity across the nineteenth century, which gradually spread particularly as the effects of industrialisation began to manifest themselves to ordinary people. The term ‘English Musical Renaissance’ seems to be used solely to enable writers to compartmentalise the colossal amount of musical activity, along with its social and political connotations. Throughout the texts Brahms has featured fairly prominently as

\textsuperscript{56} Hughes and Stradling, 2001, p. 136
an influence on English composers of the period, especially Hubert Parry and Charles Villiers Stanford. However, the references to Brahms are always very brief and never justified with musical examples. The next section of this chapter therefore, will be devoted to a discussion of biographical works on Parry and Stanford, in an attempt to glean more specific information regarding the influence of Brahms on their compositional outputs.

3.4: Biographical works on Charles Hubert Hastings Parry and Charles Villiers Stanford

The general lack of attention given to specific aspects of English music of the late nineteenth century by musicologists until relatively recently has meant that even now, while the subject enjoys a good deal of new research, there is still relatively little published material in contrast to that available about a composer such as Brahms. Whilst there must be over fifty monographs dedicated to Brahms and his music, there are only a handful dedicated to the life and works of Parry and Stanford, ranging from items produced while both men were still alive, to more recent publications by authors such as Jeremy Dibble and Paul Rodmell. In this section, these works will be assessed chronologically with particular reference to the influence of Brahms on both composers.

Aside from brief and ultimately unhelpful obituary notices in various publications, ranging from newspapers to specialist journals, the first biographical work produced on Parry and Stanford is in Charles Willeby’s 1893 monograph *Masters of English Music* whilst both composers were still alive. The biographies are in the form of very short chapters right at the end of the book, which is not altogether surprising, given
that they were both still active at the time of publication. As the older of the two composers, Parry is dealt with first, followed by Stanford who concludes the book.

The chapter on Parry contains a large amount of rather dry biographical material which has been covered amply by all the writers who will be discussed in the remainder of this chapter, and for this reason it does not warrant further attention in this study. Willeby then briefly discusses a selection of the composer’s most prominent compositions (in 1893 when the book was published). In this section, there are a number of references to Brahms which are significant. The first comment is a throwaway remark in relation to ‘Prometheus Unbound’. Willeby maintains that it is apparent that ‘Brahms has a fair hold over him [Parry]’\textsuperscript{57}. However, in a similar fashion to Stradling and Hughes, there is no further elaboration or analytical proof to support the remark. It is only in the middle of the chapter that Willeby provides a little more information:

In most of his works Dr. Parry has been greatly influenced by Beethoven and by Brahms, perhaps the latter most conspicuously… One thing is quite evident – he is determined to be original at any cost. Speaking of Brahms at the conclusion of his ‘Studies of Great Composers,’ he says:- “The way he treats the inner parts of his harmony is as much his own as his melody at the top…In other words to make the whole more homogenous”. This is well enough, and the tendency lies assuredly in the right direction; but nevertheless true that there are times when Brahms succeeds in lessening this sharpness of outline, as much by a lack of interest in the subject itself as by an increase of interest in the intervening portions. Dr Parry’s remarks upon his hero are only made the more interesting by the fact that his own music endorses them. The revival of the principles of the great old contrapuntal school, the

working into instrumental forms of the musical qualities of the polyphonic method of Bach, the wedding of the old with the new – these are its prominent characteristics.\textsuperscript{58}

Parry’s own work, \textit{Studies of Great Composers} will be dealt with at length in the next chapter of this study, so no further comment will be made on it at this point. Willeby’s perception of Parry’s music in relation to the composers monograph, however, is very interesting. The first notable aspect of the writing is Willeby’s choice of text to make his point. \textit{Studies of Great Composers} is conspicuous amongst Parry’s written works for the simple reason that apart from a short section of the conclusion, there is no mention of Brahms at all. Given the publication year of 1894, this is possibly not surprising, as Brahms was still alive, and Parry may well have been using Brahms in his conclusion as a current and future ‘great composer’, thereby making his placement in the conclusion justified. Indeed, this notion would seem even more likely based on that fact that the preceding chapter is about Richard Wagner, who died in 1883, thereby providing a good (and at that time, recent) concluding point for past ‘great composers’. Why Willeby chose this particular text of Parry’s is not clear, especially when it is remembered that, at this point in the nineteenth century, Parry had produced a significant amount of material relating to various aspects of music and form in Grove’s dictionary. Willeby’s concluding comments regarding Parry’s emulation of the supposed Brahmsian feature of working contrapuntal devices of the past into current instrumental forms is one of the most insightful comments encountered so far in this study. However, disappointingly, instead of attempting any form of analytical justification for this claim, he moves the discussion on to the ‘English’ aspects of the music. Had Willeby used one or more of Parry’s entries for Grove’s dictionary, he would have had ample analytical material with which to proceed with an analytical

\textsuperscript{58}Ibid., p. 272-274
discussion. On the other hand, it may be that Willeby deliberately chose this text in order to avoid being drawn into such an argument, since the publication is principally biographical. One also senses a slightly mocking tone in Willeby’s writing with the continual references to ‘Dr’ Parry (in a similar manner to Shaw) and the rather colloquial description of Brahms as his ‘hero’

Willeby’s chapter on Stanford seems to follow the same kind of format as its predecessor. The author prominently mentions Michael Quarry who introduced Stanford to the music of Brahms. However, the motive for Willeby’s inclusion of Parry and Stanford become much more apparent in this chapter. In fact, his second reference to Brahms in this section seems to give the game away. He says:

In the autumn of ’73 [1873] he [Stanford] went abroad for the first time. At the Schumann Festival at Bonn he met Brahms and Ferdinand Hiller. In the latter he found a friend; in the former he met his “idol”. His adulation for the art of Brahms is now so great as to almost constitute him a musical sectarian. He can listen to the Fourth Symphony in E minor – yea, even to the Clarinet Trio – and pronounce them beautiful.59

This is a much more bold statement in relation to Brahms in England than any seen in the previous chapter. To refer to Stanford as a sectarian in relation to Brahms without a shred of analytical evidence makes Willeby sound like a nineteenth century Stradling and Hughes. But his argument is unravelled further when he shamelessly uses Stanford’s respect for Brahms as a means of voicing his own dislike of Brahms’s music. This is detected in a review of the work, written in 1893 for The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular, in which the reviewer is universally negative about the work throughout. In the first paragraph for instance, the reviewer states that the book

59 Ibid., p 287-288
'is so thoroughly unsatisfactory in tone and in execution that it is our painful but imperative duty to make an example of it, with the assistance of Mr Willeby himself. It is utterly unrepresentative of cultivated musical opinion in this country, and it is as well that foreigners should understand this clearly.'\textsuperscript{60} It is unsurprising that the reviewer chooses to launch such a strong counterattack on Willeby, expressing particular hope that foreign musicians (and one can assume especially German musicians) would not view any of the content as representative of general musical opinion in England. Regarding the Parry and Stanford chapters, the reviewer refers to them as ‘short, perfunctory, and in places decidedly vulgar’, and that they were ‘inserted, so far as we can see, for the sole object of enabling Mr Willeby to indulge in a number of overt and covert sneers at Brahms.’\textsuperscript{61}

Remaining references to Brahms throughout the chapter confirm this. In relation to Stanford’s ‘The Canterbury Pilgrims’, Willeby maintains that ‘He [Stanford] loves to play at “see-saw” on an enharmonic diesis; but then so does Brahms, and doubtless that is to him sufficient justification. If Brahms’s String Sextet in G and his romances from Tieck’s “Magelone” be examples of what is nicest in manner of modulation, why, then, much of the music in “The Canterbury Pilgrims” is on this score beyond reproach.’\textsuperscript{62} Again, Willeby presents a negative view of Brahms at the expense of Stanford’s own work. As the chapter progresses, these comments become gradually more barbed, concluding with what would be best termed a melodramatic soliloquy at the end of the chapter (and indeed the whole book):

\textsuperscript{60} ‘Masters of English Music by Charles Willeby’, \textit{The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular}, 34 (1893), 425
\textsuperscript{61} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{62} Willeby, \textit{Masters of English Music}, p. 296
Through the efforts of Dr. Stanford, a number of famous musicians will shortly be gathered together in this country, and although it may grieve him sorely that all efforts to secure the attendance of the great Johannes have, for the present at all events, been unavailing, he will be entitled to claim the thanks of his fellow musicians for having used the power which, by virtue of his position, is his to such good purpose. But let him not be cast down. The day may come when even Brahms will awake to the fact that Germany is no longer the hub of the musical universe, and himself its “bearings”; and although it is now a matter of some difficulty to induce him to so much as address an envelope to this country, the time may yet come when he shall be seen fast asleep in his stall at St. James’s Hall (and that through no fault of the performance, mind you) whilst his Fourth Symphony is being conducted by Dr. Villiers Stanford. 63

Based on the information uncovered from the final chapter of the book, The Musical Times reviewer’s evaluation of the book is unfortunately quite accurate. Comments such as the above made by Willeby effectively discredit any other potentially sensible areas of his thesis. For these reasons in the context of this study, Willeby’s work can not be viewed as anything more than a few anecdotal opinions which use England’s two leading composers of the era as flimsy evidence to voice his dislike of the Music of Brahms. Had the author provided any analytical discussion referring comparatively to specific pieces of music, his argument might have been stronger and more plausible. However, as it stands, his comments actually echo those of George Bernard Shaw, discussed in Chapter 1 of this study, although Willeby’s written style is amateurish compared to that of Shaw. But Willeby definitely seems to believe that Brahms’s music influenced the musical output of Parry and Stanford and that his compositional traits are traceable in both their outputs. Although he does not provide anything in the way of analytical evidence to support his claim, the notion has continued to haunt longer biographical publications on both composers throughout the

63 Ibid., p. 302
twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The remainder of this chapter will therefore be devoted to exploring all of these publications in more depth in order to see if there are any more detailed references to the Brahmsian influence in the music of Parry and Stanford.

3.5: Parry the Brahmsian

There have been two principal biographical publications on Charles Hubert Hastings Parry, the first of which was produced by Charles L. Graves and published in two volumes in 1926. The second work was produced over sixty years later by Jeremy Dibble and was published in 1992. Both works provide comprehensive accounts of the life of Parry, although Dibble’s referencing and provision of a bibliography makes his thesis much easier to discuss in current musicological discussion. Another feature which unites both works and is discussed by both authors with varying degrees of detail, is the notion that Brahms was a prominent influence on Parry’s compositions, and that this influence can be seen throughout various aspects of his output.

Graves begins his work with some mildly interesting information regarding Parry’s ancestry, schooling and university education, although much of this data is rather anecdotal and unhelpful. Indeed, when the publication was reviewed in *The Musical Times* of 1 June, 1926, the reviewer actually comments that ‘we feel that he [Graves] lavishes far too much space on trivial details… a mere sample of this kind of thing would have sufficed’⁶⁴. From the various sources used by Graves, a letter to his brother reveals a particular fondness for the music of Bach, Handel and, perhaps least

⁶⁴ ‘Hubert Parry: His Life and Works by Charles L. Graves’, *The Musical Times*, 67 (1926), 524-525 (524)
surprisingly, Mendelssohn amongst the boys in the Eton musical society\textsuperscript{65}. The first reference to Brahms occurs logically at the point at which Parry met Julius Stockhausen, Joachim, and Clara Schumann for the first time in the spring of 1871, at which point Graves recalls Parry’s supposed first exposure to the music of Brahms which was apparently the performance of a ‘Quintet’ in a concert given by Willem Coenen\textsuperscript{66}, although no date is given by Graves as to when the performance took place. If we correlate this supposed performance with the data collected in Appendix I of this study (Vol. II, p. 1), it becomes almost certain that the performance was that of what is thought to have been the British première of the Opus 34 Quintet performed at Coenen’s concerts at some point in April, 1871, reviewed in \textit{The Musical World} on 29 April, 1871. The remainder of the two volumes contain plenty of such occasions demonstrating Parry’s obvious admiration for the music of Brahms.

Graves’ work is unfortunately not particularly comprehensive in its analytical discussion of Parry’s music, including only two references in the work which refer to Brahms’s influence on Parry. The first of these appears in volume I of the work in relation to Parry’s \textit{Prometheus Unbound} for which Graves provides the following evaluation:

The reception of the work by the professional critics of 1880 was, as might be expected, in the main cold and unsympathetic. An exception must be made, however, of the late Professor Prout’s article in \textit{Atheneum} (September 11, 1880), in which the writer, while tracing occasional evidences of an undue leaning towards the methods of Wagner and Brahms (a commonplace of all orthodox critics at that time) and complaining of lack of contrast and repose, of overloaded orchestration, and an excessive continuity of high pressure, finds ‘much more to praise than blame’; acknowledges the presence of


\textsuperscript{66} Ibid., p. 129
‘real poetic feeling and no ordinary dramatic power’, and justly singles out the composer’s unfailing sensitiveness in his treatment of the text, and in coining ‘appropriate expression for every word and every change of sentiment’. 67

As the quotation from Graves’ work demonstrates, virtually none of the evaluation of Prometheus is actually his own – most of it is simply a regurgitation of sections of Ebenezer Prout’s article. Furthermore, there is virtually nothing throughout the two volumes in terms of musical examples, which further weakens his argument, particularly in a discussion of this nature. This weakness with Graves’ work is discussed in the review in The Musical Times: ‘Mr Graves’s treatment of the musical side of his task is less satisfactory – in fact, he has shirked it. Instead of a reasoned, first hand critical discussion of Parry’s works, he gives us a collection of views of others, drawn largely from periodical sources. The result is patchy and unsatisfactory in other ways. A multitude of counsellors may as easily lead to confusion as to wisdom.’68 The notion of Brahms’s influence on Parry is not made any clearer in the second principal reference to the issue in volume II of Graves’ work. In a discussion relating to Parry’s songs, Graves quotes the thoughts of Harry Plunkett Greene on the supposed similarities between the songs of the two composers69. However there are no references of any substance relating to specific works by either composer, and consequently no musical examples, yet again leaving the reader non the wiser as to the manifestation of the Brahmsian influence in Parry’s music.

The other central biographical work on Parry, Hubert Parry: His Life and Music produced by Jeremy Dibble in 1992 provides a more penetrating view of Parry’s

67 ibid., p. 214
68 ‘Hubert Parry’, Musical Times, 67 (1926), 525
69 Harry Plunket Greene in Graves, Hubert Parry, II, p. 169
music than does Graves. There are many references to the Brahmsian influences on Parry’s work throughout the text. The central difference here is that as well as providing ample and meticulously researched biographical information on Parry, Dibble also devotes a great deal of time to discussing the composer’s music, providing a significant amount of comparative analytical explanation not hitherto seen in any of the literature examined so far in this thesis.

Dibble’s first serious reference to a Brahmsian influence on Parry appears in his discussion of the *Grosses Duo* in E minor, a work for two pianos which Parry began composing in September 1875. Significantly, at the same time as writing the *Grosses Duo*, Parry was apparently engaged in the ‘intellectually absorbing’ exercise of a detailed study of Brahms’s Piano Quintet \(^70\). Parry’s engagement in such a detailed analytical activity almost certainly influenced his compositional output at this time. Dibble’s subsequent discussion of the Brahmsian elements of the work is made all the more convincing by the use of substantial musical examples.

Parry’s indebtedness to Brahms in the *Grosses Duo* apparently manifests itself most prominently in the second subject group of the first movement:

His indebtedness is perhaps most conspicuous in the second group which exploits the possibilities expounded by Brahms in his G minor Piano Quartet. Here the first movement contains one of the largest, most prodigiously integrated second groups in sonata literature, infused by a strong contrast between the minor and major modes of the dominant key – a method Brahms no doubt borrowed from the first movement of Schubert’s G major quartet (D. 887). Brahms begins his second group with a new theme in the dominant minor which soon gives way to a longer (and thematically richer) section in the dominant major and concludes with the minor which reiterates the opening material, now recomposed.

Between the two statements occurs a new theme in G major…The transition to G major is prefaced by a passage through the Neapolitan of B (achieved by a reinterpretation of the German sixth in bar 43 as the dominant seventh of C) of which G is the natural dominant. G major, although more prolonged, acts as a Neapolitan to the dominant of B to which it drops in bar 62. Such an extensive use of the Neapolitan again suggests the strong influence of Brahms’s Piano Quintet whose first movement is finely balanced between established keys and their Neapolitans.\textsuperscript{71}

Dibble also provides four musical examples in full score, one of which comes from the first subject group of the \textit{Duo} and the remaining three from the second group, which allows one to see the processes in the area under discussion. Most of Dibble’s argument in relation to the Brahmsian element of this piece is related to tonality. His use of Brahms’s Quartet in G minor (Op. 25) and the Quintet in F minor (Op. 34) as suitable modes for comparison with the \textit{Duo} is made even more convincing when it is remembered that these pieces are probably some of the only chamber works of Brahms that Parry had been exposed to at the point at which he began composing the piece (indeed, as has already been revealed in Appendix I of this study, these two pieces were first performed together along with the Op. 26 Quartet at Willem Coenen’s concert at the Hanover Square Rooms in 1871 – a performance which Parry very likely attended). There are some aspects of Dibble’s argument in relation to the \textit{Duo} which are less clear. For instance, in his discussion of the recapitulation, he maintains that it provides ‘further confirmation of the Brahmsian model’\textsuperscript{72}, with extensive recomposed sections in both the first and second groups. At this point, with the exception of a few obvious tonality changes, Dibble does not venture any further into the technical aspects of the recapitulation. However, this is unsurprising, as the

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid., p. 129-130  
\textsuperscript{72} Ibid., p. 134
monograph also biographical, therefore Dibble does not have the time to discuss the piece in any more detail.

The remainder of Dibble’s text follows a similar pattern in the discussion of Parry’s works. He demonstrates with excellent conciseness and clarity the supposed Brahmsian elements in several more chamber and orchestral works, including the Piano Trio in E minor (1876), the Wind Nonet in B flat (1877), The First Symphony (1883), Quintet in E flat, The Overture to an Unwritten Tragedy, The Fifth Symphony, and, of course, the Elegy for Brahms. His discussion of the Piano Trio focuses on the opening movement and the ‘Brahmsian principles of tight motivic integration’ with the opening thematic idea of B-C-B, with a sprinkling of examples of its prevalence throughout the movement. Yet more interesting is the discussion regarding Parry’s Quintet in E flat, to which Dibble draws a brief but insistent comparison to Brahms’s Quintet (Op. 88):

In his Quintet Parry attempted to mirror many of the features of Brahms’s work. The first movement has a similar fresh lyricism, though it lacks the vibrancy of Brahms’s thematic and tonal contrast. The Scherzo on the other hand, is a vigorous, inventive movement imbued with Brahmsian seriousness and characterised by the explosive chords heard at the opening which are then dramatically extended in the coda.73

This comparison is less helpful than some of the others in the text, as it does not seem to refer to specific aspects of the piece, so much as the general style, which of course, without analytical evidence is open to debate. Indeed, Dibble provides a similar type of discussion in relation to the Overture to and Unwritten Tragedy and the Fifth Symphony, although in the case of the Overture, he does highlight the seminal motif

73 Ibid., p. 220-221
of the piece (A-G sharp-A). Critical evaluations of Dibble’s text tend to revolve around the lack of integration between purely biographical information and the interjected analyses of Parry’s music. However, one critic ventures further, stating that the specific analyses (such as that of the *Grosses Duo* quoted earlier in this chapter) ‘contain a good deal of unconvincing motif identification at once out of place in the chronologically arranged setting and insufficiently rigorous to reveal much about Parry’s thematic processes, except perhaps to demonstrate how less cogent and economical they were than those of Brahms, upon whom Parry has so often been considered to have modelled his mature style.’

Whilst Dibble’s approach may not be appreciated by all, in relation to this study, it is an ideal one. The chronological approach to the book enables one to see almost immediately exactly which pieces of Brahms’s music Parry was likely to have been exposed to at key points, such as when he began writing the *Grosses Duo*. Furthermore, the short analyses and discussions of Brahmsian stylistic features provide an invaluable starting point for further analytical research into the issue, which will be investigated in chapters 5 and 6 of this study.

The comment made by Grogan regarding Parry’s modelling of his ‘mature’ style on that of Brahms is actually disproved by Dibble, in that the Brahmsian element of his work is thought to have begun with the *Grosses Duo* in 1876 and continued until the Symphonic Fantasia of 1912. Indeed, at this point in his text, Dibble takes his argument even further, tentatively suggesting that the Fantasia is so forward looking that its processes are more akin to the early tonal works of Arnold Schoenberg (and in particular the Op. 7 Quartet in D minor) than those of Brahms. However, Dibble does point out that it is unlikely that Parry knew of Schoenberg’s Quartet, but it is

---

74 Christopher Grogan, ‘C. Hubert H Parry: His Life and Music by Jeremy Dibble (Review)’, *Music and Letters*, 74 (1993), 455-458 (457)
75 Dibble, *C. Hubert H. Parry*, p. 462
interesting nonetheless to speculate that Parry may have latterly moved beyond Brahms to an even more forward looking style.

After Dibble’s monumental study of Parry, there has only been one more substantial study of his musical output entitled Parry’s Creative Process by Michael Allis. This book is focused on Parry’s music, but more from the point of view of the process of its creation, from gestation to its eventual rehearsal and performance. There are a number of references to Brahms throughout the study, but these tend to be related to historical events rather than his influence. Therefore at this point, Allis’s book does not warrant further discussion. However, his work will be considered in the analytical discussions of Chapters 5 and 6 of this study.

3.6: Stanford the Brahmsian

In no way outdone by his contemporary Parry, there are also a number of biographical monographs on Stanford and his musical output. In a similar manner to Parry, there were a number of brief obituary items produced immediately after his death in 1924. The first substantial study of his life was produced by Harry Plunket Greene and published in 1935. In a parallel fashion to Parry, research on the composer lay almost untouched for many years until two simultaneous publications appeared in 2002: Charles Villiers Stanford by Paul Rodmell, and Charles Villiers Stanford: Man and Musician by Jeremy Dibble. All the publications provide information regarding Stanford’s admiration for Brahms with some superficially discussing the Brahmsian influence on Stanford’s compositional output.
Of the three monographs, Plunket Greene’s biography is the easiest to evaluate in the context of this study, for the simple reason that it contains the least useful information. Whilst Plunket Greene provides an undoubtedly interesting account of Stanford’s life, and an excellent account of his output in the field of vocal music (many of Stanford’s songs were written specifically for Plunket Greene, who was a bass-baritone\(^76\)), the instrumental music is given little attention. Furthermore, aside from a couple of now famous anecdotes about his association with Brahms and his music – such as the 1877 honorary degree ceremony at Cambridge\(^77\) – Plunket Greene does not venture any further into the already familiar notion that Brahms influenced his compositional output. None of the reviews of the book present much in the way of critical insight as to Plunket Greene’s method or ability as a biographer and analyst. One can only assume that out of deference to his friend, Plunket Greene was being deliberately reserved, and thus was indeed not the ideal candidate to be discussing Stanford’s output from the point of view required by the present study.

The works of Dibble and Rodmell on the other hand both contain some interesting and controversial critical insight into Stanford’s music, particularly relating to the Brahmsian elements which it supposedly contains, with both parallels and differences in terms of which works are the most Brahmsian. Both authors provide an excellent foundation, discussing Stanford’s early years, his time at Cambridge and his studies in Leipzig. However, regarding the notion of Stanford the Brahmsian, divisions between the two works begin to occur in the discussions of the music.


\(^77\) Harry Plunket Greene, Charles Villiers Stanford (London: Edward Arnold, 1935), p. 69
Rodmell’s first reference to a Brahmsian influence on Stanford occurs in relation to the Piano Quartet in F. Rodmell maintains that the ‘harmonic language may remain strongly redolent of Schumann and Brahms’ and that the piece uses rhythmic figures and melodic motifs derived from Irish folk song. He provides six musical examples to accompany his short analysis of the piece:

![Musical example 3.6c](Figure 3.2: Musical example 3.6c in Charles Villiers Stanford by Paul Rodmell – the second subject of the first movement of Stanford’s Piano Quartet in F, Op. 15)

All of Rodmell’s examples associated with Stanford’s Op. 15 Quartet are focused on motivic identification with brackets and labels, such as that seen in Figure 3.1, which presumably – although it is never explicitly stated – relate to Rodmell’s brief reference to the use of motivic material derived from Irish folk music. He does not attempt to provide any further explanation for his assertion of the harmonic language being Brahmsian. Most of his remaining comments on Brahmsian elements in Stanford’s music are of a similar depth and vein to this. For instance, he says that Brahms ‘obviously’ influenced the first movement of Stanford’s Second Symphony but explains himself no further. Rodmell also discusses the famous motivic parallel between the slow movements of Brahms’s Fourth Symphony and Stanford’s Third (Irish), discussed at length earlier in this chapter.

Rodmell’s most interesting and controversial reference to Brahms, however, occurs in his discussion of Stanford’s Seventh Symphony:

---

79 Ibid., p. 88
The Seventh Symphony in D minor, Op. 124 was completed on 6 February 1911 and premiered at the Philharmonic Society on 22 February 1912. Its most noticeable feature is its brevity – it takes about twenty-five minutes to perform – and Stanford is said to have been delighted that he managed to compress the whole symphonic argument into the time taken by Haydn or Mozart…The first movement … is Brahmsian in structure, although Stanford greatly compressed the development and transition passages. Interest is maintained by presenting exposition material differently in the recapitulation by extensive re-orchestration, and continuing thematic and tonal manipulation. This use of Brahms’s ‘developing variation’ technique is taken further in the next movement, a structural ingenuity. The movement opens with a B flat stately minuet, imbued with classical figures but with nods to both Beethoven and Brahms, and is followed by a ‘trio’ in the tonic minor.\textsuperscript{80}

Rodmell’s argument is very difficult to justify. As the above quotation demonstrates, he evidently believes that there are many Brahmsian processes at work in the symphony, although their exact manifestations are never fully explored or explained. However, most radically, Rodmell suggests that Stanford adopts what he calls ‘Brahms’s developing variation technique’. In the context of this study, this statement requires further consideration and clarification. Developing variation is not actually a technique invented by Brahms, as Rodmell appears to be suggesting at this point. It was in fact a very vague term used by Arnold Schoenberg in his critical and analytical discussions of Brahms’s music. All appearances of the term in Schoenberg’s writing are fleeting and include no serious attempt to clarify it. For instance, in \textit{Fundamentals of Musical Composition}, Schoenberg produces the following definition:

\begin{quote}
Homophonic music can be called the style of “developing variation”. This means that in the succession of motive forms produced through variation of the basic motive, there is something which can be compared to development, to growth.\textsuperscript{81}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{80} Ibid., p. 268-269  
There are no further references to the term in the book. All other definitions throughout Schoenberg’s intermittent theoretical writing are similarly brief. Furthermore, Schoenberg fails to define any of his supporting terminology (e.g. ‘basic motive’), hence why ‘developing variation’ is a difficult term to justify in a study of this type. Several musicologists (notably Walter Frisch) have attempted to come up with a clearer definition of ‘developing variation’. However, in spite of much additional research, and, due to an absence of source material, and the notorious vagueness of Schoenberg’s theoretical works, the term still remains something of an enigma. In the case of Rodmell’s monograph, use of the term in the context of a biographical study without adequate explanation should probably have been avoided, as it almost certainly creates more problems than it answers. Rodmell also refers to the third and fourth movements of the Symphony as being in the Brahmsian style, particularly referring to the innovative use of variation form. As with his other analyses, there is a page of musical examples, which again follow the same ‘motivic’ emphasis of those seen in the Op. 15 Quartet. Whilst they assist the reader in visualising the motivic content of the symphony, they do not really assist with the question of exactly how Stanford treats them in terms of the supposed intense variation and manipulation that they are subject to throughout. Rodmell’s persistence regarding the Brahmsian and general Germanic tone of Stanford’s work is noted by reviewers of the book, and in particular Peter Horton, who concurs with Rodmell that this was the reason that many of his works ‘failed the test of greatness’\(^{82}\).

---

\(^{82}\) Peter Horton, ‘Charles Villiers Stanford by Paul Rodmell’, *Victorian Studies*, 46 (2004), 351-353 (352)
Dibble’s approach to the Brahmsian influence on Stanford is quite different from that of Rodmell. Dibble’s first crucial reference to Brahms in the text is during his discussion of Stanford’s early musical education in Dublin with Michael Quarry in which he claims that it was as a result of Quarry’s ‘progressive musical sympathies’ that Stanford initially became acquainted with the music of Brahms\(^{83}\). This essentially gives the reader a good indication of the relatively large length of time that Brahms was a familiar composer to Stanford. Indeed, the fact that Stanford’s introduction to Brahms’s music occurred before he visited Frankfurt in 1874 and 1875 demonstrates that Brahms’s music was undoubtedly a long term influence and not one which he encountered suddenly during his training in Germany, although his German trips would seem likely to have increased the influence.

The first reference made by Dibble to the Brahmsian influence in Stanford’s musical output is in relation to his early Serenade Op. 18, which he describes as ‘unabashed in its emulation of the German master’s first major symphonic essays, the two serenades, Opp. 11 and 16, which blend those features of classical clarity, dance forms, and lyricism. The opening movement, a concise sonata structure, is a sunny natured affair, surely influenced by the first movement of Brahms’s Second Symphony (itself a ‘serenade’ work in spirit) and characterised by the self assured ‘waltz’ idea of the second subject’. Immediately one is presented with an alternative to Rodmell’s work. Dibble (unlike Rodmell) helpfully suggests pieces of Brahms’s music which he believes influenced Stanford’s work and also suggests more specific musical features by which Stanford was influenced.

The largest portion of Dibble’s text devoted to the correlations between the two composers is his discussion of Stanford’s Third (Irish) Symphony:

The first movement of the ‘Irish’ Symphony confirmed unequivocally Stanford’s conviction in the Brahmsian model of organic evolution, a process already essayed with some thoroughness in the corresponding movement of the Piano Quintet. Here, however, the composer makes much play on the opening cell C – D flat – F which is ubiquitous throughout the first group, development and coda (where its inversion is especially prevalent).\(^{84}\)

Although Dibble provides no musical examples in this instance, his explanation for what he believes to be the principal Brahmsian element of the work is more than sufficient explanation. The opening ‘motivic cell’ and its subsequent manipulation throughout the movement is a common observation in Brahms analyses. Indeed, this is very similar in tone to Dibble’s descriptions of similar activity in Brahms’s Op. 34 Quintet in his Parry monograph discussed earlier in this chapter. However, the notion that there is strong Brahmsian motivic variation in this movement may seem strange when it is remembered that the motifs in this symphony are largely derived from Irish folk music (hence its nickname) and Stanford actually acknowledged that folk tunes do not lend themselves to developmental treatment. For these reasons, this piece, and in particular its first movement will be examined in more detail in the second part of this study.

The remainder of Dibble’s references to Stanford’s Brahmsian inclinations tend to be of a similar type to those presented in relation to Stanford’s Op. 18 Serenade. Pieces which Dibble believes contains these influences include the Opp. 44 and 45 Quartets, which he describes as being ‘Brahmsian in method’ but ‘un-Brahmsian’ in terms of

\(^{84}\) Ibid., p. 185
the lighter texture of the works\textsuperscript{85}. The Clarinet Sonata, Op. 129, is described by Dibble as being modelled on Brahms two Op. 120 sonatas, whilst in Stanford’s Second Piano Concerto, the ‘shadow’ of Brahms’s two works in the genre are said to be perceptible, particularly in the ‘passage work of the piano writing and in much of the developmental process of the music’\textsuperscript{86}. Whilst these are relatively short comments, they are useful in that they pinpoint the exact aspects of each piece which Dibble perceives the Brahmsian influence, thereby giving the present investigation an excellent starting point for further study of the music.

Both Dibble and Rodmell’s work on Stanford present this study with useful information. Whilst Rodmell’s analyses are generally longer and usually have at least one musical example, Dibble’s analytical comments are more focused, which present one with specific ideas which can be investigated in more detail. Indeed, this notion is echoed in Martin Anderson’s review of the two works in the \textit{Tempo} journal\textsuperscript{87}. However, as has been mentioned previously in this study, both monographs are biographical works, therefore both authors have had to be brief and often do not get the opportunity to explain their analytical ideas in anything other than the briefest terms.

3.7: Conclusion

This chapter has assessed and evaluated the most prominent pieces of literature containing relevant references to the current thesis. Separation of the chapter into the three sections has allowed one to see the strength and weaknesses associated with

\textsuperscript{85} Ibid., p. 232
\textsuperscript{86} Ibid., p. 425
various types of literature, as well as presenting a clearer idea of how various authors viewed the supposed Brahmsian influence on Parry and Stanford. The common theme which runs throughout the literature is a constant nagging insistence that Brahms did in fact influence these composers, but nearly all the works lack the necessary analytical evidence to justify the claim. Deconstruction and discussion of the terms ‘Das land ohne musik’ and ‘English Musical Renaissance’ within the context of Brahms’s music in England has demonstrated that their use is largely unnecessary and probably more of a hindrance than a help when discussing specific aspects of the period such as this. All the literature, but especially the biographical publications have presented an excellent starting point in terms of musical works by Parry and Stanford which supposedly display the Brahmsian influence. Some of these will form the basis of analytical discussion in later chapters of this study. Indeed, Parry and Stanford have emerged as the leading figures regarding the notion of a Brahmsian influence on English composition. It is extremely fortunate that, as well as their musical works, both composers also left a great deal of theoretical work on music. The natural progression from this chapter therefore, is to examine these theoretical publications in order to try and isolate further exactly which aspects of Brahms’s music they thought were significant, thus forming a solid foundation for the analytical dissection and discussion of their own works.
Chapter 4: Subject of Influence: Brahms in the Written Works of Charles Hubert Hastings Parry and Charles Villiers Stanford

‘Not one great composer, not one great sculptor or painter, has ever brought the world to his feet, who has not laid his foundations on the work already done by his predecessors. The laws of evolution are as true in music as in other arts; composers do not as a rule, spring ready-made out of the head of Jupiter; if they do, it is because they have already absorbed what is best in Jupiter’s brains.’

4.0: Introduction

The music of Johannes Brahms evidently became a large and important part of English concert life in the late nineteenth century, as the previous chapters of this study have demonstrated. However, his supposed influence on compositional trends is very much taken for granted by many musicologists, with virtually all publications being very blasé about the notion. Indeed, there is disappointingly little evidence of any serious study of Brahms’s impact on British composition other than the small excerpts discussed in Chapter 3 of this study. Hubert Parry and Charles Villiers Stanford are generally held as two of the nineteenth century’s prime representatives in English composition. Both composers have been the subject of biographical publications. These studies have revealed a wealth of official and unofficial publications by both composers relating to many aspects of music, including compositional method and formal analysis.

1 Charles Villiers Stanford, ‘Mr Hubert Parry’s Judith’, Fortnightly Review, 44 (1888), 537-545 (538)
As previous chapters of this thesis have revealed, Parry was a principal contributor to the first edition of Grove’s *Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, presenting information on many aspects of music, and in particular various musical forms. Similarly, Stanford authored the famous treaty on composition along with a number of other publications in which he presents snippets of his thoughts on the technical aspects of Brahms’s music. Both composers covered a wide variety of musical subjects. Indeed, the writings could quite easily form the subject of a thesis in their own right. In order to prevent this chapter from descending into a chronological chain of vague unrelated comments on Brahms from each composer, the writings are probably best dealt with from the following perspectives:

1) General comments on the music of Brahms, as well as their deference towards other composers.

2) Harmony.

3) Process.

4) Genre and Form.

5) Orchestration.

Within these categories the most useful examples relating to the music of Brahms from their publications will be discussed. Wherever possible, musical examples and discussions thereof by Parry and Stanford are used to provide conclusions. In instances where musical examples and further discussion are not provided (which occurs more frequently in the case of Stanford, for the simple reason that he produced less formal written work on music than Parry), appropriate examples from Brahms’s works, along with speculative analytical discussion by the present author are included. From this, it should be possible to build as detailed a picture as possible of exactly
how each man was influenced by Brahms, thus providing an analytical foundation on which analysis of select examples of their own orchestral and chamber works is carried out in chapters 5 and 6 of this study. The principal texts which are used in the discussion of formal compositional features are Parry’s contributions to the first edition of Grove’s *Dictionary of Music and Musicians* and Stanford’s *Musical Composition: A Short Treatise for Students*. Out of each composer’s numerous formal publications, these are the most substantial in terms of attention to detail in their discussions of exactly which compositional features of Brahms they most admired and by which they were probably most influenced.

### 4.1: *Parry and Stanford’s Reaction to the Music of Johannes Brahms: A General Perspective*

There are a large number of very general references to the music of Brahms in the written works of both Parry and Stanford, most of which indicate that they saw his music as a primary example of German composition in the late nineteenth century. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the later chapters of Parry’s second published monograph, *The Evolution of the Art of Music*:

And moreover, even in the highest branches of art, represented by the noble symphonies of Brahms, which illustrate the loftiest standard of style of the day, the significant change from the old ideals in respect of the subject matter is noticeable. For the aim in his works on the grandest scale is but rarely after what is equivalent to external beauty in music. What beauty is aimed at is beauty of thought, the beauty of nobleness, and high musical intelligence. Even beauty of colour is but rarely present; but the colours are always characteristic, and confirm the reality of the powerful expressive ideas.²

---

Parry’s respect and deference towards the music of Brahms can be seen in the above quotation, with a slightly defensive tone to the writing. Indeed, his claims that the music lacks what was perceived to be ‘external beauty’ suggest that he was defending Brahms’s work, possibly in relation to the various critical comments that were being produced by the newspapers and journals of the time, many of which have been discussed earlier in chapter 1 of this study (although by 1896, most reviews of performances of Brahms’s music in England were generally quite favourable). Similarly, his famous address to the students of the Royal College of Music, upon the death of Brahms also reveals fondness and respect for the composer. For instance, he refers to the ‘overwhelming sense of loss’ and that ‘we can scarcely bring ourselves to face the fact that there will be no more symphonies, quartets, Schicksalslied, requiems, songs, sonatas, part-songs, nor any other treasures of art marked by the strong and noble individuality of that particularly heroic tone poet’. Brahms’s death evidently affected Parry extremely deeply. Jeremy Dibble indicates in his biography on Parry that Brahms ‘epitomised Parry’s ideal of all that was artistically sincere, single minded, and intellectually honest.’ Furthermore, he was also apparently ‘too much overcome in talking about Brahms’, noted in his diary after he presented the address. That said, from a purely analytical point of view, because Parry does not go into any further detail regarding his thoughts on specific works in either of these works, the comments can only be used as a general indication of how he viewed Brahms’s music. However, Parry’s work for the first edition of Grove’s *Dictionary of Music and Musicians* is a treasure trove of information on Brahmsian processes that he admired.

---

4 Dibble, *C. Hubert H. Parry*, p. 345
5 An excerpt from Parry’s diary, in Dibble, *C. Hubert H. Parry*, p. 346
In a similar manner to Parry, Stanford also produced much written work with general comments regarding his thoughts on Brahms. By and large, Stanford’s written style is much more florid and interesting than Parry’s, which probably resulted in him creating more personal reminiscence works than Parry, such as *Pages from an Unwritten Diary*, and *Interludes, Records and Reflections*. A good indication of Stanford’s general written style can be seen acutely at the beginning of the former publication, in which he states ‘A few of the records it contains may, and I trust will, be of some future value. They are my only excuse for inflicting upon the public a volume which is so prolific of the first person singular. In all such books the “I’s” must needs stand out like telegraph poles’\(^6\). Regarding his more general comments on the music of Brahms, Stanford is more of a challenge, in that most of them relate to personal reminiscences from either his own experiences or those of acquaintances. His admiration and respect for the composer can clearly be seen in his recollection of the Cambridge honorary degree celebrations of 1877, discussed in chapter 1 of this study. However, his most potent comment is made in reference to a concert in Hamburg in 1880:

During the winter of 1880 I went with a highly gifted Fellow of Trinity, the late Richard C. Rowe, to Hamburg, and we chanced by good luck on a concert at which Brahms played his Second concerto in B flat, then a novelty. The reception given to the composer by his native town was as enthusiastic as we anticipated. His pianoforte playing was not so much that of a finished pianist, as of a composer who despised virtuosity. The skips, which are many and perilous in the solo part, were accomplished regardless of accuracy, and it is no exaggeration to say that there were handfuls of wrong notes. The touch was somewhat hard, and lacking in force-control; it was at its best in the slow movement, where he produced the true velvety quality, probably because he was not so hampered by his own difficulties. But never since have I heard a rendering of a concerto, so complete in its outlook or so big in its

\(^6\) Charles Villiers Stanford, *Pages from an Unwritten Diary*, p. vii
interpretation. The wrong notes did not really matter, they did not disturb the hearers any more than himself. He took it for granted that the public knew that he had written the right notes, and did not worry himself over such little trifles as hitting the wrong ones.\footnote{Ibid., p. 200}

This account of the concert, whilst not particularly helpful from an analytical point of view, certainly gives the indication that Stanford was fond of Brahms’s music. Indeed, Stanford’s humorous inclinations are also visible here, particularly in relation to Brahms’s technical performing accuracy. In a similar manner to the work of Parry, one senses that these comments regarding Brahms’s accuracy, although outwardly humorous are also slightly defensive particularly when coupled with his deference regarding Brahms’s general interpretation of the work. Similar respectful comments appear throughout Stanford’s work, such as in his short biography of Brahms, in which he claims that ‘Brahms never wrote a single note to make money, though he never (in the interests of his brethren as well as himself) would acquiesce in the undervaluing of music when written because it was intrinsically good’\footnote{Charles Villiers Stanford, Brahms, The Mayfair Biographies, 2 (London: Murdoch, 1912), p. 19}. Unsurprisingly, again, Stanford is very deferential here, suggesting that, in spite of his eventual relative wealth and fame as a composer, Brahms was not a composer who wrote music specifically for financial gain. Indeed, the reviews of his music witnessed in Chapter 1 of this study reflect such an approach. The fact that his music was seen as difficult to understand unless one was privileged to repeated hearings suggest that the music was written primarily with technical and aesthetic considerations in mind, as opposed to a positive reaction from the audience.

Both Parry and Stanford present interesting views regarding how they interpreted Brahms’s position in the historical progression of composers and their music. Parry’s
monograph *Studies of Great Composers* was discussed briefly in the last chapter. However, the publication warrants further attention at this point. The book was originally published in 1886, ten years before Brahms’s death (although as previous chapters of this study have demonstrated, his music was fairly well established in England by this point). Parry divided the work into twelve chapters with eleven relating to a specific composer, and the twelfth being a conclusion:

Table 4.1: The Division of the Chapters in C. Hubert H. Parry’s monograph *Studies of Great Composers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Palestrina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Handel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Johann Sebastian Bach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Haydn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Carl Maria von Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Franz Schubert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mendelssohn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Robert Schumann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Richard Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table 4.1 shows, Parry’s choice of composers is revealing. With the exception of Palestrina, he discusses (in chronological order) exclusively Austro-German composers, giving the reader a clear indication of his musical preferences from the outset. His comments on Wagner are exactly what one would expect from a relatively small chapter in a volume of this nature, comprising a brief account of his life with a particular focus on his contributions to the genre of opera. Parry’s general opinion on Wagner’s output is mostly constructively positive:

His character and abilities were extremely comprehensive in many ways, and it was this diversity of artistic gifts which gave him pre-eminence in his particular branch of art. He had at once great literary talents and power of verbal expression, an astounding sense of colour and rhythm, an insight into the
meaning of the highest music, and the right way to deal with it; a strong sense of human character and a feeling for its greatest beauties; dramatic fire, passion, tenderness, and even a very acute sense of scenic effect, and of what was thoroughly adapted to theatrical treatment. Such a combination was just what was needed to achieve the highest artistic possibility in a music drama; for all the elements necessary were in one man’s hands… The marvel in the case of Wagner was that prior to his time so little had been done in the direction which he took, and the great pitch to which he carried the new treatment of his art.⁹

This paragraph describing Wagner’s contributions to opera is very deferential and is reflective of the tone of the whole chapter. Based on some of the literature discussed in the previous chapter of this study (particularly that of Hughes and Stradling), it may seem surprising that Parry demonstrates such respect to Wagner. However, it clearly demonstrates that Parry was not entirely and exclusively obsessed by the music of Brahms, although the Austro-German bias of the work as a whole is noticeable. Indeed, with such a strong emphasis on composers from this tradition, it is perhaps surprising that he did not include a specific chapter on Brahms. However, one only needs to look at the conclusion section of the book to understand Parry’s intentions in this regard.

The conclusion section is fairly typical, in that it looks to the future in terms of the leading figures in composition of the era. Based on Parry’s strong Austro-German bias throughout the book, and the fact that Brahms was still alive and active at this point, he (Brahms) is the principal subject of this section of the work:

The pre-eminence which the Germans have gained by their thoroughness and clearness of judgement, and true nobility of thought in music is still maintained by Johannes Brahms, a descendent in the direct

⁹ C. Hubert H. Parry, *Studies of Great Composers*, p. 355
line of Bach and Beethoven. He represents a totally different kind of art from Wagner, who is nearest
to him in point of time, for all his fame is centred in instrumental music and songs and choral works,
and none in dramatic music for the stage, while Wagner’s position is entirely due to his great
achievements in the latter department. 10

Parry demonstrates an acute awareness of the strengths of both Brahms and Wagner
in the field of composition, and evidently has a huge amount of respect for them both,
although Brahms is spoken of very much as the future in terms of composition. Parry
goes on to provide a short relatively uninteresting biography of Brahms. However, he
then describes Brahms’s approach to composition in a little more depth, referring to
Brahms’s principle of ‘developing his works as complete organisms’ 11 within the
context of a traditional musical form, with evidence of the ‘polyphonic method of
Bach’ 12. What seems to impress Parry the most about the fusion of tradition and
modernism is that it ‘is achieved without a trace of pedantry, as it is not the details,
but the principles which are used’ 13. Unfortunately, as a result of the constraints of the
chapter, Parry does not suggest any examples of Brahms’s music which particularly
embody these ideas. Therefore, at this point a speculative example will be used. As
the book was published in 1886, the obvious piece which springs to mind for use as
an example is the finale of Brahms’s Fourth Symphony, which (as Appendix I shows)
was first performed in England in the same year, although it would seem likely that
Parry would have known of the piece before this point. The finale of the Fourth
Symphony is in the form of a set of over thirty variations, set on the following
passacaglia bass:

10 Ibid., p. 361
11 Ibid., p. 362
12 Ibid., p. 363
13 Ibid.
Figure 4.1: The passacaglia theme in the finale of Brahms’s Fourth Symphony

It has been suggested by some musicologists, including Walter Frisch that Brahms’s passacaglia theme was actually based on a chaconne subject in the last movement of Bach’s Cantata No. 150:

Figure 4.2: The chaconne subject from Bach’s Cantata 150

If one compares figures 4.1 and 4.2, the overall shape of the themes are very similar. There is some evidence in the memoirs of the conductor Siegfried Ochs that Brahms used the cantata as a starting point for the finale of his Fourth Symphony. However, the citation is not supported by definitive evidence. The very fact that Brahms was using the ancient technique in the context of a modern symphony, supports Parry’s idea regarding Brahms's combination of old forms in modern composition. Brahms’s skill in the area of variation is demonstrated by the lack of prominence of the passacaglia throughout the movement. Furthermore, Brahms eventually incorporates into the variations, the falling third figure originating in the first movement, although in a varied form:

Figure 4.3: The principal theme of the opening movement of Brahms’s Fourth Symphony (bars 1-4)

The changes to the principal theme can be seen clearly. The motif also occurs in the thirtieth variation in different forms across virtually all the instrumental groups. The appearance of this motif in the twenty ninth and thirtieth variations of the movement is significant, as they are the last notable variations on the passacaglia theme before the music moves on to the coda in bar 253. So Brahms is re-introducing the motive at the last possible moment before he has to present the coda material to bring the movement to a close, thereby effectively taking the music in an organic thematic circle. Such an organic technique operating alongside the traditional passacaglia surely reflects Parry’s notions of the ‘complete organism’ and an excellent demonstration of the use of the principles of the ‘old contrapuntal school’.

The other interesting quotation in relation to Brahms’s music in the concluding chapter of Parry’s book, is in relation to his supposed progression in relation to previous composers in the field of chamber music:

The change began in Beethoven’s time, and he succeeded in producing much more massive works without losing the refinement of the old style. After his time the style of the best and most popular works of the kind became much louder and more symphonic, and the details were more richly treated; more colour was introduced, and more vehemence of expression. From this point of view of the worshipper of the old delicate and refined style of chamber music this was naturally a great falling off; but this branch of art was undergoing an inevitable change, and though it still kept the name, chamber music ceased to be designed only for small audiences or private rooms. Under these conditions Brahms

\[ \text{Figure 4.4: The re-appearance of the opening theme of Brahms's Fourth Symphony in the strings in the twenty-ninth variation of the finale (bars 233-236)} \]

\[ \text{Parry, } Studies, \text{ p. 362} \]
found a comparatively fresh field, and he developed his pianoforte quartetts, trios, and quintetts on an immense scale, aiming at the most powerful effects the instruments were capable of, and replacing the refinements of the older school by the interest and complexity of his details.\footnote{Ibid., p. 365}

Once again, due to the necessarily brief nature of the chapter, Parry is unable to provide an analytical example to substantiate his discussion. Indeed, any one of Brahms’s numerous chamber works could act as an example at this point. However, the one which is probably the most fitting in relation to Parry’s discussion is the Op. 25 Piano Quartet. The Opus 25 and 26 quartets of Brahms are cited by many musicologists, including again Walter Frisch, as the turning point in his output between his earlier more acerbic works, and the more concise and sophisticated efforts of his later works.\footnote{Walter Frisch, \textit{Brahms and the Principle of Developing Variation} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), p. 77} Frisch’s argument is based upon the Schoenbergian idea of ‘developing variation’. However, in relation to this study, it would seem very significant that of all his principal chamber works, it was the Op. 8 Trio which was subject to revision later in the composer’s life, suggesting that by the time Op. 25 was composed, Brahms was more at ease with his method of composition. Parry’s first notable comment in relation to Brahms’s chamber music is that of his ‘producing much more massive works without losing the refinement of the old style’. One need only compare the length of Brahms’s quartet to one by Haydn to demonstrate exactly what Parry means:
Table 4.2: The Difference in Length Between Haydn’s String Quartet, Op. 33, No. 2, and Brahms’s Piano Quartet, Op. 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Haydn’s String Quartet, Op. 33, No. 2</th>
<th>Brahms’s Piano Quartet, Op. 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>90 bars</td>
<td>373 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>68 bars</td>
<td>325 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>72 bars</td>
<td>235 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>172 bars</td>
<td>405 bars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 amply demonstrates the larger scale of the Brahms composition compared to a similar one by Haydn. Parry also comments that the ‘details were more richly treated’. This can be seen simply by examining the opening of each piece:

![Figure 4.5: The opening thematic idea from Haydn’s String Quartet, Op. 33, No. 2](image-url)
Figure 4.5 demonstrates a typical opening to a Haydn string quartet. Most of the thematic interest is in the first violin part, with the second violin, viola and violoncello acting as an accompaniment. In stark contrast, the opening of Brahms’s quartet (figure 4.6), reveals a prominent use of counterpoint from the outset, with the principal thematic material starting in the piano, gradually moving its way through the
remaining three stringed instruments. Furthermore, the crucial motive of the minor second (F sharp-G in bar 1) is developed almost straight away by the piano in the right and left hands in bars 6 to 8. In the right hand an augmented inversion of the second appears in the uppermost part, whilst rhythmically augmented versions appear in octaves in the left hand. This is surely a prime example of what Parry meant when he referred to the treatment of ‘details’. Figures 4.5 and 4.6 also demonstrate Brahms’s more ‘symphonic’ outlook as Parry calls it, in that from the outset Brahms gives each of the four parts an almost equal footing in the iteration of the thematic material, with each part possibly reflecting a different orchestral instrumental group. This is in contrast to Haydn, who rarely entrusts the thematic material to anyone other than the first violin. Indeed, the symphonic potential of Brahms’s chamber music has no better realisation than in Schoenberg’s famous orchestrated version of the Op. 25 Quartet. Thus, through careful analysis and musical selections, one can build a more complete picture of how Parry viewed the music of Brahms in relation to the general backdrop of Austro-German musical history.

Stanford’s view of Brahms’s place in musical historical trends is voiced in a much more direct and concise manner than that of Parry. His thoughts on this matter are demonstrated in his small biographical publication on the composer in the Mayfair Biographies series in the form of diagrams:
Figure 4.7: A diagram demonstrating Stanford’s view of Brahms’s place within the general progression of Austro-German composers as listed in his monograph: *Brahms*.

Figure 4.8: A diagram demonstrating Stanford’s view of Brahms’s ‘educational’ family tree as listed in his monograph: *Brahms*.
Figure 4.7 demonstrates that Stanford believed that Brahms’s music descended from that of Bach through Haydn and Beethoven. From the outset, this opening chapter of Stanford’s work, focuses on the dichotomy between Brahms and Wagner, hence why he also provides Wagner’s line of descent on figure 4.7. Stanford justifies his first diagram by referring to a ‘lineal descent’ between ‘Bach and Handel, Haydn and Gluck, Beethoven and Weber’\(^\text{18}\). These parallel descents, Stanford argues, can be broadly referred to as ‘Opera and Symphony’, with Handel, Gluck, Weber and Wagner being in the Operatic category, and Bach, Haydn, Beethoven and Brahms being in the Symphonic category. As with Parry, Stanford exhibits deference to both composers throughout his discussion:

The two ruling chiefs were two men of rare force and still rarer genius – Richard Wagner and Johannes Brahms. Wagner, by an acridity of pen for which the grotesquely severe attacks of his opponents are mainly responsible (if they do not account for the lack of personal dignity which made it possible), led the rank and file of his supporters onto all manner of verbal excesses for which they had no such excuse as their chief. The publication of a manifesto signed by Brahms, Joachim, Scholz, and Grimm

\(^{18}\) Stanford, *Brahms*, p. 6
fanned the flame... With the signature to this document Brahms’s personal share in party recriminations entirely ceased. He kept to his own territory, and stoutly refused to be drawn into criticism or attacks on his neighbour’s proceedings.  

In a similar manner to Parry, Stanford is evidently quite neutral regarding the Brahms-Wagner dichotomy. He clearly respected the output of both composers, explaining that comparison between them is unnecessary, stating that ‘neither composer was in reality interfering with the other in place or in policy’. Stanford further emphasises this by comparing them to kings one of whom held his court in the theatre [Wagner] and the other in the town-hall [Brahms], an analogy obviously relating back to the genres of Opera and the Symphony in terms of their relative performance venues. Contrary yet again to Stradling and Hughes’s work (see pages 149 - 156 in Chapter 3), Stanford does not seem to have any particular designs to direct composition of English music in either of these areas. It is becoming apparent therefore, even at this early stage of the chapter that the frequent dismissal of Parry and Stanford as staunch Brahmsians is not true or helpful in any way when discussing late nineteenth century English music. Like Edward Dannreuther, they were both obviously far more open minded than much of the past and current literature would suggest.

The second part of Stanford’s book on Brahms is a chronological biography of the major events in the composer’s life, alongside the emergence of certain compositions. Stanford acknowledges at the end of the publication that much of the information in his monograph comes from the earlier publications of Florence May and Max Kalbeck – the former produced the first complete English publication on the life and work of Brahms, and the latter the first German publication. Stanford notes significant

19 Ibid., p. 7
events in Brahms’s life, such as his introduction to the Schumanns, Hans von Bülow and Julius Stockhausen (although he also acknowledges that the biography also presented significant difficulties because of Brahms’s ‘quiet, unassuming and undemonstrative’ personality\(^{20}\)). More interesting however is Stanford’s selection of the composer’s works worthy of mention in the small publication:

Table 4.3: The works discussed in Stanford’s monograph: Brahms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Page Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scherzo for Pianoforte, Op. 4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pianoforte Sonata in F minor, Op. 5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Trio, Op. 8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballades for Pianoforte, Op. 10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Serenade, Op. 11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Piano Concerto, Op. 15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Serenade, Op.16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pianoforte Quartet in G minor, Op. 25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Sextet in B flat, Op. 18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Romances (Magelone), Op. 33</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handel Variations, Op. 24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pianoforte Quartet in A, Op. 26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pianoforte Quintet in F minor, Op. 34</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Symphony in C minor, Op. 68</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violoncello Sonata, Op. 38</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn Trio, Op. 40</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ein Deutsches Requiem, Op. 45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quartet in C minor, Op. 51/1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of Destiny, Op. 54</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinaldo, Op. 50</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Mainacht’, Op. 43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Von ewiger Liebe’, Op. 43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Wiegenlied’, Op. 49</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liebesliederwalzer, Op. 52</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alto Rhapsody, Op. 53</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triumphlied, Op. 55</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haydn Variations, Op. 56</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Four Symphonies</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragic and Academic Festival Overtures, Opp. 80 and 81</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Pianoforte Concerto, Op. 83</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Concerto, Op. 102</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{20}\) Ibid., p. 15
Stanford gives a reasonably comprehensive list of compositions from the earlier part of Brahms’s output, acknowledging the prominent early chamber and orchestral composition. However, it becomes clear later on that he was possibly running out of space, as he refers to the symphonies only collectively, and mentions nothing in the chamber music genre after the Op. 51 string quartet. Another reason for this may have been that, at the point of the book’s publication (1912), some of Brahms’s later chamber works may not have been as established as the earlier ones, therefore Stanford was using works which would have been more universally well known in England at that time, even though they had all been premiered by leading performers within the last quarter of the nineteenth century. In spite of the brevity of Stanford’s discussion in this publication, he presents some valuable information in terms of the compositions of Brahms which he rated highly enough to include, and thus potentially which influenced his own compositional output.

4.2: Parry, Stanford, and Brahmsian Harmony

The music of Brahms is full of unusual and advanced harmonic features which make it very distinctive. Indeed, Parry and Stanford demonstrate their admiration for certain aspects of Brahmsian harmony in their written work. Parry provided two main articles for the first edition of Grove’s dictionary which fall nicely into this category: ‘Harmony’ and ‘Modulation’. Stanford provides a few small comments in his composition treatise.

The most appropriate starting point for a discussion on Brahmsian harmony is almost certainly Parry’s article ‘Harmony’, written for the first edition of Grove’s Dictionary. Contained in the first volume of the work, the article was one of Parry’s first to be
published for the dictionary. In typical Parry style (discussed in chapter 2 of this study), the article is very long (16 pages) and rather unbalanced in relation to some of the others in the volume. The basic structure of the article is a detailed history, from c.1000 AD by monks, of the progression of combining tones, from what he refers to as the ‘ecclesiastical scales’\textsuperscript{21}. Parry then progresses logically through various eras of music, initially focusing on Italian and French theorists and composers, such as Jean de Muris and Josquin in his discussion of the Renaissance era. As his discussions move through the more recent Baroque and Classical eras, his focus unsurprisingly shifts to the Austro-German tradition of Bach, Handel, Haydn, Beethoven and Mozart. Throughout the later parts of the article, Parry explains the importance of the development of the basic fundamental chords, particularly the tonic and dominant and their development in relation to polyphony. He acknowledges that the work of Bach laid the foundations for ‘all the advance that has been made in harmony since his time’\textsuperscript{22}. Usefully, throughout the article, Parry provides numerous music examples to demonstrate and elaborate his discussions. Furthermore, when one compares it to the present day article in the current edition of the same publication \textit{(Oxford Music Online)}, the structure of each article is remarkable similar, demonstrating Parry’s instinctive and comprehensive musical knowledge.

His reference to the music of Brahms in the article is made in relation to the harmonic effects created by accented passing notes:

Of strongly accented passing notes the following are good examples –

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., p. 683
From the overture to *The Messiah*; and

From Brahms’s Ballade in D, which is practically the same passing note as that in the example from Handel, but passing in the opposite direction.\(^{23}\)

Parry provides two excellent musical examples illustrating the accented passing note. Interestingly, he chooses an example from Handel as well as Brahms, emphasising once again Brahms’s reverence to music of previous eras. Furthermore, Parry emphasises that the two examples are in fact not very different from each other, apart from the descending direction of Handel’s passing note and the ascending direction of Brahms’s. The passing notes are both in the bass parts of each composer’s four-part writing (although Brahms doubles the note in the tenor part). Whilst this section of the article undoubtedly gives one an indication of an aspect of harmony which Parry viewed as important, it is not a particularly defining or extraordinary technique in itself, confirmed by the use of examples from both Handel and Brahms.

Parry’s second harmony related article is more revealing. Entitled ‘Modulation’ and contained in volume two of Grove’s *Dictionary*, it is significantly shorter than its predecessor ‘Harmony’. However, Parry provides more in the way of examples of

\(^{23}\) Ibid., p. 683
modulation techniques that he admired in Brahms’s music. In a similar manner to the article on harmony, Parry gives an initial theoretical discussion of the different types of modulation (Diatonic, Chromatic and Enharmonic) and the techniques by which they are achieved. He then elaborates the discussion further, discussing what he calls ‘transitory’ and ‘subordinate’ modulations – short tonal deviations within the principal key. His discussion of Brahms’s music comes in relation to subordinate modulations. He begins by using Beethoven’s Op. 90 sonata in E minor as an example. In the first twelve bars of the work, the music moves thus: E minor – G major – B minor – G major – E minor. Parry explains that ‘the main centre of the principal key is supplemented by subordinate centres; the different notes of the key being used as points of vantage from which a glance can be taken into foreign tonalities, to which they happen also to belong, without losing the sense of the principal key which lies in the background.’

The Beethoven example acts as an introduction for a discussion of Brahms’s use of the technique:

In composers of note since Beethoven, we find a determination to take full advantage of such transitions. Brahms for instance makes constant use of them in his instrumental works from the earliest to the latest. The first two pages of the G minor Quartet for pianoforte and strings, shows at once how various are the subordinate centres of which he makes use. In a much later work – the Pianoforte Quartet in C minor, op. 60 – he presents a short version of his principal subject in the principal key, and then passes to B flat minor, D flat major, E flat minor, A flat, G flat minor, and B flat minor in rapid succession before he resumes his original key in order to propound his first subject more fully.

---

24 Parry, ‘Modulation’ *Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, II, pp. 343-351 (p. 343-346)
25 Ibid., p. 350
26 Ibid.
Whilst Parry gives no musical examples in this explanation, it is actually one of the most important harmonic aspects of Brahms’s compositional output as a whole. If one looks a little more closely at Parry’s examples, these progressions can be seen:

Figure 4.10: A reduction of the opening bars of the first movement of Brahms’s Piano Quartet in G minor, Op. 25, demonstrating the constant harmonic transitions

Figure 4.10 clearly demonstrates exactly what Parry was referring to in relation to the opening of Brahms’s Op. 25 Quartet, with several keys being implied between the strong iterations of the tonic in bar 1 and bar 9, including those in the notes of the tonic (G minor) triad. This becomes even more sophisticated in the later Op. 60 Quartet:
The suggestions of keys in the reduction of Brahms’s Op. 60 Quartet (figure 4.11) are even more adventurous than the Op. 25 Quartet. As Parry suggests, such harmonic progression is commonplace across Brahms’s output. Indeed, one need look no further than the opening of the First Piano Concerto in D minor, Op. 15 where the piece opens with strong B flat tonality, or the opening of the Clarinet Quintet in B minor, Op. 115, in which the sophisticated interplay between the tonic and its relative major make the aural perception of the tonic very difficult. Parry’s relatively full discussion regarding this harmonic feature, as well as his very descriptive and accurate examples would suggest that such a technique may well have filtered into his own compositions. Consequently, this forms the basis of the harmonic investigations of Parry’s music in the preceding chapters of this study.
Stanford also briefly discusses the harmonisation of melodies in his *Musical Composition: A Short Treatise for Students*. His style is very different from Parry’s which is hardly surprising, as the book was intended as a guide to student composers and thus discusses more basic techniques. However, there is a definite emphasis throughout the text on the importance of counterpoint in harmonisation. In relation to Brahms he says the following:

The most useful method is to begin with voices. Choose a hymn tune or a chorale, and, after harmonising it freely in four or five parts, take the melody as a Canto Fermo in long notes in one part and write three of four free parts around it. Brahms’s motet ‘A Saving Health’ [‘Es ist das Heil uns kommen her’, Op. 29, No. 1] is a compact and admirable model of this style of treatment; the phrases of the chorale are treated in intelligible sections or sentences, and the free parts are all founded upon the phrases which they accompany… For the harmonisation of the tune itself innumerable prototypes can be found in Bach, many of them modern and experimental enough to satisfy, and even surprise the most ultra-progressive taste…Brahms’ Choral Preludes for Organ are also most valuable examples for study. It is unnecessary to specify any, when all this vast treasure house is within the reach of every student. He must not, however, be content with playing them through, but must study closely the texture of the individual parts and the ways in which they interweave and combine.27

Stanford’s text is obviously written with the intention of prompting composers to do their own research in terms of harmonic accompaniment. The crux of his argument at this point in the proceedings appears to revolve around the notion that the melody should act as the basis for the harmonising parts in a piece of music. Therefore, the use of Bach and indeed Brahms as examples for his students to pursue in their studies is eminently appropriate, as it is well known that Brahms viewed counterpoint as an

---

essential aspect of the compositional process. Indeed, virtually every composition produced by Brahms contains significant evidence of this principle.

For the purposes of remaining as close to Stanford’s discussion as possible, examples from the Op. 122 preludes will now be examined to find evidence of the melodic basis for harmonisation:

Figure 4.12: The opening of Prelude no. 5 Schmücke dich, o liebe Seele from Brahms’s Eleven Chorale Preludes for Organ, Op. 122
Figures 4.12 and 4.13 demonstrate very clearly and concisely exactly what Stanford meant. One can clearly see the principal melodic idea and its smaller constituents in figure 4.13 and their subsequent use in the lower parts in the prelude itself (figure 4.12). The figures can be seen in rhythmically diminished form, with countless examples of inversion, retrograde and retrograde inversion throughout the prelude. Indeed, figure 4.13 is virtually the only thematic element of the prelude, demonstrating how effectively Brahms could create harmony from simple melodic elements. His indebtedness to the counterpoint of Bach is surely evident here. The structure of the motivic content is very obviously neo-Baroque. However, unlike Bach’s use frequent use of figured bass in his chorale works, this prelude does not appear to have any relationship to this technique (although Brahms may have used it during the composition process). Neither is the Prelude the only one in the set which demonstrates this. All eleven preludes are based on similar principles. For instance, the harmony in the second prelude is based upon a descending minor third motion:

Figure 4.14: The ‘soprano’ line in bars 2-3 of ‘Herzliebster Jesu’ from the Eleven Chorale Preludes, Op. 122 by Brahms
If one then looks at the opening of the second prelude, the prevalence of the descending third and its variants is undeniable:

**Herzliebster Jesu**
Savior of my heart

![Musical notation of Herzliebster Jesu](image)

Figure 4.15: The opening of ‘Herzliebster Jesu’ from the Eleven Chorale Preludes for Organ, Op. 122 by Brahms
A few examples of the third motive in the lower parts of the second prelude have been highlighted in figure 4.15, demonstrating how an even smaller motif than in the fifth prelude has been used as a basis for the harmonic progression. Stanford’s use of the pieces from Op. 122 in his discussion on harmony therefore is eminently appropriate. Furthermore, the small scale of the pieces would have made them excellent examples for students to study, as opposed to similar activity within a large orchestral composition. This sort of counterpoint is therefore very likely to have infiltrated Stanford’s compositional process, as well as that of his students and will be examined in subsequent chapters of this study.

4.3: Parry, Stanford, and Brahmsian ‘Process’

It has been amply demonstrated that both Parry and Stanford admired Brahms’s advanced and traditional approach to harmony. However their discussions of Brahms’s music indicate strongly that they also admired the mechanics and processes which Brahms employed, particularly in the realm of development and variation. Parry and Stanford both produced rather detailed work in relation to these aspects of Brahms’s music. Parry’s articles ‘Figure’ and ‘Variations’ from the first edition of Grove’s dictionary, alongside Stanford’s analysis of Brahms’s Variations on a Theme of Haydn (Op. 56) from his Treatise, provide an insight into what type of technical aspects of Brahms’s music they both admired.

Parry’s article ‘Figure’ in volume one of Grove’s Dictionary provides a somewhat unexpected and useful starting point for the discussion on Brahmsian process. Parry naturally briefly defines the term figure as ‘any short succession of notes, either as a melody or group of chords, which produces a single, complete, and distinct
impression … It is in fact the shortest complete idea in music; and in subdividing musical works into their constituent portions, as separate movements, sections, periods, phrases, the units are the figures, and any subdivision below them will leave only expressionless single notes, as unmeaning as the separate letters of a word." Parry’s definition is logical, concise and comprehensive. No doubt if Grove had been stricter regarding the length of the articles, the subsequent information presented by Parry would have been omitted. He goes on to discuss the method by which one can break up a subject into constituent figures. However, it is the section after this which is of particular interest to this discussion – using a figure as the basis for an entire movement:

In this case the figure is not identical on each repetition, but is freely modified, in such a way however that it is always recognised as the same, partly by the rhythm and partly by the relative positions of the successive notes. This manner of modifying a given figure shows a tendency in the direction of a mode of treatment which has become a feature in modern music: namely the practice of transforming figures in order to show the different aspects of the same thought, or to establish a connection between one thought and another by bringing out the characteristics they possess in common. As a simple specimen of this kind of transformation, may be quoted a passage from the first movement of Brahms’s P.F. Quintet in F minor [Op. 34]. The figure stands at first as at (h), then by transposition as at (i). Its first stage of transformation is (j); further (k) (l) (m) are progressive modifications towards the stage (n),

28 Parry, ‘Figure’, in Dictionary of Music and Musicians, I, pp. 520-522 (p. 520)
which, having been repeated twice in different positions, appears finally as the figure immediately attached to the Cadence in D flat, thus –

C.H.H.P²⁹

This extended excerpt from Parry’s article demonstrates yet again how forward looking Parry was in terms of musical process and analysis, particularly when compared to later writings on Brahms and the processes of thematic transformation and developing variation. These terms were first considered seriously by Schoenberg in 1934 in the Gedanke manuscript³⁰, and then intermittently throughout his theoretical publications up until 1950. Indeed, if anything, Parry’s explanations and musical examples are clearer than those of Schoenberg. Although Parry obviously does not mention the Schoenbergian terms, his observations of Brahms’s tight knit and structural use of small motivic cells is very similar to that seen in later musicological work, in particular that of Walter Frisch. His use of Brahms’s Op. 34

²⁹ Ibid., p. 521-522
Quintet is also significant in that it was the first major chamber work to be produced after what Frisch refers to as the turning point between Op. 25 and Op. 26. There have been several detailed studies of the Quintet carried out during the twentieth century (including one by Walter Frisch), all of which focus on the notion of developing variation and thematic unity throughout the work. All of the authors submit similar observations to those of Parry, although with more attention to detail. For instance, Franklin Larey in his doctoral thesis on the work, focuses on Brahms’s development of the minor second motive, referring to it as ‘one of the most striking features of the entire work’, operating on both ‘thematic and structural levels’. This is very similar to Parry’s reference to the use of a figure as a ‘bond of connection running through a whole movement.’

At this point therefore, it would be sensible to explore this notion of the all-pervading figure or motive in Brahms’s music in a little more depth. Such a motivic connection has been demonstrated in this chapter already in the discussions of the falling third motif in Brahms’s Fourth Symphony, and of melodic motivic-based harmony in his Organ Preludes, Op. 122. For this part of the discussion therefore, it would seem logical to examine the Op. 34 Quintet in more depth. Discussions of the work rightly isolate and discuss what Franklin Larey calls ‘semitonal activity’ and in particular the intense local and ultimately structural use of the semitone interval D flat-C:

---

32 Ibid., p. 59
33 Parry, ‘Figure’, p. 521
Figure 4.16: A reduction of the opening idea of the first movement of Brahms’s Quintet, Op. 34

Figure shows the opening theme of the first movement Brahms’s Op. 34, which is not unusual in that there is a traditional interplay between the tonic and dominant tonalities. However, even at this early stage, there is definitely an emphasis on the semitone interval:

Figure 4.17: A voice-leading graph illustrating the emphasis on the semitone interval in the opening thematic idea of the first movement of Brahms’s Quintet, Op. 34

The voice-leading graph in figure 4.17 (whilst not Schenkerian in the conventional sense), demonstrates three distinct voices within Brahms’s thematic idea, all of which emphasise the interval of a semitone: C and D flat; G and A flat; and F and E. Building on Parry’s idea of the variation of the ‘figure’, one can then explore how the semitone motif is used throughout the rest of the movement. Tonally, the music moves from the initial tonic of F minor to the unusual submediant minor for the transition, moving to the submediant major of D flat for the second subject group. The use of the submediant is almost certainly a tonal variation of the C to D flat semitone encountered in the opening, the key of the submediant sounding very alien in relation to the strongly prolonged dominant note of C in the first subject group. This interplay
between the tonic and subdominant continues throughout the development section of
the opening movement, moving back to the tonic for the conclusion.

The other interesting aspect of this movement is that virtually all motivic activity in
the movement can be traced back to cells in the opening subject:

![Fig. 4.18: The principal motivic cells in the opening four bars of the first movement of
Brahms's Quintet, Op. 34](image)

![Fig. 4.19: Variation of cells C and E in the second subject group of the first movement of
Brahms's Quintet, Op. 34 (bars 86-90)](image)
Figure 4.20: Variations of cells A, B and C in the development section of the first movement of Brahms’s Quintet, Op. 34 (bars 122-126)
Figures 4.19 – 4.21 are dissected reductions of various parts of the first movement of Brahms’s Op. 34 Quintet. The saturation of the piece with figures A, B, C, D and E can be very clearly seen throughout the examples. In a similar manner to that illustrated by Parry in his discussion of Brahms’s use of the ‘figure’, as the piece progresses, iterations of each motivic cell become more varied through small rhythmic and intervalllic changes but at the same time are still instantly recognisable as a derivative from their original forms.

These motivic cells can also be seen in the remaining movements of the piece, for instance in the lower piano writing in the *Andante*:
As figure 4.22 shows, there is a definite interplay between the low E flat and D flat pedal notes, which provides an essentially augmented version of cell B from the opening of the first movement. This interplay of a major second is a prominent feature of the bass throughout the movement. The Scherzo movement makes extensive use of variations of cell B, fitting very neatly within the contrasting times of 6/8 and 2/4. The seminal semitone cell along with cell D, return in abundance in the final movement (best described as a ‘rondo style sonata form’) through the following thematic ideas:

Figure 4.23: The principal thematic idea of the ‘Poco sostenuto’ section of the final movement of Brahms’s Quintet, Op. 34 (bars 2-5)

Figure 4.24: The first subject of the final movement of Brahms’s Quintet, Op. 34 (bars 42-46)
In figures 4.23 and 4.25, one can clearly see the prominence of the semitone. In figure 4.23, the music hovers pensively around the notes B natural, C and D flat, creating a theme made up of movement in semitones. Similarly in the second subject in figure 4.25 Brahms makes more varied use of the semitone by creating a theme made up of a sequential series of rising and falling semitones, demonstrating yet again how this thematic cell is the basis of the whole work, the sequencing being a method by which Brahms is able to logically repeat the crucial interval. In fact, one could argue that the sequencing is actually as important at this point as the interval itself, as it creates the structure around which the interval is used. The importance of the semitone is affirmed by a very prominent change in tonality towards the end of the movement, again to the submediant minor (C sharp), which as in the first movement, provides a strong hint toward the C to D flat semitone relationship in the key of F minor. In the first subject of this movement (figure 4.24), Brahms clearly recalls cell D from the first movement, although as figure 4.24 demonstrates, it is used as and accompanying figure in the piano beneath the folk-like theme which is exchanged between the string parts.

The detailed analysis carried out on Brahms’s Op. 34 Quintet has revealed a complex and intricate web of motivic processes used by Brahms. Parry’s definition of the musical ‘figure’ has provided the theoretical basis of the analysis. The result has been
the discovery of crucial motivic cells, which not only account for the intricate and
decorative variational processes on the surface, but also the underlying larger tonal
structures on which the movements are based. It has also been demonstrated that the
use of these motivic cells spans the entire work rather than a single movement, thus
providing and aurally and analytically very organic complete work. One wonders at
this point whether Parry would have engaged in such a discussion had he been given
free reign without the necessary restrictions imposed on him by the dictionary – the
answer would seem to be very likely so, based on his astute, confident, but alas all too
brief analysis in ‘Figure’.

Stanford has also produced some very interesting thoughts on process in his student
composition treatise, with the music of Brahms appearing as a reliable,
comprehensive and infinite provider of examples throughout. His main ideas
concerning thematic process in relation to Brahms occur in the fifth chapter of his
book entitled, ‘The Complex Treatment of Melodies. Variations’. Indeed, when one
reads the chapter today, it would certainly have been more appropriate for the author
to have placed a colon between the words ‘Melodies’ and ‘Variations’, as this chapter
is almost entirely concerned with the different methods of varying melodies,
unsurprisingly using examples from sets of variations, and in particular Brahms’s
Variations on a Theme of Haydn, Op. 56. As a result of the chapter being part of a
publication aimed at assisting student composers, it is understandably far more
concisely and logically laid out than much of Parry’s work discussed above. The
result of this is that far less speculative analysis will be required at this point, as
Stanford had the time and space to justify and explain his assertions with support from
various musical examples.
The whole of Stanford’s fifth chapter is based upon the assumption that the students concerned would be writing sets of variations. It is surely no coincidence that many of Stanford’s students produced sets of variations. For example Samuel Coleridge-Taylor produced the *Symphonic Variations on an African Air*, Op. 63, as well as a couple of unnumbered, unnamed sets; William Hurlstone produced the *Fantasie-Variations on a Swedish Air*, and two sets for piano; and Arthur Bliss produced the *Belmont Variations* for brass band, Op. 10, and the *Metamorphic Variations*, Op. 122.

Stanford says in the chapter’s opening remarks that variations ‘are to free composition what counterpoint is to technique – the master key of the whole building’, and that the ‘repetitions of the main themes themselves become far more interesting in the hands of a composer who is well practised in variation writing’.

Stanford begins by discussing how a composer should devise a theme for his work, in which Brahms’s choice of the theme in the *Haydn Variations*, Op. 56 is put forward as an example of how a composer should ensure that the theme has some ‘striking’ feature. In the case of Brahms’s Op. 56, Stanford refers to the unusual phrase length structure across the theme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase Number</th>
<th>Length (bars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

34 Stanford, *Musical Composition*, p. 53
He then discusses how to create variations on a theme, stating that the simplest way is to begin with ‘variation of movement, starting with slow gradation and increasing the speed of the note values’, followed by ‘rhythmical changes’ for which he provides the following examples:

![Theme](image1)

![Variation 1](image2)

![Variation 2](image3)

![Variation 3](image4)

![Variation 4](image5)

![Variation 5](image6)

![Variation 6](image7)

![Variation 7](image8)

*Figure 4.26: Stanford’s examples illustrating different methods of variation of a theme from *Musical Composition: A Short Treatise for Students* (pages 56-57)*

---

35 Ibid., p. 56-57
Whilst Stanford’s examples in figure 4.26 do not relate to the music of Brahms specifically in this instance, they are fascinating in that they give an insight into the sort of variation techniques and ideas that he used in his compositions. Some of Stanford’s variations are perhaps a little fanciful here, in that they stray further from the original motive more than the examples of Brahms encountered so far. However, this was probably necessary in order to encourage his students to think more laterally when creating their own sets.

Following Stanford’s initial explanations is an analysis of Beethoven’s Twenty Four Variations on ‘Vieni Amore’, and Brahms’s Variations on a Theme of Haydn. Before discussing Stanford’s analytical remarks it would be sensible to provide the theme in full:
Stanford’s introductory comment is that the ‘detail of the first bar must be kept closely in mind’ when discussing this set of variations, suggesting that he possibly viewed the thematic cell of the opening bar as the crux of the remaining variations. However, as the analysis progresses, he does pick out other features – usually a single pervading thematic idea from the original theme per variation.

The first variation, Stanford argues is distinguished by the five pedal B flats which conclude the theme:

This pattern of pedal notes (figure 4.28) runs through the entire first variation. The arpeggio-based melodic material does not appear to be particularly related to the original theme. However, Stanford notes that harmonically the chord sequence of the
original theme is preserved in its entirety. The second variation is possibly a little more interesting, as it is based on the first three notes of the theme:

![Figure 4.29: The example provided by Stanford in Musical Composition, demonstrating the basis of the thematic material in the second of Brahms’s Variations on a Theme by Haydn, Op. 56](image)

The variation is also in the tonic minor. Figure 4.29 is the only analytical example Stanford provides for this variation. So at this point, some more examples will be added:

![Figure 4.30: The first section of the second variation of Brahms’s Variations on a Theme by Haydn, Op. 56](image)

By expanding Stanford’s initial example to include the entire first part of the second variation, one can see the intensity with which Brahms develops the opening motive. Indeed, the similarity of intensity to the motivic cells of Op. 34 is extremely evident at this point. Therefore, one can speculate that like Parry, this process of intense variation which provides thematic and structural unity was also admired equally by Stanford. Indeed, the remainder of Stanford’s motivic analysis of the variations supports this theory.

His discussion of the sixth variation is particularly detailed:
The key figure is the first bar of the theme inverted, diminished into semiquavers, and repeated twice

\[ \text{Music notation image} \]

The modulation at the close of the first and second five bar phrases is to D major instead of to F major.

The remainder of the opening figure is from the fourth bar of the theme

\[ \text{Music notation image} \]

An arpeggio figure

\[ \text{Music notation image} \]

to which can be traced the germ of the melody in the succeeding variation, is frequently used in the second part.\textsuperscript{36}

Once again here, Stanford provides a lot of starting points for slightly more detailed study:

\[ \text{Music notation image} \]

\[ \text{Music notation image} \]

\textbf{Figure 4.31: The opening thematic material of the sixth variation of Brahms’s Variations on a Theme of Haydn, Op. 56}

Figure 4.31 clearly shows Brahms’s almost exclusive use of the two themes highlighted by Stanford in the above quotation. There is, however, a crucial difference which Stanford neglects to mention – that is the difference in rhythm between the second motive and its original appearance in the theme (it is a dotted quaver followed

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., p. 66
by two semiquavers in the original, as opposed to a quaver followed by two
semiquavers in figure 4.31). Such a small difference may seem insignificant, but it is
exactly that sort of subtle variation which creates such organic unity in Brahms’s
music. Indeed, perhaps if Stanford had only focused on selected areas of the work,
such details might not have been missed. One can also elaborate on Stanford’s
observation regarding the arpeggio theme in the last part of the variation. Stanford
provides an example of this figure, referring to it as the germ of the succeeding
variation but then only offers a short explanation as to its significance and use in the
seventh variation:

![Figure 4.32: The opening of the seventh variation of Brahms's Variations on a Theme of Haydn, Op. 56](image)

Stanford merely states that the arpeggio figure is the ‘germ’ of the idea in the next
variation, and that the rhythm of the opening cell of the theme is preserved. This is
ture, but based on the opening of the seventh variation (figure 4.32), it should also be
stressed that whilst the arpeggio is used frequently throughout, the more prominent
idea is the rhythm of the opening, as it is present in every single bar of the seventh
variation, whereas the arpeggio figure is not.

The final part of Stanford’s analysis of the variations, and probably the most detailed,
is that of the Finale of Op. 56, which is, for want of a better term, ‘variations within
variations’, as it is a series of five bar variations on a ground bass. Interestingly, this
portion of Brahms’s Op.56 is also briefly discussed as a good ‘modern’ example of
both variation writing, and use of a ground bass by Parry in the entries entitled
points out almost immediately the importance of the ground bass, which is essentially based on rhythmic and melodic progressions from the original theme:

\[ \text{augmented version of the dotted rhythm from the opening melodic cell} \]

\[ \text{rhythmic augmentation of the descent from bars 2-3 of the main theme} \]

Figure 4.33: The ground bass theme of the finale of Brahms’s *Variations on a Theme of Haydn*, Op. 56

Brahms’s sophisticated thematic variation ensures that whilst definitely relating to the original opening theme, the ground bass theme is also suitable for its purpose in the finale. Stanford produces a relatively detailed account of the variations in the finale. A discussion detailing every aspect of Stanford’s account is not necessary at this point, as much of the information highlights more of the Brahmsian variation techniques already encountered in this chapter. A couple of the more potent and sophisticated examples will be discussed in more depth. The first significant observation is in the ninth variation of the finale, where Brahms recalls the ‘spirit’ of variation 7 (of the main composition) by use of the arpeggio figure and the ‘character of the melody’:

\[ \text{Figure 4.34: The original ‘Arpeggio’ motive of variation 6 of Brahms’s *Variations on a Theme by Haydn*, Op. 56, provided by Stanford in *Musical Composition*, p. 66} \]

\[ ^{37} \text{Ibid., p. 68} \]
Figures 4.34 - 4.36 show the development of Stanford’s arpeggio motive, from its initial appearance in the sixth main variation, to its appearance in the triplets in the ninth variation of the finale. In a similar manner to the motivic variation encountered in the various movements of Brahms’s Op. 34 Quintet, the motive is easily relatable to its original form, in spite of the changes as a result of the variation. To elaborate on Stanford’s discussion further, the seventh variation is also hinted at by the constant triplets throughout the five bars in figure 4.36, which aurally reminds the listener of the compound time (6/8) encountered in the seventh variation.
In a similar manner to Op. 34, Brahms’s distribution of the thematic material throughout the Variations is also relatively even. Stanford highlights the fourteenth and fifteenth variations in the finale in his discussion:

Figure 4.37: A reduction of the fourteenth variation of the finale of Brahms’s Variations on a Theme by Haydn, Op. 56 (bars 426-430)

As figure 4.37 shows, the ground bass actually moves into the higher voices in the fourteenth variation (which continues throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth) and, in the orchestral version, is initially taken by the oboe, transferring higher to the flute in the fifteenth, and then to the upper strings in the sixteenth. The cello and the bassoon provide a tonic pedal in place of the ground bass in the fourteenth variation, with the thematic variation of the original descending fourth (bracketed in figure 4.37) occurring in the upper strings. A further and fuller discussion in relation to Brahms’s orchestration will be presented later in this chapter.

To conclude this complex section on thematic process, it is evident that Parry and Stanford had a huge amount of admiration for this aspect of Brahms’s music, to the
point that they were both prepared to discuss it in considerable detail in their own theoretical publications. Using their examples, this section of the chapter has attempted to clarify and elaborate on their initial discussions. Furthermore, taking into account the strong thematic nature of their discussion in the earlier section on Brahmsian harmony, the notion that Brahms’s intensely disciplined thematic process may have influenced their own compositions now seems even more likely. Thus this section provides an excellent theoretical basis for observing similar patterns in Parry and Stanford’s own chamber and orchestral compositions.

4.4: Parry, Stanford, and Brahmsian Form and Genre

No discussion of Brahms in the theoretical writing of Parry and Stanford would be complete without reference to genre and form. The reason for dealing with these two broad sub-headings together is simple: it is a well known fact that most of Brahms’s major compositions are based on the modern notion of sonata form. All the symphonies, and most of the chamber works, contain at least one extended movement in sonata form. Indeed, this is observed respectively by both Parry and Stanford in the Grove Dictionary articles and the composition treatise. It makes sense, therefore, in the interests of clarity and conciseness to deal with both of these aspects of their writing together.

A fairly substantial amount of Parry’s work in the first edition of Grove’s Dictionary is definition and discussion of various traditional genres of composition. With articles entitled ‘Symphony’, ‘Variations’, ‘Sonata’, and ‘Form’, they give a unique insight into which composers Parry most admired in all of these areas. All the articles are linked by the prominence of Brahms as an exemplary exponent in ‘modern’ iterations
in all of the categories, which is unsurprising based on the plethora of general comments available in more recent literature on the level of mastery, sophistication, and advancement exhibited by Brahms in all of them. For example, Bernard Jacobson in his chapter on Brahms’s symphonic work refers to his ‘mastery’ in ‘handling large scale form’, referring particularly to the latter’s frequent use of sonata form. David Brodbeck maintains that Brahms should be credited with ‘upholding’ the tradition of chamber music as a result of his impressive contributions to the genre.

Parry’s first article in this category is ‘Form’ in the first volume of the original edition of Grove’s Dictionary. In a similar manner to his previous longer articles he begins with a short definition: ‘The means by which unity and proportion are arrived at in musical works are the relative distribution of keys and harmonic bases on the one hand, and of ‘subjects’ figures or melodies on the other; and this distribution is known as the form of a work’. Even this short definition provides the reader with a very generous hint as to the principal focus of the rest of the article. His use of the phrase ‘distribution of keys and harmonic bases’, along with his use of the word ‘subject’ suggest that the focus of the article is going to be relatively traditional, possibly with an emphasis on sonata form. As in his previous longer articles he provides his interpretation of a small history of form, starting with the notion of repetition, moving onto rondo form, settling on sonata form at the point of reaching the era of Johann Christian Bach (although Parry uses the term ‘sonata form’ sparingly and with some uncertainty). He then unsurprisingly takes a distinctly Austro-German approach in his examples of the progression of the form, with Haydn, Beethoven and Mozart.

40 Parry, ‘Form’, in Dictionary of Music and Musicians, I, pp. 541-555 (p. 541)
occupying much of the discussion. Using Mozart and Beethoven as contrasting examples, Parry explains that Beethoven ‘abandoned the formal definition of the sections by cadences, and by degrees seems rather to have aimed at obscuring the obviousness of the system than at pointing it out.’\textsuperscript{41} Based on the chronological structure of the article, Brahms’s name appears towards the end:

The main tendency observable in later instrumental works is to develop still further the system above discussed of taking one key as central in a group comprising many subsidiary transitions. Schumann’s works present remarkable instances of this; Mendelssohn adopts the same practice, but with more moderation; Brahms again is extremely free in the same direction; as may be observed for instance, in the first section of the first movement of the Pianoforte Quartet, Op. 25 which is nominally in G minor.\textsuperscript{42}

Parry’s focus on the development of sonata form by nineteenth century composers appears to be based around the notion of obscuring the traditional tonic-dominant key relationships in favour of more unusual ones. This has been encountered in the discussion on harmony earlier in the chapter. Indeed, Parry used the same example of Brahms’s Op. 25 in his article on harmony, suggesting a particular admiration for the harmonic progressions in the first movement of this work. Such a treatment of the form was also demonstrated in the lengthy analysis of the first movement of Brahms’s Op. 34 Quintet, in which the submediant was used as the principal contrasting key to the tonic, in order to provide the movement with a more intense level of motivic unity. However, Brahms does not use the submediant in the ‘traditional’ way that the dominant would have been used in earlier sonatas. It first appears in the transition between the first and second subjects, thus obscuring the definition between the two

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., p. 550
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., p. 552
groups. During the recapitulation the submediant is not used at all, but is replaced with the even more foreign F sharp minor, although there are constant inflections throughout the section toward C sharp/D flat, through the use of frequent B sharp accidentals. Parry's notion of form therefore, is principally focused on sonata and rondo form, both of which were used by Brahms (the former particularly frequently). As a result, it will be useful to keep this in mind during the remaining discussion of Parry’s use of Brahmsian examples in relation to the developments in the genres of the Sonata, the Symphony, and, to a lesser extent, Variations.

Stanford also devotes a chapter (VI) of his treatise to musical form, using the first movement of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata Op. 31. Whilst there are no references to Brahms in the chapter, it is interesting to observe the forms which Stanford deemed worthy of teaching his students:

Minuets and all sorts of old measures can be practised first on the shortest of lines such as ||4, 4 :||: 8, 4, 4 :||, and later with extended phrases… Next in order of difficulty comes the rondo… with its threefold repetition of the main theme… From rondos he may pass to slow movements both in song, rondo and elementary first movement form, and from slow movements to sonata form proper as in the first movement of sonatas.\[43\]

In a similar manner to Parry, Stanford is motivated by the traditional forms of composition. However, his principal intention is very obviously to enable his students to eventually compose in sonata form, starting with the easier form of the minuet, and progressing until the student has enough experience to compose a sonata form movement. Stanford then introduces the Beethoven Op. 31 sonata to the discussion, presenting it as a sort of ‘ideal’ sonata movement both in the proportions of the whole

\[43\] Stanford, *Musical Composition*, p. 77-78
movement and of the motivic cells and development. He presents a bar by bar plan of
the movement within the context of sonata form, and then a break down of the main
thematic components, followed by a detailed thematic analysis of each of the sections,
with the principal thematic cells being labelled A, B, C, D and E. For example, in the
development section, his analysis of the first twenty bars is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89-92</td>
<td>The first four bars of the sonata repeated A and B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-94</td>
<td>B repeated, modulating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-96</td>
<td>B repeated, modulating further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96-99</td>
<td>A break, and a connecting link, founded on A, and being a written out version of the pause in bar 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Bar 100 = Bar 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-108</td>
<td>= bars 18-25, but in the relative minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>= bar 17&lt;sup&gt;44&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In spite of the lack of reference to Brahms in the chapter, it is significant in relation to
this study. The principal reason is that Brahms was also a regular user of sonata form
in his compositions, and this method of analysis, whilst intended for composition
students is also useful to the musicological analyst, in that it provides an insight into
which components of a sonata structure Stanford wanted to encourage his own
students to develop. It seems that, as with much of the evidence presented in this
chapter, the focus is again on the process of motivic development within the overall
structure of the various sections of the sonata form. Furthermore, following on from
Stanford’s composer ‘family tree’ presented earlier in this chapter, it would seem
likely that Stanford would have been equally likely to use Brahms (as he would
Beethoven) as the subject of such a discussion, since he viewed Brahms as a direct
descendent of Beethoven.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., p. 86
Parry also discusses Brahms’s output in his articles on various genres of composition, namely the Sonata, Symphony and Variations. Based on the previous few paragraphs of discussion, it makes sense to begin the analysis of this trio of articles by looking at ‘Sonata’. Unsurprisingly, this is one of Parry’s longer articles in the dictionary, spanning twenty-nine pages. Parry’s opening sentence is very interesting: ‘The history of the Sonata is the history of an attempt to cope with one of the most singular problems ever presented to the mind of man, and its solution is one of the most successful achievements of his artistic instincts.’\footnote{Parry, ‘Sonata’, Dictionary of Music and Musicians, III, pp. 554-583 (p. 554)} In a similar manner to his previous articles, he attempts, largely successfully, to present a short history of the sonata. In places the article is rather confusing because, whilst Parry strongly acknowledges the difference between ‘a sonata’ and ‘sonata form’, he uses them rather interchangeably throughout. In this respect, therefore, the article does lack clarity, as Parry assumes that readers will be aware of the difference. Parry’s short history takes the reader through the various contributions of key composers in the genre, from the apparent initial adoption of the term as an ‘antithesis to Cantata’\footnote{Ibid.}, to the then ‘present day’ works of composers such as Brahms and Sterndale Bennett.

Throughout Parry’s discussion there are several key points emphasised in the development of the sonata. One of the most important in relation to the discussion is the contribution of Beethoven to the genre after a somewhat stagnant period during the era of Haydn and Mozart in which the form reached a point which ‘left men time to pause and contemplate what appeared to them to be perfection’\footnote{Ibid., p. 569}. In relation to Beethoven, Parry says:

\footnote{Parry, ‘Sonata’, Dictionary of Music and Musicians, III, pp. 554-583 (p. 554)
Ibid.
Ibid., p. 569}
Prior to Beethoven, the development of a long work was based upon the antithesis of distinct tunes and concrete lumps of subject representing separate organisms, either merely in juxtaposition, or loosely connected by more or less empty passages... But what Beethoven seems to have aimed at was the expansion of the term ‘idea’ from the isolated subject to the complete whole; so that instead of the subjects being separate, though compatible items, the whole movement, or even the whole work should be the complete and uniform organism which represented in its entirety a new meaning of the work ‘idea’, of which the subjects, in their close connection and inseparable affinities, were subordinate limbs.48

This reference provides a very prominent parallel in relation to the analytical work carried out earlier in this chapter on Brahms’s Op. 34 Quintet, in which material in the first subject provides the thematic and structural material not only for the remainder of the first movement but also for the remaining movements, thus creating a ‘complete and uniform organism’, as opposed to the ‘separate organism’ subjects in juxtaposition prior to Beethoven. Unsurprisingly, not long after this point in the article, Brahms’s contributions to the genre are discussed, starting with his early piano sonatas. However, instead of discussing them in relation to the developments to the genre in relation to Beethoven, Parry directs the argument into a rather unexpected corner, introducing the poetic and romantic implications of the works based on the inclusion of a quotation from a Sternau poem on the slow movement of the F minor work (Op. 5). The reason for Parry’s digression is not entirely clear, but what does seem obvious is that he does not want to engage in any kind of analytical discussion regarding Brahms’s early piano sonatas; this is not particularly surprising when it is remembered that they were the product of his very early years and rather acerbic in relation to the later works which have formed the bulk of the analytical content of Parry’s writing examined in this chapter.

48 Ibid., p. 573
Parry steers the topic back round to the Beethovenian concept of the complete and uniform organism when he introduces Brahms’s chamber music to the argument:

Brahms seems most characteristically to illustrate the tendency in modern music which has been styled ‘intellectualism’; which is definable as elaborate development of all the opportunities and suggestions offered by figures, harmonic successions, or other essential features of subjects or accessories, so as to make various portions of the work appear to grow progressively out of another. This sometimes takes the form of thematic development, and sometimes that of reviving the figures of one subject in the material or accompaniment of another, the object being to obtain new aspects of close and direct logical coherence and consistency.\(^{49}\)

Once again, the general direction of Parry’s writing is that of organic motivic development. He argues that many of Brahms’s chamber compositions ‘are just as much sonatas as those so usually designated.’\(^{50}\) Parry again uses the Quintet, Op. 34, as an example because one of its published versions was in fact a ‘sonata’ for two pianos. This not only demonstrates Brahms’s affinity with the traditional sonata form in his music, but also highlights Parry’s difficulty of staying within the boundaries of definitions of sonata as a musical form and as the name of a specific musical work. In order to demonstrate the organic nature of the work, Parry included a short example from Brahms’s Op. 34 Quintet:

---

\(^{49}\) Ibid., p. 580
\(^{50}\) Ibid., p. 579
Figure 4.38: The examples from Brahms's Quintet, Op. 34 given by Parry in his explanation of motivic and thematic unity in his article ‘Sonata’ in the first edition of Grove’s Dictionary of Music and Musicians

The examples (figure 4.38) demonstrate very concisely the organic nature of the music and provide an excellent illustration of a section which grows from a previous one. Unfortunately Parry does not actually indicate exactly from which points in the piece these examples are taken. It is actually taken from bars 22-24 of the original score. The upper two staves in figure 4.38 are from bar 22 of the piano part, and the lower two staves are bars 23 and 24 with the violin part in the treble line. Based on the analysis of Op. 34 earlier in this chapter, Parry’s focus here is the semitone motive, which as demonstrated earlier, pervades the whole work in various forms. Indeed, there is clear voice leading in the lowest bass stave in figure 4.38 creating aural interplay between the semitone interval of F and E natural. Therefore Parry’s article, whilst lacking some definitional structure, particularly in relation to the difference between ‘sonata’ and ‘sonata form’, is once again very informative, particularly in terms of organic motivic thematic development.
Parry also created an article for Grove’s *Dictionary* on the genre of the symphony, entitled ‘Symphony’. Once again, it is one of his longer pieces for the work with a particularly large section on Brahms’s contributions to the genre towards the end of the article. Parry again follows the standard format of a short history of the genre, beginning with the difficulties regarding the original meaning of the term, then progressing chronologically through various principal contributors to the genre, including Lully, Scarlatti, C.P.E. Bach, Mozart, Haydn, Beethoven, Mendelssohn, Berlioz, Liszt and Schumann. Brahms is introduced by Parry as ‘the greatest existing representative of the highest art in the development of the symphony.’\(^{51}\) Parry goes on to say that, at the point of the article’s creation, Brahms had ‘as yet given the world only two examples’\(^{52}\). However, in a footnote relating to this statement, Parry says that ‘a third, in F was produced at Vienna on Dec. 2, 1883, but the facts ascertainable about it are not yet sufficiently full to base any discussion upon.’\(^{53}\) These pieces of information indicate that the article was written probably sometime in 1884, after the first production of the Third Symphony in Germany, but before its British première by Richter in May of the same year. The analytical content of the article relating to Brahms’s symphonic output is therefore focused on the First, and, more prominently, Second Symphonies.

Parry’s general impression of Brahms’s first two symphonies is revealing:

He seems to have set himself to prove that old principles of form are still capable of serving as the basis of works which should be thoroughly original both in general character and in detail and development, without either falling back on the devices of programme, or abrogating or making any

\(^{51}\) Parry, ‘Symphony’, in *Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, IV, pp. 11-43 (p. 42)  
\(^{52}\) Ibid., p. 40-41  
\(^{53}\) Ibid., p. 41 (fn.)
Based on the content of Parry’s other articles, he further develops his thoughts yet again at this point. It has been made clear in previous parts of this chapter that Parry was obviously impressed and possibly influenced by Brahms’s intricate motivic development. At this point, however, Parry elaborates upon this, indicating his admiration for Brahms’s ability to execute such developments within the recognisable context of a traditional form or genre. He further explains that the intricate motivic development is ‘used in such a way as not to disturb the balance of the whole, or lead to either discursiveness or tautology.’ To demonstrate his point, Parry uses Brahms’s Second Symphony as an example, citing the move from the development section to the recapitulation in the first movement. He does not provide any musical examples, but states that ‘the recapitulation of the first part of the movement is so welded onto the working-out portion that the hearer is only happily conscious that this point has been arrived at without the usual insistence to call his attention to it.’

Based on Parry’s lack of analytical examples at this point, it will be necessary to create some in relation to the point in question to clarify the discussion regarding the first movement of the Second Symphony. There is no shortage of analytical material on the work. Many musicologists have commented on the extreme motivic and thematic development which occurs in the work, for example, Walter Frisch in his book *Brahms: The Four Symphonies*, and Carl Schachter in his article ‘The First Movement of Brahms’s Second Symphony: The Opening Theme and its
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Consequences’. In a similar manner to Brahms’s Op. 34 Quintet, the main thematic cells can be traced back to the opening bars:

![Figure 4.39: The principal thematic material of the opening movement of Brahms’s Second Symphony in D, Op. 73, as identified by Frisch in his analysis of the movement (bars 1-9)](image)

Figure 4.39 shows the principal thematic cells which are subject to development throughout the movement. Walter Frisch identifies motives x, y and z as the foundation of the movement. In relation to Parry’s comments, if one then looks at the bars immediately before and after the point at which the recapitulation begins, Parry’s point is easy to demonstrate.

There is a substantial amount of motivic-thematic activity in figure 4.40 (p. 241). The beginning of the recapitulation has been marked on the reduction (bar 302). Around this point there are many developments occurring to the original motivic material, thereby ‘welding’ (to use Parry’s words) the recapitulation and the development together, thus making it aurally quite difficult to ascertain exactly when the recapitulation starts. For example, before the recapitulation, there is some very intense development of motive ‘y’ in the strings, making extensive use of the very Brahmsian trait of hemiola. This is followed by what seems to be a false recapitulation in the horns in bar 290, thus confusing the listener further.
There is also more extended development of the cells in lower parts, using rhythmic augmentation, such as in the lower strings at bar 292. Parry supports his discussion of the Second symphony with references to the First. He considers the third movement
of this work, saying that ‘an outline of a characteristic feature is all that is retained in
the final return of the principal subject near the end’\textsuperscript{56}, once again highlighting
Brahms’s immense ability to develop his themes without monotony. He also makes
the interesting comment that ‘all signs of “padding” are done away with’\textsuperscript{57},
presumably referring to the characteristic feature of earlier contributions in the genre
in which the themes of a work were accompanied by uninteresting and unrelated
material. Indeed, Brahms’s student Gustav Jenner probably best summarised this
Brahmsian feature: ‘one can’t write a sonata by stringing together a few such thematic
ideas through sonata form. Quite the contrary: the sonata form must be a necessary
consequence of the themes.’\textsuperscript{58}

Parry does provide some analytical examples in relation to motivic development and
evolution in the second symphony later in his article. However, the examples
unusually relate to the third movement, tracing the development of a motivic cell
across the different time signatures in the movement. Parry provides the following
accompanying explanation with the examples:

In the first movement of the Symphony in D there are even several subjects in each section, but they
are so interwoven with one another, and seem to fit and illustrate one another, that for the most part
there appears to be but little loss of direct continuity. In several cases we meet the devices of
transforming and transfiguring an idea. The most obvious instance is in the Allegretto of the Symphony
in D, in which the first Trio in 2/4 time (a) is radically the same subject as that of the principal section
in 3/4 time (b), but very differently stated. Then a very important item in the second Trio is a version in
3/8 time (c) of a figure of the first Trio in 2/4 time (d).\textsuperscript{59}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{58} Gustav Jenner, quoted in Carl Schachter ‘The First Movement of Brahms’s Second Symphony: The
Opening Theme and its Consequences’, \textit{Music Analysis}, 2 (1983), 55-68 (55)
\textsuperscript{59} Parry, ‘Symphony’, p. 42
With Parry’s accompanying explanation, the developments which take place between the two themes (figure 4.41) are much clearer, although again he does not provide bar references. Examples (a) and (b) are taken from bars 33-34 and 1-2 respectively. Examples (c) and (d) are taken from bars 132-135, and 57-60. Although Parry says that the examples are obvious, in relation to the thematic analysis carried out by the present author above, one would possibly have expected him to examine the first movement rather than the third. However, based on the intense motivic and thematic
continuity in the first movement, it would have been quite difficult to provide short, concise examples. It also demonstrate Parry’s evident desire not to focus solely on opening movements in his analyses, presumably in an attempt to show the organic nature of the work as a whole. One wonders what examples he might have used had the article been written after the establishment of Brahms’s Fourth Symphony in England. Parry continues the discussion with examples in the genre produced by then current British composers, including the Second ‘Elegiac’ Symphony of his colleague Stanford. He then tellingly concludes the article by commenting that ‘it is not likely that many will be able to follow Brahms in his severe and uncompromising methods… we can hardly hope that even the greatest composers of the future will surpass the symphonic triumphs of the past, whatever they may do in other fields of composition’. His concluding remarks are indicative of his admiration for Brahms, particularly in the evident attitude that his contributions to the symphonic genre would not be surpassed by anyone. His comments also imply that future developments in the genre would have to use Brahms’s approach as a starting point, and especially, one assumes, his intense and sophisticated thematic processes discussed so prominently in this instance.

The final article in relation to genre discussed by Parry in Grove’s Dictionary is that of ‘Variations’. As expected, he provides a history of variation form and the means by which the late nineteenth century contributions to the form had been reached through the use of select composers as examples, again with the usual Austro-German bias. This article contains many parallels to the one entitled ‘Sonata’, particularly in Parry’s difficulty in separating the notion of ‘variation form’ and the actual musical process

60 Ibid., p. 42-43
of variation. If one had to choose, the article leans more toward variation form, but
Parry often digresses into discussions of variational process.

Brahms naturally once again appears towards the end of the article whose sets of
variations are described by Parry as ‘the finest since Beethoven’. Parry provides the
following general analysis of Brahms’s approach to the form:

His principles are in the main those of Beethoven, while he applies such devices as condensation of
groups of chords, anticipations, inversions, analogues, sophistication by means of chromatic passing
notes etc., with an elaborate but fluent ingenuity which sometimes makes the tracing of the theme in a
variation quite a difficult intellectual exercise. But analysis almost always proves the treatment to be
logical, and the general impression is sufficiently true to the theme in broad outline for the principle of
the form to be intelligible.

Parry again indicates the popular notion that Brahms was the musical descendent of
Beethoven, highlighting also Brahms’s intellectual approach to the mechanical
process (indicating yet again Parry’s difficulty in separating genre and process). Parry
goes on to justify his thoughts on Brahms’s approach with two principal examples.
The first is a general example taken from the Variations on a Theme of Haydn, which
Parry maintains illustrates ‘the building of one variation upon another.’ Based on the
detailed evaluation of Stanford’s analysis of the work carried out earlier in this
chapter, it will not be necessary to include an example at this point, as this notion was
one of Stanford’s principal discussions. Parry also uses Brahms’s Op. 56 set of
variations to demonstrate Brahms’s ‘success’ in his codas, citing in particular the
derivation of the ground bass from original components in the opening theme, also

---
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discussed earlier in this chapter in relation to Stanford’s analysis. Parry provides no musical examples in relation to his comments on Brahms’s *Haydn Variations*, which is surprising in light of the attention and frequent mention of them in a subsidiary fashion in other articles produced by him in the *Dictionary*.

Surprisingly, the set of variations Parry chooses as a focal point for his discussion on Brahms’s contribution to the form is probably the least well known and performed set today – the *Variations on a Theme of Paganini*, Op. 35:

Figure 4.42: Examples provided by Parry from Brahms’s *Variations on a Theme of Paganini*, Op. 35, in his discussion of Brahms’s contributions to the variation genre

Parry provides the following accompanying explanation:
In the following examples – which show the first four bars of the theme, and the corresponding portion of the third variation in the first Paganini set, the nature of several very characteristic devices such as anticipation, insertion of new chords between essential points of the harmonic succession, doubling the variation by giving the repetition of each half in full, with new touches of effect etc. – is illustrated.\textsuperscript{64}

Parry’s choice of the Paganini Variations is not entirely clear, but in a similar manner to the choice of the third movement of the Second Symphony, it is probably related to the necessity of finding an example short enough to fit the context of the dictionary article. The \textit{Haydn Variations} were possibly on too large a scale to use in musical examples. Parry’s selections in this instance are easier to visualise within the context of the whole work, as he actually says which points they come from within the set. The variation techniques Parry discusses are made visible by his annotations on the examples and do not require any further comment at this point. Unusually, Parry does not use Brahms as the conclusion of his thoughts on Variation form. Instead, he discusses the equivalent notions of the ‘\textit{idée fixe}’ in the music of Berlioz, and the ‘\textit{leitmotiven}’ in the music of Wagner\textsuperscript{65}, demonstrating again that Parry was not as biased in favour of Brahms as people suggest in general literature on English music of the late nineteenth century. What has been made abundantly clear in this section devoted to Parry’s writing on form and genre, is that, in his more intricate discussions of these, he has actually provided a lot more information regarding his views on Brahmsian process, which was discussed in the previous part of the chapter. Indeed, whilst it certainly seems that Parry evidently had a huge admiration for Brahms in the area of genre and form, he was more profoundly affected by Brahms’s attention to detail in his organic treatment of thematic and motivic material

\textsuperscript{64} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{65} Ibid., p. 230
Stanford, by contrast, has not produced anything like the amount of writing that Parry has on genre. His principal reference to Brahmsian genre is in Chapter V of his book in which he analyses the *Variations on a Theme of Haydn*, Op. 56, discussed earlier in this chapter. Stanford’s strong affinity with the form and his reasons for viewing it in such terms has been made clear earlier in the chapter. However, he does provide a very short account of the place of the form in musical history:

The greatest masters of it were, without question, Bach, Beethoven and Brahms. To them variations meant the extraction of the essence of the theme, a freedom of development which amounted to new inventions founded upon old ideas, and extraordinary power of twining, twisting and juggling with the details of themes, of presenting them in lights illuminated by their own individuality… the ability to turn the conceptions of others into an original conception of their own.66

Stanford yet again provides an account of his perception of the progression of composers in music history, as laid out in his biographical publication of Brahms. This paragraph also gives another strong reason why Stanford emphasises the form so much in his book – it will supposedly enable composers to develop new and intricate thematic ideas within the context of old forms, as Brahms demonstrates through the majority of his compositional output. Stanford’s only other substantial comments in relation to his admiration regarding Brahmsian genre is much later in the book, in his discussion of the popular combination of the sonata for violin and pianoforte. He maintains that ‘the basis of a sonata for piano and violin of the type adopted by Mozart and Beethoven, and continued with modifications and enrichments down to our own day, is a three part one’.67 Stanford then provides a table demonstrating the possible distributions possible in such a work:
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66 Stanford, *Musical Composition*, p. 52
67 Ibid., p. 123
What Stanford is referring to at this point seems to be the relative importance between the various individual musical lines in the sonata, which he lists as threefold – the violin and the individual hands of the piano part. He maintains that the best models of the genre are Mozart, Beethoven and Brahms. This is a difficult part of Stanford’s publication because, disappointingly, he does not include any examples by any of the composers. Therefore, one has no clue as to exactly how to select the appropriate distribution from the selection of three from an analytical point of view.

At this point, one of Brahms’s contributions to the genre will be considered. Brahms’s output in the sonata genre is somewhat neglected in favour of his larger chamber and orchestral works. He produced a total of seven excluding those for solo piano: three for violin (Opp. 78, 100 and 108), two for cello (Opp. 38 and 99) and two for clarinet (Op. 120). For the purpose of this discussion, some small sections of the opening movement of the Op. 78 Sonata for Violin and Piano will be considered in relation to Stanford’s comments:

---

68 Ibid.
69 Ibid.
The first example in figure 4.43 suggests Stanford’s first distribution:

I. Violin  
II. Piano, right hand  
III. Piano Left hand

The principal reason for this distribution is that there is clear, prominent thematic material in the violin part, with quaver arpeggios accompanying in both hands of the piano. In contrast, when one looks at figure 4.44 (p. 251), there is much more thematic material in the right hand of the piano part, with obvious counterpoint taking place between the two parts.
Figure 4.44: Bars 21-27 of the first movement of Brahms's Sonata for Violin and Piano, Op. 78
The thematic material in the right hand of the piano is even more pronounced in figure 4.45, with the violin and the left hand of the piano having purely accompanying minims and dotted minims respectively, against the quaver thematic material in the right hand suggesting that the distribution in figures 4.44 and 4.45 could be interpreted as I. Piano, right hand; II. Violin; III. Piano, left hand. It is easy to see why
Stanford viewed Brahms as a good example of this type of distribution in a sonata. Another point which is not made particularly clear by Stanford is that the constant counterpoint in Brahms’s music allows the distribution of the three parts to change within the same movement. Apart from this very short discussion towards the end of *Musical Composition*, Stanford does not really present any other thoughts on genre. His principal concern (like Parry), as demonstrated amply earlier in the chapter was the process of composition, particularly within the realms of development and variation in a piece of music.

**4.5: Parry, Stanford, and Brahmsian Orchestration**

Before this chapter is concluded, a small section must be devoted to Parry and Stanford’s parallels to Brahms in terms of orchestration. This study will not be attempting to prove that there are many significant similarities between the music of Brahms with that of Parry and Stanford in relation to orchestration (especially in the context of the actual physical spread of the instruments and use of their tessituras), because one need only listen to the music of Parry or Stanford to realise that this is not really the case. There are certain corners of their works which contain the odd Brahmsian-sounding element of orchestration. However, by and large, both Parry’s and Stanford’s style of orchestration was much lighter and less severe than Brahms’s. Although Brahms’s orchestration is generally thought to have lightened as the years progressed, many of his earlier and middle period works exhibit a rather acerbic tone to the orchestration. For example if one contrasts the opening movements of Brahms’s First Piano Concerto with Parry’s Fifth Symphony, it can be seen that both make prominent use of the mediant pedal in the double basses, a very difficult scale degree to use in this section of the orchestra without creating a dense sounding result.
Brahms holds the mediant note in the double basses as a simple tied pedal for 10 bars, adding the bassoons and timpani with the same note. Parry on the other hand actually gives the double basses thematic material, allowing them to move around the mediant, and does not add any other instruments to this material which allows for a much lighter texture. Furthermore, this chapter has clearly demonstrated the aspects of Brahms’s music which Parry and Stanford admired. It is almost certainly no coincidence therefore, that there is a parallel between the obvious lack of similarities in their own orchestration the fact that they said comparatively little regarding Brahms’s orchestration techniques. Therefore, slightly less time will be devoted to its discussion in this study.

The only article in which Parry discusses this aspect of Brahms’s music is entitled ‘Arrangement’ in Grove’s Dictionary. Most of the article discusses the role of the ‘arranger’ in relation to the ‘composer’. Parry likens the arranger to a translator in literature. However, his comments regarding Brahms are interesting. Yet again he chooses the stalwart Op. 34 Quintet for his discussion. Unsurprisingly, the principal focus of the discussion is how Brahms adapted and changed the work for the two-hand piano version. However, the following paragraph is of particular relevance to this study:

In this [the Op. 34 Quintet] the main object seems to have been to balance the work of the two pianofortes. Sometimes the first pianoforte, and sometimes the second has the original pianoforte part for pages together, and sometimes for a few bars at a time, but whenever the nature of a passage admits of it, the materials are distributed evenly between the two instruments.70

70 Parry, ‘Arrangement’, Dictionary of Music and Musicians, pp. 89-95 (p. 92)
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Whilst Parry is referring to just one composition here, Brahms’s music is full of examples of even distribution of thematic material between the various instruments and voices, from the two piano arrangements to the full orchestral pieces. Indeed, this was demonstrated earlier in this chapter in the speculative analysis of Brahms’s Op. 34. However, it was also the case in his orchestral compositions too. For the sake of continuity, the orchestral version of the Haydn Variations (Op. 56a) will suffice as an example at this point. The sixth variation in the set is a good one to discuss the issue of Brahms’s use of the orchestra in the context of his intense motivic process. Neither Parry nor Stanford actually mentions this in their writing, but as one of Brahms’s only works in which the two piano version was published at the same time as the orchestral version, it cannot be ignored. Virtually all the examples provided so far in this chapter have been based principally on the two piano version of the work (Op. 56b), with occasional elements taken from the orchestral version. The crucial factor in the orchestral version is the evenness with which the thematic material is distributed amongst the various instrumental groups.

Appendix IX (Vol. II, p. 64) is the orchestral score of the sixth variation. As discussed earlier, the principal thematic components of the variation are:

![Figure 4.46: The principal thematic cells in the sixth variation of Brahms’s Variations on a Theme of Haydn, Op. 56](image)

With these two figures in mind, one can trace their development through the different sections of the orchestra as the variation develops. Looking at Appendix IX, cell A in figure 4.46 begins in the horn parts. In bar 268 it moves into the woodwind, starting in
the flute, clarinet and the bassoon, and is then adopted by the remainder of the section in bar 269. In the second part of the variation, Brahms introduces figure B, which can be seen in various forms in the upper and extreme lower woodwind, and the upper and extreme lower strings. In contrast, the middle woodwind, horns and middle strings continue with motive A, until bar 277. Then again, a similar effect is produced in bars 286 to 292. This very clearly demonstrates the evenness with which Brahms treated every section of the orchestra in terms of thematic content, as opposed to the principal thematic material only really being in the upper strings or one of the other traditional melody bearing instruments, such as the flutes. Stanford does not really present any kind of substantial analysis on Brahms’s orchestration, even in the section of his book entitled ‘Colour’. As was indicated at the start of this section, the two British composers do not really seem to have been particularly influenced by Brahms in this area, apart from perhaps the very consistent and even distribution of thematic material across all the instruments in a movement. Therefore, the next analytical chapters will focus on this particular facet of orchestration.

4.6: Conclusion

This chapter has provided a detailed analytical discussion of the principal theoretical texts of Parry and Stanford, in order to ascertain exactly which features of Brahms’s music they found particularly potent. The results of the analysis of their written works, coupled with some speculative analysis in sparser areas, have provided a solid foundation for further discussion. The chapter has viewed the crucial compositional elements of harmony, process, form, genre and orchestration. In all of these categories, the writing of both composers has consistently gravitated towards the local and structural possibilities present in the process of developing and varying one or
two motivic cells. It has been demonstrated that they admired the consideration and
variation of motivic cells in the harmonic and formal structure of a work, as well as
localised motivic variational process. The notion of the all pervading motivic process
throughout a single work provides an ideal analytical focus for part two of this thesis,
in which select examples from the chamber and orchestral works of Parry and
Stanford are analysed, with the intention of addressing and isolating exactly which
Brahmsian elements are present in their compositions, thus providing detailed,
definitive analytical evidence that their principal influence was the music of Johannes
Brahms.
The Music of Johannes Brahms in Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century England and an Assessment of His Reception and Influence on the Chamber and Orchestral Works of Charles Hubert Hastings Parry and Charles Villiers Stanford

Three Volumes

Volume Ib

Edward Luke Anderton Woodhouse

BA (Hons) (Dunelm), MA (Dunelm)

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Durham University

Department of Music 2012
Part 2

Musical Analysis

Chapter 5
Analysis of the Chamber Music of Charles Hubert Hastings Parry and Charles Villiers Stanford

Chapter 6
Analysis of the Orchestral Music of Charles Hubert Hastings Parry and Charles Villiers Stanford
Chapter 5: Analysis of Chamber Compositions by C. Hubert H. Parry and Charles Villiers Stanford

5.0: Introduction

The research carried out in Part 1 of this thesis offers a comprehensive contextual and analytical framework regarding Brahms reception and influence in England. Chapter 1 gives an indication of the timescales, and detailed accounts of the contributions of key figures. Chapter 2 demonstrates England’s empathy towards Brahms’s music in terms of organised performance and educational trends during the late nineteenth century. Chapter 3 evaluates all the available literature on the topic, and indicates which works of Parry and Stanford might be worthy of analytical investigation. Finally, Chapter 4 provides a valuable theoretical basis for subsequent analysis of works by Parry and Stanford.

The literature reviewed in Chapter 3 indicates that the main two branches of composition in which Brahms’s influence is most evident, is in chamber and orchestral music. Furthermore, most of Parry and Stanford’s own musicological and analytical work demonstrates a particular fondness for these two areas of Brahms’s output. Therefore, the final two chapters of this study are divided into analytical discussions of Parry and Stanford’s chamber and orchestral music respectively. Obviously, given the large amount of contextual research which has had to be carried out for this project, a survey of the complete output of both composers in these branches of composition at this point is an unrealistic endeavour. Therefore, the discussion in these chapters is based on select compositions of each composer based on the suggestions, comments, and brief analyses presented by the research in
Chapters 1 to 3. The same categories are used to assess the music in this chapter (harmony, process, form and genre, and orchestration) as were employed in Chapter 4 to evaluate Brahms’s music in the context of Parry and Stanford’s writings. This provides the clear insight to determining the precise correlations that may exist between Parry and Stanford’s works and those of Brahms. Chapter 4 reveals a strong and undeniable admiration on the part of both composers of Brahms’s intense motivic process throughout his works. Indeed, their regard for this facet spread beyond articles and discussions devoted to compositional process and extends to their discussions of harmony and orchestration. It has been demonstrated that Brahms’s music started to gain serious recognition in England from c.1870 onwards, with the première of Ein Deutsches Requiem on 2 April 1873 being a point of reference for the increase in popularity of the composer’s music. Therefore, a selection of chamber works by Parry and Stanford, dating from around this time until the 1890s are examined in the remainder of this chapter. The pieces discussed are:

**Table 5.1: Pieces of chamber music by Parry and Stanford selected for analytical study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Year of composition</th>
<th>Date of first performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parry</td>
<td><em>Grosses Duo</em></td>
<td>1875-77</td>
<td>11 April, 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pianoforte Trio in E minor</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>31 Jan, 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pianoforte Quartet in A flat</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>13 Feb, 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata for Violin and Piano in D</td>
<td>1888-1889</td>
<td>14 Feb, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Pianoforte Quartet in F, Op. 15</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>26 May, 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pianoforte Quintet in D minor, Op. 25.</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>10 June, 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pianoforte Trio in E flat, Op.35</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>16 Jan, 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>String Quartet No 1 in G, Op. 44</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>22 Jan, 1892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All of these pieces are linked to the music of Brahms by the authors discussed in Chapter 3 and the analysis in this chapter builds on their comments using the analytical framework of Chapter 4 of this study.

5.1: C. Hubert H. Parry: Grosses Duo

Parry’s Grosses Duo is an ideal starting point in the analytical portion of this study, as it is the earliest of all the chamber works examined, but, more importantly, as a duet for two pianos, its format makes spotting tonal, motivic, and structural relationships more straightforward than in larger scale works thus providing an accessible point of entry to Parry’s output. The Duo is the first piece discussed in Jeremy Dibble’s biography with any significant reference to Brahms. In one of his abundantly informative analytical digressions, Dibble maintains that ‘Parry’s chief aim in the first movement… was to consolidate that mastery of Brahmsian sonata technique which had been essayed only tentatively in the violin sonata.’1 In terms of the piece’s harmonic and tonal structure, of particular importance according to Dibble is the second subject of the first movement which contains tonal parallels to Brahms’s Piano Quartet in G minor Op. 25, in the infusion of ‘a strong contrast between the major and minor modes of the dominant key.’2 Dibble provides ample musical examples which illustrate this; therefore it will not be dwelt on here. More importantly however, is his observation of Parry’s use of the Neapolitan chord in the second group:

Parry introduces his second group in the dominant major and concludes with the minor which reiterates the opening material now recomposed. Between the two statements occurs a new theme in G major… The transition to G major is prefaced by a passage through the Neapolitan of B (achieved by a reinterpretation of the German sixth in bar 43 as the dominant seventh of C, of which G is naturally the

1 Dibble, C. Hubert H. Parry, p. 129
2 Ibid.
dominant. G major, although much more prolonged, acts as the Neapolitan to the dominant of B to which it drops in bar 62. Such an extensive use of the Neapolitan again suggests the strong influence of Brahms’s Piano Quintet whose first movement is finely balanced between established keys and their Neapolitans.³

The two significant instances Dibble is referring to at this point (bars 43 and 62) are not actually presented in his musical examples. However, in relation to Parry’s brief comments in relation to Brahms’s Op. 34 discussed in the previous chapter, these two points cannot be ignored:

![Musical notation](image)

Figure 5.1: Bars 42-44 of the first movement of Parry’s Grosses Duo in E minor

³ Ibid., p. 131-132
Both figures 5.1 and 5.2 demonstrate the two areas of the second subject group of the first movement of the Duo in which Neapolitan chords are employed. Dibble rightly points out the parallel with Brahms’s Quintet, Op. 34 in terms of the structural use of the Neapolitan. However, as is also the case with Brahms’s piece, Parry saturates the music with what might be termed ‘motivic element’ of the Neapolitan progression – the semitone. In the first movement for instance the semitone is one of the principal cells of the first subject group material:

*Figure 5.3: The opening motivic cell of the first movement of Parry’s Grosses Duo in E minor*

The motivic cell in figure 5.3 appears constantly throughout the first movement. In a similar manner to Brahms’s organ preludes discussed in the previous chapter, the motive is actually interwoven into the counterpoint which occurs between the two pianos, and, at certain points, the individual hands:
Figure 5.4: Bars 5-6 of the first movement of Parry’s *Grosses Duo* in E minor

Figure 5.4 demonstrates this point amply, in which the semitone interval is seen in several different contexts (all the principal examples have been marked). It is clearly visible in the thematic material in the upper parts of the counterpoint, but is also visible in rhythmically augmented forms in the bass parts of each hand. Whilst occurrences of the semitone motive are mostly inverted in the melodic material, their saturating presence in the thematic fabric of the piece would seem far too frequent to be coincidental in relation to the strong presence of this harmonic element.

The semitone motive also appears with some frequency within the final part of the extended second subject group:
Figure 5.5: Bars 66-77 of the first movement of Parry’s *Grosses Duo* in E minor
Figure 5.5 shows almost all of the final part of the second subject group of the first movement of the *Duo* which is saturated with the semitone motive. There are also variations of the figure such as the use of its distinctive rhythm in the ascending and descending third motions in bar 71 in the *primo* part, and the use of the major second interval in place of the minor second which can be found on the first beat of bar 67 also in the primo part. These small variations are exactly the type one might expect in a piece of Brahms’s chamber music. Indeed they were witnessed in abundance in the opening movement of his Op. 34 Quintet in Part 1 of this study. As well as providing Parry with a means of maintaining unity through subtle variation, the use of the semitone motive at this point is also significant in relation to its reappearance towards the end of the movement in bar 157:
This repetition of the first group material (demonstrated in figure 5.6) occurs after the recapitulation of the second group, forming a quasi codetta. As well as demonstrating the importance of the semitone motive, this additionally highlights the coda as an important thematic event within the structure of the piece, as was the case with many of Brahms’s codas. Whilst the second group material is largely recomposed in the recapitulation (demonstrating yet another Brahmsian feature witnessed in the last chapter), unity is maintained by the subtle reappearance and re-composition of the semitone interval towards the end of the section, leading into the coda material of figure 5.6:
Figure 5.7 comprises the bars preceding the coda with the transformation and variation of the semitone motive for both instruments. The original version can be seen in rhythmically augmented and diminished forms, as well as smaller versions, all of which have been indicated with brackets in figure 5.7. This re-composition of the motive in the second group, allows Parry to compose organically to the intense repetition of the first group material in the coda, thereby making it an aurally logical progression.

The motive is also visible in the final cadence in the form of an expected leading note:

![Musical notation](image)

**Figure 5.8: The final bars (162-164) of the first movement of Parry’s *Grosses Duo* in E minor**

Whilst it might be argued that the semitone at the end of the piece is a normal part of a simple perfect cadence in E minor. Yet it should be remembered that the movement E to D sharp is the original motivic cell of the first subject. Therefore its prominent inclusion in a rhythmically augmented form with emphasising accents as the leading voice in the *secondo* part at this point is surely not accidental. The motive began as an essentially inverted mordent, and is at this point used in the culminating perfect cadence of the piece, which creates an excellent example of an organic link between melodic motive and harmony.
Parry also uses variants of the motive throughout the other two movements of the work:

Figure 5.9: The principal thematic cell in the second movement of Parry’s *Grosses Duo* in E minor

Figure 5.10: The principal thematic cell in the third movement of Parry’s *Grosses Duo* in E minor

Figures 5.9 and 5.10 demonstrate the thematic elements of the second and third movements of the *Grosses Duo*. The second movement is distant from the original thematic cell of the third movement as it is rhythmically augmented, and comprises a major second rather than the minor second throughout the movement. The movement is also in the dominant key of B major, making Parry’s use of the major second between the dominant and the submediant very pronounced (a progression which would be a minor second if the piece were in a minor key). Furthermore, the cell in figure 5.9 is also an inverted version of the original motivic shape. The constant use of sicilienne-style rhythmic cells throughout the movement serves to emphasise the motivic cell even further both rhythmically and tonally. However, this is really the only element which could be seen as Brahmsian in the second movement. Dibble refers to the movement as a ‘pastorale’⁴, a term which along with sicilienne, has

---

⁴ Dibble, *Parry*, p. 129
become generally associated with music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and in particular the music of Handel⁵.

![Figure 5.11: Bars 5-6 of the second movement of Parry’s Grosses Duo in E minor](image)

As figure 5.11 demonstrates, Parry perfectly captures the typical ‘simple melodies and clear, direct harmonies’⁶ of the pastorale in the Grosses Duo by use of a narrower tessitura in both parts. He also ensures that each hand contains a single line of music, almost entirely avoiding the use of large spread chords seen in the opening movement. Furthermore, there is little in the way of subtle variation and transformation of the thematic material in this movement which pervades most of Brahms’s music and indeed the first movement of the Grosses Duo. The overall effect of the piano in this movement is distinctly un-Brahmsian, and provides a noticeable departure from those processes discussed in the first movement.

By contrast, in the final movement, the semitone motive resembles its original form much more closely, although as figure 5.10 shows, its initial appearance is in a

---


⁶ Ibid.
rhythmically diminished form. A few excerpts from the final movement reveal the extensive use of the motive:

Figure 5.12: Bars 21-24 of the right hand primo part of the final movement of Parry’s *Grosses Duo* in E minor

Figure 5.13: Bars 80-81 of the final movement of Parry’s *Grosses Duo* in E minor
Figures 5.12, 5.13 and 5.14 all show instances of the use of the semitone motive in the final movement. Figure 5.12 demonstrates the figure in a compacted form than the original, although rhythmically augmented in the final bar. Figure 5.13 shows the motive closest to its original form in the first movement, although the timing and note groupings suggest groupings of two semiquavers (as opposed to the original motive which was three notes – two semiquavers followed by a quaver). The most interesting recurrence of the motive is in the penultimate bar of the work, which as well as containing a strong dominant pedal in the *seco...
intense development of a single motivic cell. The use of such techniques is perhaps not very surprising particularly as Parry was studying during this time with Dannreuther (indeed the title page of the first edition of the work, published by Breitkopf and Härtel bears a dedication to Dannreuther), who was very fond of Brahms’s chamber music, as demonstrated in Chapter 1 of this study by the large numbers of performances of Brahms’s work at his Orme Square concert series. However, that is not to say that the music should be written off as a deliberate copy of Brahms. Indeed, the second movement of the Duo provides a marked departure from the intense motivic variational processes seen in Brahms’s music, pointing towards Baroque dance forms as the source or its inspiration, as well as a more conservative use of tessitura and texture on the piano. Furthermore, Parry’s sonata form of the first movement, and indeed those of the other two movements are much more concise than those generally seen in Brahms’s works, perhaps only with the exception of some of his much later movements. Indeed, it is Parry’s concise writing, coupled with intense local and structural variation which is a striking feature of the next work to be examined, his Piano Trio in E minor.

5.2: C. Hubert H. Parry: Piano Trio in E minor

Parry’s Trio in E minor was produced a little while after the Grosses Duo in 1879 and the composer continues to employ many of the Brahmsian techniques witnessed in the Duo. Once again, Jeremy Dibble is the only musicologist who has engaged in any kind of analytical discussion of the work. Michael Allis discusses the piece only superficially in relation to performance and publication history. Based on accounts by both Allis and Dibble, Dannreuther was once again a huge source of support for Parry
in the creation of this work, and was apparently particularly taken with the Scherzo.\footnote{Ibid., p. 148}

Dibble’s discussion is principally related to the first movement:

His [Parry’s] excitement at Dannreuther’s satisfaction was well justified, for all four movements showed a yet more confident handling of the Brahmsian principles of tight motivic and tonal integration. The basic contour of the movement, B-C-B, and in particular the central pitch C, play a vital role in determining the tonal scheme of the entire work. Within the first movement this can be seen in several different contexts. The first group, for example, includes a deviation to C major for 13 bars (bars 34-46) before reverting to the dominant of E minor. The move to the submediant occurs again at the end of the first group (bar 65) but this time C helps to establish the new second group key of A flat…C major continues to assert itself in the Scherzo in A major in that it forms the key of the Trio, and the Schumannesque slow movement, the emotional centre of the work is set in C major. Finally, the virtuoso sonata-rondo of the last movement also deploys C major prominently as its second group key.\footnote{Ibid., p. 148-150}

This is a useful summary of the work, particularly in terms of tonality. Parry’s emphasis on the submediant key provides a very interesting parallel to the same use of tonality in Brahms’s Op. 34 Quintet. Whilst Parry does not actually discuss this particular aspect of the piece directly at any point in his theoretical writing, his constant use of the work as an example in the first edition of Grove’s \textit{Dictionary}, alongside countless performances of the work in various concert venues in London (including six performances over the seventeen year period of Dannreuther’s Orme Square Concerts, making it the most performed piece of Brahms in this series) would suggest that he was almost certainly aware of it if not influenced by it directly in his own output. This explanation is made even more plausible by Parry’s obvious
deference towards Dannreuther as his mentor in the composition of chamber works, as seen in Dibble and Allis’s research of Parry’s output at this time.

The opening phrase of the first movement of the Trio therefore takes on a new significance based on current research on the work:

![Figure 5.15: A reduction of the opening nine bars of the first movement of Parry’s Trio in E minor](image)

The thematic cell of the entire movement (B-C-B) can be seen in several forms in figure 5.15. There are two distinct versions in the treble part, all of which is played by the violin which eventually merge together through octave transfer in bars 7-8. There is a version of the motive in bar 4 indicated by a bracket. There are also inverted diminutions occurring in the left hand of the piano. This opening bears a very striking resemblance to that witness in the last chapter of Brahms’s Op. 34 Quintet. Not only are the principal semitonal motivic cells identical (B-C-B, compared to C-D flat-C in Brahms’s work) but also its subtle voice leading across the opening bars is also very similar. It could be argued that the voice-leading analysis in figure 5.14 may possibly be a little fanciful and may not have any bearing on Parry’s compositional process. Whilst such long range motivic process may not have been in Parry’s mind whilst he was composing, it cannot be denied that the intensity of the foreground motives allow
aural and analytical perception of longer range versions as seen in figure 5.14. By 1878-9, Brahms’s Op. 34 would have been performed at Dannreuther’s concerts once, as well as countless other times in and around London. Coupled with Parry’s reliance on the work as an example in Grove’s *Dictionary* from its first published volume in 1878, one can safely assume that his general acquaintance with the piece would have been intimate, thereby making the similarity between the Quintet’s opening and the opening of his Trio a little less surprising than it might have otherwise been.

As Jeremy Dibble has pointed out, this thematic cell (dominant – submediant – dominant) also effects the overall tonal structure of the music, with the first modulation to the submediant occurring in the first subject group in bar 34:

![Figure 5.16: Bars 35-38 of the opening movement of Parry’s Trio in E minor](image)

As Dibble maintains, this section of the first subject in C major and its reappearance at the end of the first subject, assist in the establishing of the second group key of A flat (the submediant of C), thereby creating tonal unity in a key change which would otherwise be quite alien in the context of E minor. It is also interesting to note the economical aspects of Parry’s motivic writing in figure 5.16 in which the violin and the cello exchange lines with each other after two bars. Throughout the first subject group, the original B-C-B motive and its variants are never far away. For instance,
after its initial statement in the violin, the piano plays the theme, whilst the violin and 'cello engage in imitative counterpoint over the top:

![Figure 5.17: A reduction of bars 19-25 of the first movement of Parry’s Trio in E minor](image)

Figure 5.17 shows the transfer of the principal motivic material to the piano. Although it has not been subject to any variation, it demonstrates the Brahmsian feature of sharing the thematic material equally between all the instruments – one only need recall the Haydn Quartet examined in the last chapter in which all the major thematic material was almost exclusively confined to the first violin, in contrast to Brahms’s Op. 25 Quartet, or indeed his Op. 34 Quintet in both of which the thematic material is much more evenly distributed. Parry does not wait long before providing a varied version of the principal motivic cell:
Using the prominent acciaccatura first seen in the local presentation of the B-C-B motive (bar 4), Parry presents a series of semitonal oscillations (shown in figure 5.18) incorporating both elements. This not only provides an aural affirmation of the original motive but at the same time acts as a variation because of the use of different rhythmic elements from the opening bars (i.e. the acciaccatura). There is then a brief reiteration of the first subject material closer to its original form before the entry of the second group in bar 70.

Generally speaking the second group does not really have any particularly strong references to the B-C-B motive. However, there are one or two small passages towards the end of the second group which are clearly related to the original motive:

The re-appearance of the semitonal element of the original motive (figure 5.19) is surely not coincidental, as it leads into the development section which begins in bar...
105, in which the B-C-B motive undergoes further development. For instance, in the opening bars of the development, the opening two bars of the original theme is fused with a version of the semiquaver semitones seen in figure 5.18:

![Figure 5.20: Bars 112-115 of the violoncello part in the first movement of Parry’s Trio in E minor](image)

Variations of the type seen in figure 5.20 occur throughout the development section. Indeed, there is no material across the whole section in any of the parts which cannot be accounted for in relation to the exposition. Such Brahmsian developments continue into the coda of the movement:

![Figure 5.21: Bars 306-312 of the violoncello part in the first movement of Parry’s Trio in E minor](image)

A typical example of this kind of development can be seen in figure 5.21, in which the cello presents a rhythmically augmented version of the first few bars of the first subject group. The ‘B-C-B’ motive (indicated by a bracket in figure 5.21) is changed by the use of the major second rather than the minor second, but retains its motivic identity through the similarity in shape of the bars to the opening, and the use of the *acciaccatura.*
Whilst the opening movement is saturated with Brahmsian contrapuntal variation, much of the piano part provides a distinct departure from Brahms, in that it is generally spread over a much smaller tessitura. One need only compare the opening movement of Parry’s Trio with the opening of Brahms’s Op. 8 (first version), which contains noticeably more use of the lower registers of the piano. Parry also seems less afraid to have more extended homophonic sections on the piano in contrast to Brahms, who invariably uses syncopated rhythms in similar areas, thus avoiding a homophonic sound. Indeed, the lighter texture and homophonic writing make Parry’s piano part sound more like those of Mendelssohn than Brahms, which, given the former’s popularity in England is hardly surprising. One need only look at the opening of Mendelssohn’s Op. 49 Piano Trio to see the similarities in contrast to the generally heavier scoring of Brahms’s Trio.

The second movement (a scherzo and trio) continues in this vein and is clearly identifiable as a non-Brahmsian movement in Parry’s Trio, in that its principal theme is very lightly and delicately scored, particularly in the string parts. However, one cannot escape the presence of a variant of the B-C-B motive from the outset:

![Figure 5.22: A reduction of the opening four bars of the second movement of Parry’s Trio in E minor](image-url)
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The first varied versions of the B-C-B motive have been indicated on the example in figure 5.22. The one in the piano through the use of dotted rhythm clearly recalls the first iteration of the motive in the opening movement, whilst the fast and furious version in the violin can be traced to the end of the second subject group in the first movement. This four bar example provides most of the thematic material for the entire second movement with the exception of the Trio. However, as discussed by Dibble, Parry relates the Trio to the work as a whole by setting it in the submediant (of E minor) C major, thereby creating a larger tonal and structural relationship to the B-C-B motive, just as Brahms created in the Op. 34 Quintet. The subtlety and sophistication with which Parry moves back to the opening material from the trio is also very significant:

As figure 5.23 demonstrates, Parry reintroduces a varied version of the B-C-B motive (bracketed in figure 5.23) first in the context of C major, which he transforms to the opening version to provide a thematic link to the initial material. This technique has been used in many of Parry’s movements discussed so far in this chapter. In the reinterpretation of the opening material of this movement, there are more variations on the B-C-B motive, such as in the lower piano at bar 334:
Whilst the variant of the B-C-B motive is not the principal theme at the moment it is played in the bass part of the piano, it nonetheless provides a subtle aural reminder to the listener of the importance of the theme in the context of the entire work. It also demonstrates another parallel with Brahms discussed in Chapter 4 of this study, particularly in relation to Stanford’s discussion of the Op. 122 Organ preludes in which thematic material can act as accompanimental and harmonic material, as well as being the principal focus.

The Trio concludes with a sonata-rondo which, as Dibble acknowledges, deploys the submediant as the principal second group key thus providing a harmonic thematic link of the final movement to the first. In terms of individual thematic developments, the most interesting area is towards the middle of the movement:
Figure 5.25 shows the point at which variations of the B-C-B motive return. Some instances of the motive have been bracketed on the example. The striking feature of this section (it is in full score here) is that every single part is saturated with different versions of the motive. This, once again is a very Brahmsian procedure, probably most easily observable in the Fourth Symphony with the return of the descending third motive, although at the point that this Trio was composed, Brahms’s Fourth Symphony had not even been conceived. The return of the motive in this intense fashion certainly provides a level of organic thematic unity comparable with that of Brahms. Unlike the Grosses Duo, this piece follows the Brahmsian model of four movements and, as in Brahms’s Op. 25 Quartet and Op. 34 Quintet, contains certain key thematic elements which unify the music. Undoubtedly there are areas of the piece, particularly in terms of the character of some of the themes such as that of the second movement which do not particularly resemble anything produced by Brahms. However, Parry’s process of intense and sophisticated local and structural variation throughout the work would almost certainly seem to be influenced by similar
techniques of Brahms, which Parry probably learned through close acquaintance with the composer’s music, and in particular from Dannreuther’s assistance and guidance during the time that Parry’s major chamber works were composed.

5.3: C. Hubert H. Parry: Piano Quartet in A Flat

The Piano Quartet was composed in 1879, shortly after the Trio. This work has been included in this study for two reasons. First, it is in a form with which Brahms is very strongly associated principally as a result of his Opp. 25 and 26 (not overlooking the Op. 60 Quartet which tends to be overshadowed by the earlier two). Second, this work has not previously been discussed in relation to the music of Brahms. The present author has approached it without any preconceived ideas regarding the Brahmsian aesthetic. Structurally, the work is in four movements: a sonata form first movement, a scherzo, an ‘abridged sonata’ slow movement, and a sonata form finale. Dibble refers to the work as ‘his most assured instrumental work to date’, suggesting that all aspects of its fabric and structure are as sophisticated as those already witnessed in the Grosses Duo and the Trio in E minor.

Tonally, the work is probably generally less adventurous than the Duo and the Trio, with the first movement in the tonic, the second in the relative minor, the third in the subdominant, and the final movement returns to the tonic. Such tonal relationships between movements are outwardly not particularly extraordinary; however, one only needs to look very superficially at the thematic material to realise that the tonal relationships are yet again thematic:

---

9 Ibid., p. 168
10 Ibid., p. 167
As figure 5.26 shows, three of the four movements begin with some form of motive involving a perfect fourth. The perfect fourth appears motivically consistently throughout the work. Therefore, based on the previous discussions of Brahmsian tonality in Parry’s music and the close relationship between tonality and thematic material witnessed in the *Grosses Duo* and the Trio in E minor, the use of the subdominant as a key for one of the movements is perhaps not as ordinary as it might otherwise seem. The use of the relative minor in the Scherzo is a logical choice for an inner movement and one used by Brahms relatively frequently. So before examining the local intricacies of the work, there is an apparent relationship between many of the basic thematic and tonal elements of the work.

The powerful relationship between tonality and motive provides an ideal foundation with which to discuss the motivic processes at work within the fabric of the music. The work opens with a slow introduction (similar to that found in Beethoven’s later chamber works and a technique never exploited by Brahms in his chamber music). The excerpt in figure 5.26 is taken from bar 1 of the viola part. When the first subject group enters in the piano in bar 28, the resemblance to the introductory material is obvious:
The fourths in the first subject material in figure 5.27 are bracketed. The two principal thematic cells of the movement are in bars 28 and 29 and have been labelled A, B, C and D respectively. Indeed C is arguably a rhythmically diminished and melodic variation of B. The overt chorale-style of this opening theme provides another deviation from the chamber music of Brahms, surely pointing directly towards the chorales of Bach as the source of its inspiration with its largely homophonic harmony and mostly distinct SATB lines. Variations on these bars occur a number of times during the movement, ensuring that this Bachian element is never fully lost. However, Brahmsian variation of A, B, C and D begins virtually straight away, for instance in the violin part:

Figure 5.28: The violin part of bars 42-44 in the first movement of Parry’s Piano Quartet in A flat
Motive C is clearly the dominant force in these three bars (figure 5.28). It should be noted that the second of the three iterations of C is melodically varied, changing the perfect fourth interval to a minor third. However, it is still recognisable as motive C because of the exact repetitions of C around it as well as the retaining of the original rhythmic shape of C. Such subtle Brahmsian variations occur across the remainder of the first subject group, some direct copies of the original A, B or C motives, with other more subtle integrations of the fourth:

![Figure 5.29: The piano part of bars 48-50 of the first movement of Parry’s Piano Quartet in A Flat](image)

![Figure 5.30: The violin and viola parts of bars 49-61 of the first movement of Parry’s Piano Quartet in A Flat](image)
All of the variations of the fourth motif have been bracketed in both figures 5.29 and 5.30. The piano part of figure 5.29 is clearly more closely related to the original figures, concluding with a fourth motive combining melodic elements from B and rhythmic elements from C. In figure 5.30, Parry varies and extends the fourth, creating passages in both parts where it becomes extremely prominent. Towards the end of this example, motive C returns possibly as a reminder of its derivation. The interval of a fourth continues to assert its force throughout the development, recapitulation, and coda of the first movement in a similar fashion to the examples discussed above.

In the second movement of the work Parry continues further development of the fourth. Placed prominently at the beginning of the movement (see figure 5.26), one gets the impression from the outset that it will be prominent. The movement is a sprightly scherzo in 6/8 time, with a decisive point of imitation of rising fourths which features throughout the movement:

![Figure 5.31: The violin, viola and violoncello parts of bars 6-11 of the second movement of Parry’s Piano Quartet in A flat](image)

Figure 5.31: The violin, viola and violoncello parts of bars 6-11 of the second movement of Parry’s Piano Quartet in A flat
The ascending fourth in figure 5.32 is a diminished version of motive D, with the sequential fourths in figure 5.33 recalling the counterpoint observed early in the movement (figure 5.31). The variation in figure 5.33 is melodic beginning with a diminished fourth. The bracketed example in the violin part in the final bar could also be seen as a variant of D.

The trio section of the second movement is in the key of C major, again a fairly standard relationship as the dominant of F minor. Here also, the fourth is woven into the melodic structure of the section, as in the slow contrary motion stepwise rising and descending fourth figures between the viola and cello in bars 168-169. When the opening returns after the trio, Parry again invokes the Brahmsian spirit by maintaining the fourth as a central motive, whilst engaging in further development.

The interval of a fourth is not prominent in the third movement. However, as mentioned earlier, the movement provides a long range tonal and structural version of the fourth motive by virtue of its principal key (D flat). With the two outer
movements in A flat, one could argue that the whole work is in fact a large tonal iteration of motive C (A flat-D flat-A flat). In the final movement, the fourth pervades the melodic writing once again, both in its normal form and its inverted form (perfect fifth).

The final movement opens in the following manner:

There is a constant semiquaver harmonic pedal between E flat and A flat in the left hand. This harmonic pedal could possibly be interpreted as an inverted fourth, although such an interpretation is perhaps a little far fetched, given its harmonic function. The perfect fourth, fifth and their tonal variants are used consistently throughout the movement in the various subject groups:
The organic nature of the movement is confirmed initially by the solo string trio of the second subject group. The first subject group material from the opening movement reappears in the left hand of the piano part (bars 70-73). However, Parry’s intellectual Brahmsian side is really released during the development and recapitulation sections in which sections of the other movements are recalled:
Figures 5.36 and 5.37 demonstrate Parry's reintroduction of material from previous movements into the finale of the Quartet, a technique associated with the music of Brahms discussed in the previous chapter of this study. In the reappearance of the first movement material in figure 5.36, there is virtually no change to the shape or rhythm of the motivic material. The principal change is to the harmony at the end of the
phrase, where a diminished seventh chord is used instead of the dominant, allowing Parry the harmonic ambiguity to explore various keys in the preceding bars. Even more impressive is the merging of the opening material of the Scherzo with the recapitulation of the final movement (figure 5.37). The latter material is varied with rhythmic diminutions and augmentations in the first two bars with its original melodic shape. In the second two bars, the fourth and fifth intervals in the original are varied through rhythmic diminution and descend through the stringed instruments, finishing in the violoncello. Indeed, the motivic unity and Brahmsian process are further confirmed in the coda even in the final few bars:

![Figure 5.38: A reduction of bars 306-310 in the coda section of the final movement of Parry’s Piano Quartet in A Flat](image)

Whilst the stringed instruments are all providing the dominant pedal note on E flat, the piano is providing the thematic interest with variation of material from the opening of the first movement, creating an ascent emphasising the notes of the tonic chord every first and third beat. As well as demonstrating the organic motivic relationships throughout the work, this also demonstrates Parry’s adoption of the Brahmsian feature of treating all parts of the quartet equally in terms of thematic motivic development. The analysis of Parry’s Quartet has revealed some very potent and Brahmsian features. Once again, these are principally in the realm of organic
structural, motivic and tonal development and variation within the context of traditional genre and form. Indeed, Parry arguably goes beyond the developments generally seen in Brahms’s chamber music in this work, particularly in terms of the very strong references to the material from the first movement and the Scherzo. Whilst there is no doubt that Brahms produced effects of this nature in some of his works (such as the finale of the Fourth Symphony), the reintroduction of the previous material is not as domineering a force as it is in Parry’s Quartet. This notion has been explored very little (if ever) and makes up a substantial portion of the next chapter on the Brahmsian aspects of Parry and Stanford’s orchestral music.

5.4: C. Hubert H. Parry: Sonata in D for Pianoforte and Violin

To conclude the discussion on Parry’s Chamber music, a brief discussion of his Sonata in D will provide an example of his later chamber music. Written in 1888-1889, the sonata was his penultimate chamber work before a seemingly abrupt halt to his chamber music composition which paralleled the end of the Dannreuther concerts in Orme Square as the lease on the house expired in 1894. Described by Jeremy Dibble as exuding ‘a much greater confidence in terms of structural balance, harmonic and thematic consistency, and instrumental interplay’ than some of his other works, it would seem to be an ideal concluding piece for this discussion. The work underwent revision in 1894 (particularly the first movement according to Dibble), and was never published.

The opening theme of the first movement in the violin provides much of the foundation of the thematic activity throughout the rest of the movement:

\[\text{Ibid., p. 275}\]
In the first subject material, Parry utilises the left hand of the piano playing excerpts of the thematic material seen above in dialogue with the violin, with the right hand taking a more secondary role with accompanying chords. The crucial rhythmic motive is the distinctive crotchet-dotted crotchet-quaver movement seen in the third bar of figure 5.39, appearing in nearly every phrase of the opening subject material. Such prominent use of the piano (see full example of the opening in figure 5.40 on p. 296) is also typical of the style evident in Brahms’s Violin Sonata, Op. 78, examined in chapter 4 of this study. Figure 5.40 also demonstrates another Brahmsian trait in that the tonic of D is not actually strongly established throughout the opening twelve bars. Like Brahms in the Clarinet Quintet, Parry creates ambiguous tonality which seems possibly a little closer to the relative minor than the tonic. There is no solid D in the bass of the piano part as a result of the thematic dialogue with the violin part and the lack of a tonic triad in the accompanying chords makes the tonality even more ambiguous – like the Clarinet Quintet of Brahms the first 8 bars the right hand contains only inversions of chords rather than their root positions. In spite of these very sophisticated Brahmsian techniques in the piece, the music does not sound particularly like any of the latter’s Sonatas (possibly indicating that Parry had surpassed the very Brahmsian-sounding creations of his earlier days and was beginning to develop a more decisive individuality to the sound and style of his works). This would seem to be related to the shape of the accompanimental figures in the right hand of the piano part. Brahms predominantly uses broken chords spread
over a larger tessitura in his accompaniments, whereas Parry’s in this example are very sparse in terms of tessitura and variation.

Figure 5.40: The opening of the first movement of Parry’s Sonata in D for Pianoforte and Violin
Throughout the development section of the first movement, the violin continues its dialogue with the piano, with thematic focus shifting between the left and right hands, echoing Stanford’s idea of the changing prominence of each of the ‘three parts’ in an instrumental sonata:

Figure 5.41: The beginning of the development section of Parry’s Sonata in D for Pianoforte and Violin
Figure 5.41 demonstrates the shift in focus from the left hand to the right hand in terms of the thematic material. The actual theme itself is subject to subtle Brahmsian variation in order to accommodate the change in tonality to A minor. The overall shape and rhythm remain similar but with subtle variation to the pitches. In the recapitulation, much of the first subject remains very similar to the exposition. As a whole, the Sonata is much less cyclical than the Quartet in A flat, with less obvious instances of strong thematic recollections and variations between movements.

The final movement, with its light 6/8 time signature enables Parry to recall the driving triplet accompaniment figure seen in the first movement:

![Figure 5.42: Bars 25-28 of the final movement of Parry's Sonata in D for Violin and Pianoforte](image)

The piano and the violin both have the triplet figure in figure 5.42, with the thematic focus being in the right hand of the piano part, demonstrating again the Brahmsian equality with which Parry treated all the parts within many of his chamber compositions.

The principal non-Brahmsian element of this movement is once again in the piano part. Brahms’s three violin sonatas all have very virtuosic piano parts, composed often of broken chords over a large tessitura, or slow homophonic chords with frequent octave doubling in the left hand, creating the heavy texture for which Brahms’s music
is well known. By contrast, Parry is generally much more sparing. There is much less octave doubling on lower notes, and that which does exist is generally of a higher tessitura than that of Brahms, thereby creating a more delicate sounding and aurally clearer accompaniment.

The examination of a cross section of Parry’s chamber music has revealed a number of strong parallels with the chamber music of Brahms, particularly and unsurprisingly and most noticeably in the area of thematic development and process. But this discussion has also revealed that one must be careful not to make the mistake as many have done of dismissing Parry’s chamber music as a complete emulation of that of Brahms. Parry’s thematic style and particularly his use of instrumental colour firmly and decisively mark some of his chamber music as quite different from that of Brahms. However, based on the research and subsequent analysis carried out for this study, Parry was evidently influenced very strongly by Brahms’s strongly intellectual thematic process and treatment. The remainder of this chapter is devoted to the analysis of select examples of Stanford’s chamber music to ascertain whether there is as strong a parallel to Brahms in his output in this genre as there is with Parry.

Charles Villiers Stanford was an equally if not more prolific composer of chamber music than Parry. Being slightly younger than Parry, his contributions to the genre began a little bit later. However, unlike Parry, who seems to have been driven in this area by Dannreuther, Stanford’s chamber compositions extended well into the twentieth century until just a few years before his death in March 1924. For the sake of continuity and comparative study, the example of Stanford’s chamber music
selected for this chapter were all composed in the nineteenth century within the same time period that those of Parry were produced.

**5.5: C. V. Stanford: Quartet in F major, Op. 15**

Composed in 1879, this quartet was one of Stanford’s first chamber pieces. From the outset its dimensions are far more akin to those of Brahms than the more concise structures seen in Parry’s chamber works, with a reasonably long and extended sonata form in the first movement, followed by a scherzo, a slow movement and a sonata form finale. The quartet does not enjoy a particularly good critical reputation, and in particular the slow movement and the finale. Paul Rodmell and Jeremy Dibble have discussed the piece, with Rodmell providing the most detailed explanation:

The slow movement is an unfortunately unsuccessful experiment in form: is monothematic, with the melody used well and with some passion, but the music lacks direction, and goes off on unjustified tangents which include… references back to both the first and second movements which are gratuitous rather than purposeful… the finale… is too static harmonically since both subjects appear in the tonic in both the exposition and the recapitulation, and references back to the first subject of the first movement in the coda sits unhappily with the rest of the music.\(^\text{12}\)

Rodmell’s highly critical discussion of the work is perhaps not surprising when it is remembered that Stanford was only in his late twenties when this was composed and in a similar manner to Brahms in his earlier chamber music was possibly trying to insert too much material into the context of the chamber sonata argument. Indeed, one is reminded in particular of the first version of Brahms’s Op. 8 Trio in relation to such comments which is rather long and formally rather difficult to follow, particularly in its colossal first movement. This is made even more pronounced by virtue of the fact

---

that he revised the work towards the end of his career in 1891. The first movement in particular is almost entirely recomposed in parts and is motivically much more concise and easier to follow as an expanded sonata structure. In contrast to Rodmell, Dibble focuses on the great ‘invention’ of Stanford’s handling of sonata structure in the first movement of the work, referring to it as ‘a more confident and spacious work than either of the two earlier solo sonatas’.

Looking at the first movement, one cannot fail to be impressed with Stanford’s clear and distinctive first subject group:

![Figure 5.43: The melody of the first subject group of Stanford’s Piano Quartet in F (bars 1-5)](image)

The melody of the first subject group, shown in figure 5.43 has a very distinctive shape which is as a result of the rising and falling sixth intervals which pervade it throughout. Its principal motivic constituents are labelled A, B and C. It also contains elements of Irish folk music (for which Stanford has become well known for including in his works), particularly in the regular use of dotted rhythms which are in nearly every bar. The fast, repeated semiquaver sixths in this theme, coupled with the dotted rhythms give the theme a distinctly Irish flavour, possibly indicating traditional Irish reels as a source of inspiration. These features immediately differentiate Stanford’s movement from those of Brahms in that Brahms’s opening chamber themes are generally smoother and more lyrical (e.g. the opening of the Op. 34 Quintet).

---

13 Dibble, Stanford, 2002, p. 105
Stanford begins to vary this opening material almost immediately:

Continuity is maintained in figure 5.44 by the exact repetition and transposition of motive A. However, Stanford achieves variation by altering motive C, removing the dotted rhythm of the original, changing the first interval to a fourth instead of a sixth, and the remaining intervals by a semitone to make them minor and diminished respectively. This type of initial development points very strongly towards the progressive variation discussed in Stanford’s treaty in the last chapter of this study. Indeed this argument is confirmed further when one sees the beginning of the recapitulation:
Figure 5.45: The beginning of the recapitulation in the first movement of Stanford’s Piano Quartet in F, Op. 15

This (figure 5.45) is a perfect example of Stanford’s constant development and reworking of thematic material. The basic notes of the original theme are all still intact, but are recomposed and woven into triplet figures instead of the original semiquavers.
Indeed to illustrate this comparison, one need only remind one’s self of Stanford’s theme and final variation examples in *Musical Composition*:

![Theme]

![Final Variation]

**Figure 5.46:** Stanford’s theme and final variation in his chapter on creating variations in *Musical Composition*, p. 56

As figure 5.46 shows, in the first movement of the quartet, Stanford is practicing exactly what his instructions advocate. Even though the book was written substantially later than this quartet, one can see the principles which would eventually find themselves in the book at work even in the earliest pieces.

Tonally the first movement is generally probably less adventurous than one would find in Brahms’s chamber music, especially in the exposition, in which Stanford generally stays within the logical confines of the tonic for the first subject group and the dominant for the second subject. In the development section however, he is more adventurous, particularly with a deviation to A flat and B major. Stanford uses a G natural and F natural in the context of B major to take him back to the dominant of C, which then in turn allows him to sink effortlessly back to F for the recapitulation. The biggest emulation of Brahms’s work in the first movement is in the style of the instrumental writing, particularly in the piano part, which is filled with virtuoso arpeggio based passages, as well as denser areas of thick chords and, of course, its share of the thematic material which has already been demonstrated. A comparison of these different types of piano writing can be seen in the following examples:
Figures 5.47 and 5.48 demonstrate the similarities in style between Brahms’s piano writing and Stanford’s in the Quartet; although Brahms has the same material in both hands Stanford does not. Both composers make both the slower block chord accompaniment and the broken chords thematic. For instance in Brahms’s work, the top line of the chords provides the all important C-D flat motive discussed in the previous chapter, whilst his arpeggios recall the overall shape of the first subject.
group. Similarly Stanford’s chords form the shape of motive C in the original violin phrase, whilst the broken chords constantly move emphasise the sixth (motive A). Whilst Stanford’s piano writing is definitely rather more delicate and subtle than that of Brahms, there is certainly a stylistic parallel visible in Stanford’s Op. 15 Quartet, which was not as apparent in Parry’s chamber work.

Rodmell’s assertion regarding the re-appearance of the motivic material of the first movement in the third and final movements also requires consideration in the context of this thesis as such devices were used in the music of Brahms. The first subject material does indeed re-appear in both movements:

![Viola](image1)

![Violoncello](image2)

**Figure 5.49:** The reappearance of motive A in bars 87-88 of the third movement of Stanford’s Piano Quartet in F, Op. 15

![Violin](image3)

![Viola](image4)

**Figure 5.50:** The reappearance of motive A in bars 307-309 of the final movement of Stanford’s Piano Quartet in F, Op. 15

![Violin](image5)

**Figure 5.51:** The reappearance of motive A in bars 315-318 of the final movement of Stanford’s Piano Quartet in F, Op. 15
All the music in figures 5.49 – 5.51 is obviously related to the opening motive (A) and is evidently an attempt by Stanford to create the sort of organic whole visible in the middle period chamber music of Brahms. Rodmell’s assessment of these attempts as ‘gratuitous rather than purposeful’ is perhaps rather harsh, particularly in view of its early opus number and the otherwise very confident handling of thematic material in the first movement. However, unlike the instances in Parry in which the material from the first subject group of the first movement is recalled in later movements, these attempts of Stanford are definitely not particularly confident (for instance those discussed earlier in Parry’s Quartet in A flat, p. 291), especially as he only engages (at most) two of the stringed instruments in their repetition. It must be remembered at this point that Parry had the strong influence of Dannreuther and the Orme Square performances as a point of reference for the composition of his chamber music, therefore its strength in this respect in relation to Stanford’s is perhaps not particularly surprising. On the other side of this argument, Stanford quite amply proves his competence in the Brahmsian organic development and manipulation of thematic material in the seemingly effortless recapitulation in the first movement of the Op. 15 Quartet which is actually more adventurous than any of the development seen in Parry’s chamber works. Further investigation of Stanford’s later chamber music is therefore required in order to determine whether he refined these Brahmsian techniques.

Texturally the final movement of Stanford’s Quartet is lighter than those of Brahms. For instance in the first fifteen bars, the tessitura of the piano part all lies above the F a fifth below middle C, something virtually never seen in Brahms’s chamber piano writing. A similar tessitura is used in the opening bars of the piano in the finale of
Schumann’s Op. 47 Piano Quartet. Whilst the thematic content of Schumann’s work is very different from Stanford’s, Schumann’s delicate use of the upper registers of the piano may well have been Stanford’s inspiration at this point. Furthermore, the light piano textures are maintained all the way through the movement, particularly in areas where the piano plays broken chords.

**5.6: C. V. Stanford: Piano Quintet in D minor, Op. 25**

Written seven years after the Op. 15 Quartet, Stanford’s Piano Quintet in D minor was completed in 1886 thereby leaving a comfortable amount of time between it and the Op. 15 work in order to determine if there were indeed any developments in Stanford’s methods. This piece has also been selected for study because both Dibble and Rodmell discuss its relevance in terms of Stanford’s development of Brahmsian techniques, although neither produces any musical examples from the work. Dibble is the most insistent on the Brahmsian methodology in the work:

The two outer movements are epic in structure, intellectualist in their preoccupation with motivic process, and symphonic in the scale of thematic gesture, take their lead from Brahms’s Piano Quintet in F minor, Op. 34. In particular the first movement, cast in D minor, Stanford’s ‘elegiac’ key, is a profound, melancholy essay in which Stanford was to show unequivocally his assimilation of Brahms’s methods in instrumental music.\(^{14}\)

There is no doubt in this instance that Dibble is convinced of the Brahmsian method and techniques in operation in the piece. In the context of this study, it is very interesting that Dibble chooses Brahms’s Op. 34 Quintet as a means of comparison because as previous chapters of this study have demonstrated, Brahms’s Quintet was one of the crucially important chamber works responsible for helping the composer to

\(^{14}\) Ibid., p. 174
become established in England, enjoying countless performances across the country, not least as the most frequently performed chamber work at Dannreuther’s Orme Square Concerts. Rodmell also maintains that much of Stanford’s Quintet is ‘indebted to Teutonic composers’, referring to the ‘frequently thick scoring in the tenor register’ as being ‘strongly redolent of Brahms.’ The focus of the discussion of this work therefore, will be on the opening movement to examine whether it is possible to see these elements of Brahmsian motivic process in operation.

The Quintet opens with the principal theme entering several times in a contrapuntal style between all the string instruments, with virtuosic arpeggiation in the piano part. The full extent of the first subject material is probably most easily seen in the viola part:

![Figure 5.52: The first subject group theme of the first movement of Stanford’s Piano Quintet in D minor, Op. 25](image)

Figure 5.52 demonstrates the principal content of the first subject group. Variation of the cells labelled A, B, C, D, E and F begins almost immediately throughout the string parts with more subtle effects such as changes in pitch through to more complex local variation such as alterations in pitch alongside rhythmic changes such as augmentation or diminution. This instantaneous variation parallels many instances in Brahms’s music in which the variation, for instance in the first movement of his Op. 34 Quintet in which after citing the opening theme, the strings then develop the semitone motive through various similar means. The passage also provides an

---

interesting parallel to Stanford’s views on harmony witnessed in his discussion of the organ preludes (*Musical Composition*, p. 51), as this is a prime example of the variation of polyphonic lines to assist in the development of harmony. For example in bar 15 of figure 5.53 (p. 311), the third and fourth notes of figure F in the first violin are varied to a fifth instead of their original fourth interval to accommodate the accompanying G minor tonality. Such a small and subtle variation with no rhythmic alterations means the overall shape of the motive is still recognisable as ‘F’.

Figure 5.53: The string parts of the opening 16 bars of the first movement Stanford’s Piano Quintet in D minor, Op. 25
As well as these strong Brahmsian variation techniques, there are other similarities to Brahms’s Op. 34 Quintet in that all the instruments are treated equally in terms of their development of thematic material:
Figure 5.54 shows the next part of the first movement where the piano part is assigned the thematic material. Note how Stanford begins to ‘condense’ or ‘liquidise’ the material (to quote Arnold Schoenberg), until the final two bars of the example we have material which is undeniably related to the original theme, but has characteristics that are removed or diminished. For instance, in bars 33-34, the characteristic dotted rhythm has been removed, but the material is still related to the original theme because certain intervals and rhythmic shapes are retained. Stanford then takes the dotted rhythm and subjects it to tonal development before moving into the transition. The second subject, although different in character to the first, makes extensive use of a dotted crotchet-quaver rhythm, thereby providing thematic continuity between the two groups:

![Figure 5.55: The second subject group material in the first movement of Stanford’s Piano Quintet in D minor, Op. 25](image)

The second subject material retains the rhythmic figure of ‘B’, whilst at the same time introducing a new triplet figure. The development section contains extensive variation of the second group triplet figure, as well as motives B and F from the first group material. In the recapitulation, Stanford combines elements of both groups to create subtle variations:
Figure 5.56: The beginning of the recapitulation in the first movement of Stanford’s Piano Quintet in D minor, Op. 25

As one can clearly see in figure 5.56, the triplet figure from the exposition is present in the piano part. However, this is now reminiscent to those in the second subject group. The first group material in the strings is simpler in terms of its polyphony in this section with the viola and cello and the two violins working in pairs. Similarly in the recapitulation of the second group, motives B and F continue to receive intervallic
development. In the coda, the first and second subject materials are combined to create a further development.

Such sophisticated organic development and variation also features strongly in the final movement with definite Brahmsian references to the first movement occurring towards the end:

![Figure 5.57: Bars 377-380 of the final movement of Stanford’s Piano Quintet in D minor, Op. 25](image)

In contrast to the Op. 15 Quartet, in which the repetitions of first movement material in the final movement were not particularly confident or relevant within the structure of the work, in this instance they are fully justified. Stanford launches into a repetition of motive A, in triple time and the major mode. This work is clearly more advanced in terms of its thematic motivic processes than the Op. 15 Quartet, and almost certainly justifies the strong assertions made by Stanford’s biographers that it assimilates the methods used by Brahms in his instrumental music. Not only does the piece conform in terms of Brahms’s use of traditional genres, but the intellectual motivic process is very much akin to those seen in his Op. 34 Quintet.
There are elements of the work which certainly mark it as distinct from Brahms. One only need look at the Scherzo second movement to see this. Stanford once again provides strong reminders of his Irish heritage. The traditional triple meter of the scherzo form provides Stanford with an ideal opportunity to emphasise the Irish elements of the thematic material. Frequent ascending triplet anacruses, dotted quavers, unrelenting quaver rhythms, and frequently flattened leading notes throughout once again put one in mind of traditional Irish jigs or reels. The piano also acts in a much more classical fashion in this movement, mostly providing simple accompaniment in the form of smaller scale broken or homophonic chords, as opposed to major thematic statement and development.

5.7: C. V. Stanford: Piano Trio in E flat, Op. 35

The Trio in E flat was composed three years after the Quintet in 1889. Although the work has not been definitively associated with Brahmsian technique, it has been described as ‘attractive for its fertile structural and tonal activity’\(^\text{16}\), which based on previous analytical discussion in this chapter would suggest that it is potentially Brahmsian in its internal processes.

Jeremy Dibble’s brief analysis of the work focuses on the broad tonal progressions in the piece, and in particular the relationship between the tonic of E flat and the submediant of C:

Of particular interest in the first movement is the composer’s execution of the restatement which initially occurs on the dominant of C before gravitating back to E flat. The role of C major in this

\(^\text{16}\) Dibble, Stanford, 2002, p. 215
instance proves important for the rest of the work. The third movement ...is cast in C major, and in the
sonata rondo finale, C minor plays a tantalizing part in the recurring tangential approach to E flat.\textsuperscript{17}

Once again, the description of the tonal activity in this work suggests a strong parallel
with that in Brahms’s Piano Quintet, Op. 34 in which the submediant plays an
important structural role in the overall tonality of the piece, as well as the local
thematic developments. The opening theme of the first movement of the work is as
follows:

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image1.png}
\caption{The first subject group material of the first movement of Stanford’s Piano Trio in E flat, Op. 35 (bars 1-4)}
\end{figure}

The first subject group thematic content is noticeably simpler than that of the Piano
Quintet both rhythmically and tonally. There is interplay between the dominant and
the submediant of C major, which has been bracketed in figure 5.58. In typical
Brahmsian style, the development of the motivic material begins immediately:

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image2.png}
\caption{Bars 11-15 of the first movement of Stanford’s Piano Trio in E flat, Op. 35}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{17}Ibid.
As figure 5.59 shows, the violin and the cello parts both contain rhythmically diminished versions of the opening motivic cell. Once again, one cannot help being put in mind of Stanford’s chapter on variation in *Musical Composition*, in which rhythmic diminutions were prominently included in the examples of methods of varying a melody. The use of a B and E natural in the ’cello’s version instead of a B flat allows Stanford to hint briefly at the submediant, as well as the relative minor in the tonal transitions of bars 13-14. However, Stanford is very Brahmsian (and indeed Bachian) about the tonality at this point and does not resolve onto C. Instead, there is an interrupted cadence (6/4/2 – 6/3) which precede a sequence of unstable 6/3 transitions. Although not immediately apparent, these sequences actually hint at the relative minor without directly stating it. The piano at the same time reiterates the opening material in the right hand to its original note values. The submediant/relative minor can therefore be seen yet again to be playing a crucially important role in the local motivic development of the work as well as the overall tonality.

The second subject group of this movement is equally as potent in terms of the tonality of the work:

Figure 5.60: Bars 64-70 of the violin part of the first movement of Stanford’s Piano Trio in E flat, Op. 35

Figure 5.60 shows an even more defined emphasis on the dominant and the submediant notes in the second group, further confirming the local and structural
importance of the submediant. One is strongly reminded at this point of similar local thematic material in Brahms’s Op. 34 Quintet. Indeed, Stanford’s employment of such techniques is perhaps even more intense than that of Brahms. Throughout the first and second groups Stanford engages in constant interplay between the tonic of E flat and the submediant of C (minor and major), but does not actually tonicise C. It is only in the development section, after a long dominant preparation that C is finally established in bars 163-164. However, no sooner is the plateaux of C reached then Stanford begins making his descent back down to E flat for the beginning of the recapitulation. Not only therefore, is the submediant’s relationship with the tonic an important motion across the work as a whole as Dibble states, it is also significant across the tonal structure of the first movement, constantly being hinted at in the tonality exposition, and is also very important in the context of the two principal thematic groups in the sonata form. Such intense relationships were seen in the previous chapter of this study in Brahms’s Op. 34 Quintet, yet again indicating a strong possibility here that Stanford was influenced by Brahms in the development of his local and structural processes in his chamber output.

The second movement plays an important tonal part in the overall structure of the work. Its principal key is G minor, however, there is an almost constant interplay between G minor and B flat major which often makes the tonality very difficult to determine in a similar manner to Brahms’s Clarinet Quintet. There are also two sections in G major which provide a tonal hint as to the C major tonality of the third movement. In fact, G major is the key in which the movement ends, thereby making the move to C major more logical. The opening theme of the third movement is as follows:
As in the opening theme in the first movement there is a strong C-B motion in this theme. Even though the music is in the submediant key of C major at this point, it still acts as a reminder of the importance of the submediant within the context of the work as a whole. Indeed the submediant-tonic relationship is reiterated again in this movement in the tonality. Dibble’s analysis of the movement provides a very concise account of the tonal progressions:

It is significant that the opening binary structure embarks in E flat (once again reiterating the E flat-C relationship), a shift which encourages the tonality to move even further flatwards towards a goal of D flat. Resolution of this tonality is, however, avoided, but Stanford reminds us of the evasion of D flat by introducing the key at the reprise of the Minuetto theme after the second trio. Even more deftly, towards the end of the movement the anticipated avoidance of D flat (in parallel with the opening) is counteracted by its achievement, a flatwise motion which continues towards G flat before the re-establishment of C.

Stanford’s desire to avoid D flat is made very apparent in the short diversion after the second Trio:

---

18 Ibid., p. 215
Figure 5.62: Bars 186-197 of the third movement of Stanford’s Piano Trio in E flat, Op. 35: The end of the second Trio and the reprise of the Minuetto theme in D flat

The introduction of D flat (the Neapolitan) is very sudden, and in a very Brahmsian fashion, Stanford does not provide any kind of strong perfect cadence in D flat throughout the section. There are rather weak perfect cadences in bars 189, 192 and 195. However, in each case, one of the crucial V or I chords (in D flat) are in one of their inversions (classical Neapolitan positions) rather than root position thereby weakening the progression significantly. Right at the end of the section in bar 196, Stanford gives a very strong Ic – V7 progression in D flat, which would naturally resolve to I in root position, but Stanford yet again avoids the platitude of the cadence and takes the music back to the original key of C major, thus making strong Brahmsian use of the Neapolitan as discussed earlier. Such avoidance of the cadence is a common occurrence in Brahms’s music – not just in his instrumental music but
also in the songs. Indeed, one sees such a technique used in the Capriccio in C major (Op. 76/8) in which Brahms actually avoids a cadence in the tonic until the very end of the work. The third movement of Stanford’s Trio, therefore, is not only important from the point of view of the relationship between the tonic of E flat and the submediant of C, but Stanford also demonstrates the very Brahmsian trait of evading the cadence in secondary keys.

The final movement of the trio is initially cast in C minor, working its way back to the tonic of E flat by the end of the movement, yet again providing a structural indication of the importance of the submediant in relation to the tonic. The voice leading in the opening thematic material of the movement is also significant in this respect:

![Figure 5.63: The opening thematic material of the final movement of Stanford’s Piano Trio in E flat, Op. 35](image)

Both the piano and the violin contain thematic material emphasising B flat and C (bracketed in figure 5.63), demonstrating yet again its crucial thematic importance in the work as a whole. In terms of thematic consistency and organicism, this Trio is
certainly not as intense as the Quartet and Quintet discussed previously in the chapter. Each movement has its own thematic identity with little or no references to the local thematic content of previous movements. It could be argued that some of the second subject material from the first movement returns briefly in the finale towards the end in the form of the dotted quaver-semiquaver rhythmic motive. However, the return is only brief and furthermore, the shape of the melodic line created by the motive is vastly different to its appearance in the first movement – therefore the relationship is no more than superficial. What this work has demonstrated is Stanford’s ability to use motives both structurally in terms of tonality and locally in the individual movements to support this overall relationship. The tonal progression E flat to C has proved to be crucially important across not just the individual movements, but the piece as a whole. Such close tonal relationships more than compensate for the lesser emphasis on individual motivic development. Stanford’s Trio is one of the most Brahmsian works discussed so far, with a number of prominent striking references to the music of Brahms both in style and instrumentation.

5.8: C. V. Stanford: String Quartet No. 1 in G, Op. 44

The final piece to be examined in this chapter serves as a representation of Stanford’s later chamber music in the period under scrutiny (c.1870-1890), although he actually produced chamber compositions well into the first quarter of the twentieth century. Composed in 1891, the piece is discussed briefly by Stanford’s chief biographers – Dibble and Rodmell. The latter only indicates the date of the first performance of the Quartet. Dibble on the other hand puts forward an interesting general opinion of the work:
The contrapuntal fluency of both the Opp. 44 and 45 Quartets revealed a new leanness and classical astringency in Stanford’s style, but which, at the same time, gave a freedom and range to his distinctive lyricism. This is evident in the first movement of Op. 44 which demonstrates a true mastery of the ‘instrumental democracy’ Stanford advocated for the idiom, and the unbroken ‘prose’ of the musical fabric, Brahmsian in method, yet un-Brahmsian in its lighter treatment of texture, melodic character, and harmony, flourishes as a result of the thoroughly idiomatic, contrasting ideas of the opening semibreves, flowing accompaniment of quavers, and pizzicato bass… In place of the scherzo, the more restrained movement in G minor is a complex ‘continuing variation’ design whose deft shifts of tempo and metre suggest a precedent in the second movement of Brahms’s Second Symphony.¹⁹

Dibble presents several comparisons to the music of Brahms in Stanford’s quartet, particularly in the realm of motivic process, but at the same time is at pains to point out that the piece does not necessarily sound Brahmsian due to other aspects, such as melodic style and orchestration being treated very differently to those seen in Brahms. Indeed, one only need look at the opening of the first movement to see this.

If one compares the material shown in figure 5.64 to that in 5.65 (p. 324), there are some undeniable similarities, such as the lighter opening bars with the second violin and the viola. However, Dibble’s point becomes much clearer when one compares bars 3-4 of each example. In Stanford’s Quartet, there is minimum intrusion from the cello with the simple pizzicato bass line, close harmony, with a lyrical melody. All the instruments engage in contrasting ideas, as Dibble states. In contrast, Brahms’s melody line is a very aggressive staccato arpeggio based idea. Double stopping from the viola creates more weight in the ‘tenor’ harmony, thus creating the classic heavy Brahmsian ensemble texture. Furthermore, in contrast to Stanford’s Quartet the entire ensemble engaged in the same style of idea – attacking staccato quavers, which again

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 232
Figure 5.64: A reduction of the opening eight bars of the first movement of Stanford’s String Quartet in G, Op. 44

Figure 5.65: A reduction of the opening eight bars of the first movement of Brahms’s String Quartet in B flat, Op. 67
gives the music a harsher edge compared to Stanford’s where at no point do the instruments engage in the same rhythmic idea.

The remainder of the first movement of Stanford’s Quartet does indeed produce unbroken Brahmsian style musical prose with subtle variation of the original theme, for instance at the beginning of the development:

Figure 5.66: Bars 103-106 of the first movement of Stanford’s String Quartet in G, Op. 44 (the beginning of the development section)
One can clearly see all of the different thematic ideas presented originally in figure 5.64. Stanford has, however, varied which voices have each motive and its variants, which is a typical technique employed by Brahms. But, as Dibble has pointed out, the texture and instrumentation is much lighter than Brahms owing to more varied thematic figures. Indeed, one need only compare figure 5.66 to an area of the development section of the string parts from Brahms’s Op. 34 Quintet to see the difference:

![Figure 5.67: The string parts in bars 150-152 of the first movement of Brahms's Quintet in F minor, Op. 34](image)

Whilst it is undeniable that Brahms is developing the key motive of the semitone (discussed in chapter 4) in this section, heavy double stopping from the lower strings with fast quaver triplets, makes the texture much denser than that seen in Stanford’s quartet, even though in terms of motivic process they are both engaging in the same kind of variation and development.
5.9: Conclusion

This chapter has examined a cross section of the chamber music composed by Parry and Stanford in relation to the claims that they were influenced by Johannes Brahms in their output. The analysis of their works has revealed a definite similarity of both composers' chamber works in particular, especially in the area of local and structural thematic process and development, especially in their sonata form movements. Based on the research carried out in the previous chapter, based on Parry and Stanford’s own theoretical written works and educational backgrounds, such a parallel is perhaps not as radical as it might otherwise seem. However, it has also become clear that one must be careful not to dismiss the chamber works of these composers as solely influenced by Brahms. Whilst many of the sonata form movements are evidently heavily influenced by Brahms, there are some which contain notable departures from the music of Brahms, such as the lighter use of the piano in Parry’s Violin Sonata and the Irish folk elements to the principal theme in the first movement of Stanford’s Op. 15 Quartet. Parry and Stanford also demonstrate ample departures from Brahms in their inner movements. Nearly every piece discussed in this chapter contains a scherzo or a slow movement which does not bear any resemblance to corresponding movements produced by Brahms. The features identified are variable, such as the significantly lighter scoring, musical style, and lack of continuous variation, such as in the second movement of the Grosses Duo, and the Irish themed Scherzo in Stanford’s Op. 25 Quintet, with the un-Brahmsian piano accompaniment.

Parry and Stanford’s use and assimilation of Brahmsian techniques is even more pronounced in literature and discussion relating to their orchestral music. The next chapter therefore will analyse and evaluate select examples of their orchestral
compositions to ascertain whether or not such a reputation is indeed musicologically justifiable.
Chapter 6: Analysis of Orchestral Compositions
by C. Hubert H. Parry and Charles Villiers Stanford

6.0: Introduction

Chapter 5 of this study has produced both expected and unexpected results in terms of Parry and Stanford’s supposed assimilation of Brahmsian compositional techniques in their own output. In all the works studies, the two English composers do seem to draw a great deal from the music of Brahms and there is little doubt that his music is one of their primary influences, particularly in sonata form movements. However, the last chapter demonstrated that there are a number of non Brahmsian elements present in most of the works. Therefore the notion put forward by researchers of the Hughes and Stradling calibre – that they were staunch Brahmsians who produced nothing except Brahmsian sounding works – would seem to be far too general an assertion to be make in this context, particularly as the research presented does not take into account any of the actual music on which their judgements are supposedly based. In fact, the Brahmsian elements of Parry and Stanford’s chamber music correlate much more accurately with the content of their own technical theoretical works, which have surprisingly not been considered before in relation to the subject of this study.

Research on Parry and Stanford’s orchestral music, principally by Dibble and Rodmell, in conjunction with a couple of anonymous reviews, contains even stronger references to Brahmsian elements that their discussions of the chamber music. In a similar fashion to the last chapter, using Dibble and Rodmell’s comments as a starting point, and Parry and Stanford’s theoretical writing as an analytical guide, this chapter explores certain key orchestral compositions by both composers in order to ascertain
if they exhibit the supposed Brahmsian methodology advocated in so many musicological texts. The compositions analysed are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Year of composition</th>
<th>Date of first performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parry</td>
<td>Overture to an Unwritten Tragedy</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>13 Sept, 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elegy for Brahms</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symphonic Fantasia (Fifth Symphony)</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>5 Dec, 1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Serenade in G major for Orchestra, Op. 18</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>30 Aug, 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third Symphony in F minor (The Irish), Op.28</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>27 May, 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seventh Symphony in D minor, Op. 124</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>22 Feb, 1912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The selection of pieces in table 6.1 is based on the literary research carried out in Chapters 3 and 4 of this study. Every attempt has been made to try and ensure that the spread across their outputs in the genre is as even as possible with examples from the late nineteenth century and the twentieth century. Because of Parry’s lack of chamber music production after the beginning of the last decade of the nineteenth century as a result of the cessation of the Dannreuther concerts, the analytical content of Chapter 5 was restricted to only nineteenth century chamber output. As table 6.1 demonstrates, both composers produced orchestral music well into the twentieth century. Therefore, as well as exploring the works for Brahmsian methods and techniques, this chapter also attempts to go beyond the last, examining whether their output developed any further in terms of Brahmsian organic motivic thematic development. Whilst three pieces by each composer are broadly studied in this chapter, the focus of the analytical discussion is driven toward the twentieth century pieces by each composer – Parry’s Fifth Symphony, and Stanford’s Seventh Symphony, Op. 128.
6.1: C. V. Stanford: Serenade in G major for Orchestra, Op. 18

Produced a few years after the Quartet, Op. 15 discussed in the last chapter, the Serenade is another piece which has become very associated with Brahmsian compositional method. It also serves to illustrate that Stanford’s supposed affinity with Brahmsian technique and process developed earlier in his output than it did in the case of Parry. Jeremy Dibble’s comments of the Serenade are the most adamant in relation to Stanford’s use of Brahmsian processes in the work:

The natural consequence of his affinity for Brahmsian methods was a new orchestral work – the Serenade, Op. 18 – unabashed in its emulation of the German master’s first major symphonic essays, the two serenades, Opp. 11 and 16, which blend those features of classical clarity, dance forms, and lyricism. The opening movement, a concise sonata structure, is a sunny natured affair, surely influenced by the first movement of Brahms’s Second Symphony (itself a ‘serenade’ work in spirit) and characterised by the self-assured ‘waltz’ idea of the second subject… The energetic scherzo, replete with unexpected tonal digressions, recalls the corresponding movement from Brahms’s Op. 11… and the finale almost seems to be a paraphrase of the same movement of the Op. 16.¹

This account of Stanford’s serenade is one of the most detailed in terms of the references to Brahms seen so far, with references to all parts of the work. Dibble’s first comment regarding the overall design of the work as an emulation of Brahms’s Opp. 11 and 16 is also echoed by Rodmell who maintains that ‘the form of the Serenade’ is evidently borrowed from Brahms’s Op. 11’. The overall structure of the three works is as follows:

¹ Dibble, Stanford, 2002, p. 124
Table 6.2: The structural and tonal layout of Stanford’s Serenade, Op. 18 in relation to Brahms’s Serenades, Opp. 11 and 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allegro Molto (D major)</td>
<td>Allegro Moderato (A major)</td>
<td>Allegro. (G major)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scherzo. Allegro Non Troppo. (D minor) – Trio. Poco Più Moto (B flat major)</td>
<td>Scherzo. Vivace (C major) – Trio (F major)</td>
<td>Scherzo. Prestissimo (C major)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adagio non troppo (B flat major)</td>
<td>Adagio non troppo (A minor)</td>
<td>Notturno. Adagio (E flat major)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menuetto I (G major) – Menuetto II (G minor)</td>
<td>Quasi Menuetto (D major) – Trio (F sharp minor)</td>
<td>Intermezzo. Presto (C major/C minor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scherzo. Allegro (D major) – Trio (D major)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rondo. Allegro (D major)</td>
<td>Rondo. Allegro. (A major)</td>
<td>Finale. Allegro Vivace (G major)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 shows the basic structural and tonal layout of each work. In terms of the general name and style of each movement, all of the works can be correlated with relative ease, with Stanford’s movements matching corresponding movements in the Brahms works almost exactly (a feature observed by Rodmell in his brief discussion of the work²). In terms of the overall tonal relationships in the works, Stanford’s Serenade most closely matches Brahms’s first, with both works starting in the tonic, moving to the flattened submediant in the adagio (once again highlighting the submediant as an important tonal feature and goal), the subdominant in the fourth movement, followed by the tonic in the finale. Such a similarity in overall design would seem more than merely coincidental; therefore, one would probably expect to see Brahmsian processes within Stanford’s work too.

Indeed, Dibble indicates that the first movement exhibits influences of Brahms’s Second Symphony, although due to obvious constraints he does not venture into the

---

² Rodmell, Stanford, 2002. p. 90
analytical implications of the statement. He refers to the first movement of the serenade as a concise sonata form. Certainly the boundaries of the sonata structure are very defined in the work, with very obvious first and second subject group material:

Figure 6.1: A reduction of the first subject group of the first movement of Stanford’s Serenade in G, Op. 18

Figure 6.2: A reduction of the second subject group of the first movement of Stanford’s Serenade in G, Op. 18

Figures 6.1 and 6.2 demonstrate the charming and simple basic thematic ideas of Stanford’s Serenade. The themes from Brahms’s Second Symphony are as follows:
The similarities between the two sets of themes is undeniable, particularly the relaxed legato three time and lyrical melodic material that pervades all of them. Brahms’s Second Symphony was premièred in England on 5 October, 1878, and at the point of the composition of Stanford’s Serenade was Brahms’s most recent orchestral work. Therefore, the use of Brahms’s Opp. 11 and 16 Serenades as structural models, coupled with thematic similarities of his most recent work in the orchestral field (the Second Symphony) is not particularly surprising in the case of Stanford’s work. As
Dibble states, the sonata form is very concise in the Serenade, generally more so than any produced by Brahms. As a result, there is possibly less development in terms of thematic process than one might expect. However, there are two motives, one from the first subject group and one from the second which are given more developmental attention by Stanford than any others:

\[ \text{Figure 6.5: The principal motivic cells developed by Stanford in the first movement of the Serenade in G, Op. 18} \]

Figure 6.5 shows the principal motivic cells developed by Stanford. As the two subject areas of the exposition are so relatively short, all the thematic development occurs in the development and recapitulation sections of the sonata form. For instance, motives B and C are subjected to variation at the beginning of the development section. Figure 6.6 (p. 336) demonstrates the development of motive B. The numerical figures next to each version of the motive indicate when it is subjected to some kind of variation. B1, for example, contains a major rather than a minor second as the first interval, as well as a rhythmically augmented last note. This is then developed into B1(i) in which the rhythmic augmentation is removed. B2 is composed of a major second and a major third. The most varied form of the motive is B7 in which the second interval becomes a diminished seventh (in contrast to the original minor third). The variation continues into the next section of the development in which motive C is developed in a very similar manner (see figure 6.7, p. 337). In most instances, apart from those discussed above, Stanford retains the original rhythms of the motives in question, varying the combination of intervals used. However with every combination, Stanford always retains the melodic shape of the original.
Figure 6.6: A reduction of the beginning of the development section in the first movement of Stanford’s Serenade in G, Op. 18 (bars 108-122)
The remaining movements of Stanford’s Serenade have also been said to contain very strong references to the music of Brahms. For instance Dibble maintains that the Scherzo parallels the corresponding movement in Brahms’s Op. 11 Serenade as a result of its ‘unexpected tonal digressions’. The tonal digressions in the first Scherzo movement of Brahms’s First Serenade are very frequent. Beginning in the tonic of D minor, Brahms touches on the keys of C major, A minor, A major, E major, B flat major and F major, and back to D minor for the end of the section. This constant tonal movement is achieved by clever use and subtle chromatic variation of the principal motivic components:

Figure 6.8: The principal motivic material in Brahms’s First Serenade in D, Op. 11

---

For example, at the end of the first two bars, Brahms has already moved away from the tonality of D minor through the use of motive A (figure 6.8):

![Figure 6.9: A reduction of the opening two bars of the second movement of Brahms’s First Serenade in D, Op. 11](image)

As figure 6.9 shows, bar 1 contains the original version of motive A. In bar 2, B flat is used as a pivot note, and instead of creating a variation of the original diminished fourth interval, Brahms actually retains it, falling onto F sharp which takes the music instantly to a G minor tonality at the end of the second bar. It is presumably instances of this nature to which Dibble refers in his assessment of the similarities between Brahms and Stanford’s works. Indeed, if one examines the corresponding section of the second movement of Stanford’s Serenade, there is definitely a correlation:

![Figure 6.10: A reduction of the opening 5 bars of the second movement (Scherzo) of Stanford’s Serenade in G, Op. 18](image)

Stanford’s use of motive A (figure 6.10) enables him to achieve similar florid tonal digressions to those seen in the second movement of Brahms’s Op. 11 Serenade. As one can see in figure 6.10, Stanford manages to imply the keys of A and E minors in the context of the tonic of C major through careful placement of the motive within the melodic material. It is interesting that both the motives of Brahms and Stanford which have been discussed in the context of the tonal digression contain very prominent
semitone intervals. As was demonstrated, this was a very prominent motivic entity in the previous chapter in the analytical discussions of the chamber music. Once again, one is reminded of the simplicity, distinctiveness and versatility of the motive in the context of movements which contain frequent and often continuous motivic variation.

Deviations from Brahms’s influence are rather difficult to find in this work, as Stanford’s principal source of inspiration was undeniably that of the Austro German composer. However Stanford’s third movement *Notturno* does contain some noticeable non Brahmsian facets. In the slow movement of Brahms’s Serenade in D Op. 16, the viola, 'cello and contrabass all often have the same line an octave apart, creating the dense sound for which Brahms is famous. The absence of violins enhances the heavier, darker feel. Stanford’s work is noticeably more delicate. Although there is octave doubling, it is nearly all, without exception, of a higher tessitura than that of Brahms. Stanford also scores the tenor woodwind instruments considerably more lightly than Brahms, which, as demonstrated with the chamber music in the previous chapter, avoids the dense texture associated with Brahms’s music. Furthermore, there is frequent *pizzicato* in the lower strings, particularly in the *Poco più mosso* part of the movement which also allows Stanford to maintain this lighter more classical texture. There is also a distinct absence of counterpoint which one frequently finds in Brahms. The thematic material works its way through the instruments, beginning in the tenor register with a largely homophonic rocking duplet quaver accompaniment. Indeed, the effect is more Mendelssohnian than Brahmsian, putting one in mind of the accompaniments in works like *Elijah*. Stanford’s Irish roots also come to the surface again in this movement with pedal note on F using dotted
crotchet and quaver rhythms, reminding the listener of much of the content of Irish folk music.

The final part of the discussion of the Brahmsian processes in Stanford’s Serenade takes another of Dibble’s comments as its starting point. Dibble refers to the final movement of Stanford’s work as ‘a paraphrase of the same movement of the [Brahms’s] Op. 16’⁴. Such an interesting statement clearly requires further consideration in the context of this discussion. The two movements are both in the same time signature of 2/4 and both in rondo form. The openings of the two movements have undeniable similarities:

Figure 6.11: Reductions of the opening gestures of the final movements of Brahms’s Serenade in A, Op. 16, and Stanford’s Serenade in G, Op. 18

The obvious similarity of the dominant to tonic progression in both themes is undeniable, even down to the similar rhythmic progressions used. It is also interesting to note that Stanford’s opening matches that in his first movement, adding further motivic unity to the work. In a similar manner to the first movement of each work, Stanford’s thematic content in this final movement echoes that of Brahms:

---

⁴ Ibid.
The similarities between figures 6.12 (Brahms) and 6.13 (Stanford) are very pronounced. The style and pace of the thematic material is virtually identical in each example, beginning with the simple straight forward thematic material in the opening bars, moving to the slightly more complex pastoral sounding triplet themes in the second half, against normal quavers in the bass parts. Even the rhythmic figures in the bass are identical for the first four bars at the beginning of each of the two examples.
Such a close correlation between the content of these themes would seem too intense to be purely coincidental.

In terms of Brahmsian thematic development and process, Stanford does not disappoint in this movement, as he reintroduces very subtle yet detectable variations of all the principal motives A, B and C (see figure 6.5, p. 335) from the first movement:

If one compares these thematic cells to those seen in the first movement, there is a definite connection between them. For example, in figure 6.14, the variation of motive A seen in bar 27 sees one of the intervals changes to a fifth instead of a fourth, with descending upper notes rather than ascending, alongside rhythmic diminution to quavers as opposed to crotchets. However, the cell still bears the shape and character.
of its original iteration in the first movement. Similarly, in figure 6.15, in bar 94, the variation of motive B is actually a rhythmically diminished variant of B7 (see figure 6.6). Such developments once again highlight the organic Brahmsian nature of the work, demonstrating Stanford’s immersion in the cyclical style for which Brahms gradually became known in England. Indeed, the inspiration for the cyclical tendencies in this work may well have been the finale of Brahms’s Variations on a Theme of Haydn (première in England on 12 February, 1874 at Hallé’s concerts in Manchester), a work which evidently inspired Stanford greatly, based on his detailed discussions in Musical Composition.

In this early orchestral work, there is very strong evidence that Stanford was influenced by the music of Brahms, both in overall structure and in the individual movements in the thematic processes and tonal activity. Such blatant similarities beg the question of whether Stanford was in fact actively trying to emulate Brahms’s works in the same medium in this instance, as opposed to merely subconsciously emulating his thematic and variational processes. That said, the Adagio does deviate from the works of Brahms, both in thematic style and treatment, and orchestration. The answer of course will never be known, but the analysis of the work does point very strongly to a conscious assimilation of Brahms’s methods in the realm of forms and thematic process.

6.2: C.V. Stanford: Third Symphony in F (The ‘Irish’), Op. 28

This unique work first came to light in the context of this study in Chapter 3 in the assessment of Frank Howes’ discussion of Stanford’s place within the English Musical Renaissance; and in Dibble and Rodmell’s brief analyses of the work in their
biographies of the composer. The principal subject of the discussion of Chapter 3 was the similarity of a motivic cell in the slow movement of Stanford’s work to one in the corresponding movement of Brahms’s Fourth Symphony. As was demonstrated, this idea has been largely disproved and rightly dismissed as coincidental because of the very different harmonic contextual placement of the motives in each work. The analysis of the work in this chapter will be focused on motivic process and development, particularly in the first and final movements.

As was briefly discussed in Chapter 3, Dibble maintains that the first movement of the ‘Irish’ Symphony ‘confirmed unequivocally Stanford’s conviction in the Brahmsian model of evolution, a process already essayed with some thoroughness in the Piano Quintet’. The comprehensive analysis of the Piano Quintet (Op. 25) in Chapter 5 demonstrates that Stanford was very confident in the realm of organic thematic evolution. Dibble goes on to say that Stanford ‘makes much play on the opening cell C-D flat-F’. What has not been explored in the existing analyses of the ‘Irish’ Symphony is Stanford’s combination of Brahmsian organicism and thematic evolution in conjunction with the use of Irish folk music. Indeed, Dibble’s observation of the importance of the opening motive cannot be ignored in this context. Even a rudimentary knowledge of Irish folk music cannot disguise the fact that the melodic cell C-D flat-F (i.e. a second and a third placed together) is a common one throughout the Irish folk song repertoire:

![Figure 6.16: The different forms of the common Irish folk music melodic cell seen in the opening movement of Stanford’s Third (Irish) Symphony, Op. 28](image)

---

5 Dibble, Stanford, 2002, p. 184
6 Ibid.
Figure 6.16 demonstrates the various motivic cells which these two intervals can form. One need not look far throughout the Irish folk song repertoire to find many examples of this type:

Figure 6.17: The melody of the Irish tune ‘As Vanquished Erin’

Figure 6.18: The melody of the Irish tune ‘Lay His Sword By His Side’
The three songs in figures 6.17-6.19 all prominently display some or all of the different forms of the motive. It is the various versions of this motive which form the organism, consistency and variation throughout Stanford’s ‘Irish’ Symphony. Indeed, ‘Brian the Brave’ is used in the exposition section of the final movement:

The opening *pizzicato* theme in the strings in figure 6.20 is taken from the two bars, up to, and including the first cadential point in ‘Brian the Brave’ (see bars 2-4 in figure 6.19). The motive of a second followed by a third occurs in bar 3 in its original
form. It then appears again in bar 6 with an intervallic variation changing the third to a fourth. However, as has been observed in many of Brahms’s pieces, because the melodic shape of the phrase is similar to its predecessor, the motive is still recognisable in relation to its original appearance in bar 3. Aside from this little pocket of Brahmsian variation, the rest of the final movement does not really contain much in terms of continuous variation. The first subject group of the sonata form of the final movement is three verses of the full song ‘Brian the Brave’ with what Dibble describes as ‘increasingly generous orchestration’ each time. Whilst this provides plenty of iterations of motives A, B, C and D (see figure 6.19 on the previous page, in which all instances are highlighted), it does not give Stanford very much scope for creating any kind of subtle Brahmsian variations. Indeed, Stanford acknowledged in Musical composition that, when arranging folk tunes of any kind, ‘simplicity is the main consideration’, a belief which he adheres to in this instance.

In areas where development is called for, Stanford fragments the folk songs, using only small melodic cells. This is exactly how Stanford achieves the organic evolution present in the first movement of the ‘Irish’ Symphony:

![Figure 6.21: The opening motivic cell from the first movement of Stanford’s Third ‘Irish’ Symphony, Op. 28](image)

The opening motive of the first movement of the Symphony can be seen in figure 6.21. Within the first seven bars of music, variations on this pattern of notes can be seen six further times:

---

Ibid., p. 185
As figure 6.22 demonstrates, the motive appears several times in several varied forms. The variation of the motive is achieved in this instance principally by inversion, retrograde, retrograde inversion and alteration of rhythms. Some of the variations actually change the type of intervals used, for example the inversion in bar 3 in which the second interval is changed from minor to major, and the third is changed from major to minor. Indeed, Dibble comments that this motive is ‘ubiquitous throughout the first group development and coda’ but has not the opportunity to describe and analyse its potency across these sections. Figure 6.23 (p. 349) shows a reduction of the part of the development section of the first movement of the work. The variations of the motive have been bracketed. The striking feature of this example is the sheer saturation of the section with different versions of the original motive. In the violoncello part, one can actually see the gradual variation of the motive occurring. It begins in bar 120 with the combination of a minor second and a minor third (which is in itself a variation on the original form). As the cello part progresses, Stanford generally increases the size of the ‘third’ interval in the progression until at the end of the example in bar 131, the interval has become a compound perfect fifth. The motive is still recognisable because Stanford retains the crotchet rhythms and the original interval of the second (in both major and minor forms) throughout the section.

---

8 Ibid., p. 184
Figure 6.23: A reduction of bars 120-131 from the beginning of the development section of the first movement of Stanford’s Third ‘Irish’ Symphony in F, Op. 28
Throughout the passage shown in figure 6.23, the flute and the violin play in contrary motion to the violoncello, providing further versions of the motive in its inverted form. More impressively, in bars 125 and 126, it forms the basis of the harmony between the two flutes. One could argue that this is successive 4-3 suspensions. However, they recur in bars 129 and 130 with different intervals (from major to minor and vice versa), in rhythmic diminution. The frequent appearance of this form of the motive in such a relatively short space of time may suggest that it is actually motivic as opposed to a coincidental harmonic pattern. It could also be argued that all of this material is actually an extended sequence with the structural basis in the ’cello part as it contains various versions of the motive in its original shape.

The C-D flat-F motive is also subject to variation in the recapitulation:

![Figure 6.24: The beginning of the recapitulation in the first movement of Stanford’s Third ‘Irish’ Symphony in F, Op. 28 (bars 206-207)](image)

Whilst the original version of the C-D flat-F motive is clearly visible in the oboe and bassoon parts in figure 6.24, it also appears in retrograde form with augmented, equal rhythmic values, in the first flute and violin parts. A similar but larger scale
augmentation of the original thematic material can be seen in the recapitulation of the first movement of Brahms’s Fourth Symphony:

Figure 6.25: A reduction of the beginning of the recapitulation section of the first movement of Brahms’s Fourth Symphony in E minor, Op. 98

Figure 6.26: The thematic material of the opening movement of Brahms’s Fourth Symphony in E minor, Op. 98 in its original form as seen in the first violin in bars 1-4

Figures 5.25 and 5.26 demonstrate the similar thematic process (variation by rhythmic augmentation) in the recapitulation of Brahms’s Fourth Symphony to that of Stanford’s Third Symphony. Stanford also provides more subtle variations of the motive in the recapitulation:

Figure 6.27: A reduction of bars 239-244 of the recapitulation section in the first movement of Stanford’s Third ‘Irish’ Symphony in F, Op. 28
Figure 6.27 demonstrates further rhythmic augmentation of the motive. The first violin part is providing the melodic interest at this point with no noticeable references to the original motive. However, Stanford rather surreptitiously places an extremely rhythmically augmented retrograde of the motive in the ’cellos and double basses. Such a technique enables Stanford (in a similar manner to many of Brahms’s works) to retain the all-pervading influence and organicism of the original motive, but at the same time avoids the risk of the piece becoming monotonous.

As previous chapters of this study have demonstrated, it has been the subject of debate as to whether Stanford was familiar with Brahms’s Fourth Symphony at the time of the composition of the ‘Irish’ Symphony. Whatever the ultimate answer is, there are some undeniable parallels between the first movement of Stanford’s Irish Symphony and the music of Brahms, particularly in its intense and sophisticated variation. However the C-D flat-F motivic cell is quite clearly derived from Irish folk music, giving Stanford’s work a clear and distinctive sound compared to that of Brahms.

6.3: C. Hubert H. Parry: Overture to an Unwritten Tragedy

This work is one of Parry’s singular orchestral works, which according to the composer was not well received in its first London performance at a Philharmonic Society concert on 19 April, 1894. Once again, Jeremy Dibble provides a paragraph of analytical digression in his biography of the composer:

Why it [the Overture] should have elicited such a response is unclear, but its serious, discursive Brahmsian method may have jarred with a public more accustomed to the Parry of Judith, Job, and the Hypatia Suite. The design of the overture merits detailed analysis, particularly in the manner in which
the introductory lento plays an integral motivic role by first building to the allegro, and then, transformed, returning nostalgically in the coda. Moreover, motivically the introduction is also vital in presenting a seminal motivic cell (A – G sharp – A) which is worked with an intellectual ingenuity and thoroughness similar to the first movement of Brahms’s Second Symphony.⁹

The reports produced in relation to the work’s first performance at the Worcester Musical Festival and indeed at the London première at the Philharmonic Society would seem to contradict Parry’s impression. In relation to the Worcester performance, the reviewer for the Musical Times and Singing Class Circular said that the piece was ‘worked out with full command of necessary means and gives the impression of a masterly composition which will become more esteemed the better it is known.’¹⁰ This assessment of the composition echoes many of those made in reference to English premières of Brahms’s music discussed in Chapter 1. In a similar manner to many of Brahms’s works, it seems that the work was received with the necessary respect warranted by someone in Parry’s position, but the technical complexity and intricacies prevented the formation of detailed judgements until the opportunity of a second or third hearing.

Dibble provides a small clue to the technical intricacies of the work in his reference to the A – G sharp – A motive, as it is this which provides the motivic interest throughout the whole of the work. Once again, the interval of a semitone continues to be a crucial one. The motive to which Dibble refers is taken from the beginning of the Allegro energico section:

---

⁹ Dibble, Parry, 1992, p. 311
¹⁰ ‘Worcester Music Festival’, The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular, 34 (1893), 598-599 (598)
Figure 6.28: A reduction of the ‘A – G sharp – A motive’ from Parry’s Overture to and Unwritten Tragedy, bar 41

Figure 6.28 demonstrates the motive to which Dibble refers. However, it appears prior to this in the opening Lento section and is subject to considerable variation. It is introduced by the strings in bar 1:

![Lento notation]

Figure 6.29: A reduction of the opening bar of Parry’s Overture to an Unwritten Tragedy

The development of the semitone motive seen in figure 6.29 is subjected to development by Parry almost immediately in the clarinets and the violins:

![Variation of semitone motive]

Figure 6.30: A reduction of bars 7-8 of Parry’s Overture to an Unwritten Tragedy
Figure 6.30 demonstrates Parry’s first variation of the semitone motive in the overture. The motive is rhythmically diminished being comprised of three quaver beats in this instance. It is also inverted thus providing considerable change to the initial appearance in bar 1. An ideal piece for comparison in this instance is Brahms’s Tragic Overture, Op. 81:

Brahms varies the opening motive of a fourth (A in figure 6.31) a total of three times within the first eight bars of the piece. The fourth is a significant interval in the structure of the thematic material because not only is it the principal interval of the dramatic opening gesture in bar 1, but it is also used as a prominent goal for the ends of the phrases in bars 4 and 6. A1 is a rhythmically augmented variation of A. A2 and A3 use the interval as a basis of descending melodic progressions, with the A and D minim making the intervals more noticeable. However some would argue that such an analytical interpretation is tenuous and that phrase merely ends with a stepwise descending fifth to the cadence. It is this progressive Brahmsian type of variation which has been seen many times throughout this study which forms the basis of the
opening *Lento* section of Parry’s Overture. However, these introductory sections also show differences between Parry and Brahms. The slow opening of Parry’s work surely displays influence of the early works of Beethoven which demonstrate similar techniques (e.g. the First Symphony). Parry is much more sparing with orchestral resources than Brahms in the first section of the work, using the lower strings as a foundation and exploiting different sections of the woodwind and upper strings. In contrast Brahms enters with a dramatic thematic gesture using the full orchestra, then launching into drawn out phrases using the full string section, reintroducing the full orchestra at bar 9. By contrast, Parry does not use all his resources until bar 32, when he starts building up to the beginning of the *Allegro energico* section.

The titles of each work also suggest differences in approach of each composer in spite of their linguistic similarities. Brahms’s *Tragic* Overture was so-called because of the ‘tragic’ nature of the thematic material according to Brahms, rather than a depiction a specific programme. Indeed, Brahms denied the existence of any kind of programme for the work. On the other hand, Parry’s title suggests that there is definitely potential for programmatic interpretation, even though the tragedy is ‘unwritten’. Such a title possibly marks the beginnings of departure from the influence Brahms toward the programme music of composers such as Mahler and Richard Strauss, who both included descriptive programmatic titles in their works.

After the initial variations already discussed, Parry presents some more intense ones, with the first being in the strings in bars 18-21:

---

11 Musgrave, *Brahms*, p. 218
The intense ascending quaver variations of the opening motive in the strings in figure 6.32 act as an accompaniment figure to the more lyrical material in the woodwind. A further variation of the motive follows where the upper strings present the lyrical melody previously played by the woodwind section. However, this time, the melody incorporates two versions of the opening semitone motive with the violas which are
changed from duplet quavers into triplet quavers. The pervading motive appears once in every bar, presumably being subdued by Parry as a result of its presence in the melody. The full orchestra then enters, with the following theme:

![Figure 6.34: A reduction of bars 34-38 of Parry’s Overture to an Unwritten Tragedy](image)

This theme incorporates the semitone motive very intensively, as figure 6.34 demonstrates, particularly in the viola part with Parry’s use of *tremolo* highlighting the motive further. It is also clearly included in the principal thematic material of the upper strings and woodwind, both in simple quaver variations (i.e. bar 37) as well as longer range variations involving other melodic notes (e.g. bar 37-38). All these variations are a preparation for the climactic moment at which the *Allegro energico* section starts at bar 41.
As discussed earlier, the basic idea for the Allegro section is as follows:

Figure 6.35: The principal thematic cell in the Allegro energico section of Parry’s Overture to an Unwritten Tragedy

This is the A – G sharp – A motive to which Dibble refers in his text. However, as the analysis of the introductory section of the overture demonstrates, the motive is actually utilised in many forms before this point. Throughout this central section of the overture, and the coda section, the motive is subject to even more intense variation, using many of the techniques witnessed in the slow introductory section. Of particular interest to this discussion is bars 146 – 152 (see figure 6.36, p. 360) in which one can actually see the developments occurring bar by bar. The violins begin in bars 146-147 with a rhythmically augmented crotchet version of the principal semitone motive. The motive starts on the weak second beat of these two bars, thus making the D sharp and F sharp notes excellent examples of Parry’s emulation of the Brahmsian accented passing note discussed in Chapter 4. In the next two bars, Parry lengthens the first note of the figure by a half, and reduces the third by half which not only provides an excellent variation of the motive but also demonstrates Parry’s use of the very Brahmsian technique of syncopation as a means of variation. Further Brahmsian traits reveal themselves in the larger scale syncopation in the bass part in bars 146-149.
There are also sections in which the variation of the motive is less sophisticated as its appearance increases, such as in bars 130-140 (figure 6.37, p. 361-362). The section begins with the common Brahmsian technique of straight quavers against triplets, both of which contain versions of the semitone motive. Bar 134 sees the return of the material from the beginning of the Allegro section, however, it is tonally varied at this point. As figure 6.37 demonstrates, the section is extremely saturated with the motive, but the variations are less complex than those in figure 6.36.
Figure 6.37: A reduction of bars 130-139 of Parry’s Overture to an Unwritten Tragedy
The motive can also be seen in longer and less obvious forms, such as at the beginning of the extended coda section:

Figure 6.38 demonstrates an extended veiled transformation of the principal motive, demonstrating its all pervading prevalence throughout the movement. This recalls the obvious motivic voice leading which was discussed in relation to Brahms’s Op. 34 Quintet in Parry’s Grove Dictionary article on the ‘figure’. Therefore, once again here there is a direct indication that Parry was clearly influenced by Brahms in the realm of
motivic process and development, as not only do the variations appear on a bar by bar basis, they also appear across longer sections of the structure.

The overall tonality of the work is difficult to grasp because, in a very Brahmsian fashion, Parry creates an ambiguity between the tonic of A minor and the relative major throughout with a number of unrelated transitions in tonality. The dichotomy Parry creates in this respect recalls the opening movement of Brahms’s Clarinet Quintet. Indeed, at the point of the composition of Parry’s Overture in 1893, Brahms’s Clarinet Quintet was still a relatively new but nonetheless famous composition in England, after its première at the Monday Popular Concerts on 28 March, 1892. It is almost certain that Parry knew of the work at this point, and very possible that the tonal ideas present in the work may have influenced the ambiguities in the Overture. Furthermore, in a similar manner to Brahms’s Tragic Overture, the actual form of the work is also difficult to determine. There is agreement that it is possible to discuss Brahms’s work in the context of sonata form; however, the actual boundaries are quite difficult to determine. For example, interpretations of where the ‘recapitulation’ actually begins in Brahms’s work vary considerably. Brahms’s overture is easier to discuss analytically in relation to the themes and the ongoing continuous development and variation of those themes throughout (particularly the descending perfect fourth motive identified earlier in this chapter). Dibble refers to a ‘development’ section within Parry’s overture, but the movement does not really lend itself to discussion in this context. It is possible to place the overture within the context of a vague sonata structure (in a similar manner to that of Brahms), but there is certainly much potential for disagreement regarding where the formal boundaries actually are. It could be argued that a ‘vague sonata’ is analytically impossible, as the form is defined by its
clear thematic and/or tonal boundaries. Parry’s work is essentially monothematic, which is not necessarily a barrier in creating sonata form. Indeed many of Haydn’s sonata movements are monothematic, with the first and second subject areas being differentiated by key rather than thematic material (e.g. tonic minor – relative major). However, in the overture, the clearly defined tonal areas required for such a form are less clear cut. Therefore attempting to place the work into a sonata structure is unrealistic. Furthermore, in relation to the intensity of the continually evolving motivic development within the work identified throughout this chapter, such boundaries are not analytically helpful or illuminating and may actually be detrimental to understanding the work.

6.4: C. Hubert H. Parry: Elegy for Brahms

A study of this kind would simply not be complete without reference to this monumental work in Parry’s output. The work was composed in 1897 as a demonstration of the composer’s grief at Brahms’s death. Parry’s obvious fondness for Brahms is amply demonstrated in the famous college address relating to the composer discussed earlier in this study. In spite of its composition so soon after Brahms’s death, Parry did not actually finish the work and, as Dibble states: ‘work on it was not resumed and it was confined to the shelves until after his death when Stanford exhumed it, revised it, and performed it at the Parry Memorial Concert in November 1918 at the College.’\footnote{Dibble, \textit{Parry}, 1992, p. 346} Surprisingly (based on the large number of Parry’s works available in published form today), the Elegy remains unpublished, with the manuscript housed in the Royal College of Music archives. The manuscript is unfortunately not in particularly good condition and is, as a result, very difficult to
read clearly. A recording of the work was produced in 1991 with Matthias Bamert conducting the London Philharmonic Orchestra, with the conductors’ score being in micro-film format at the British Library.

Dibble has produced, for want of a better term, ‘Brahmsian – based’ analysis of the work in his biography of Parry. In fact it is one of Dibble’s most substantial analyses in the whole publication. The work in this chapter will therefore assess and evaluate Dibble’s analysis in the context of this study as a whole, as well as elaborating on certain parts through study of the manuscript and the conductors score produced for the recording of the work.

The analysis opens with a general synopsis of the work:

The Elegy for Brahms in A minor, a key Parry seemed to favour in expressing the darker, more brooding side of his temperament (cf. the Overture to an Unwritten Tragedy), displays a striking consistency with the structural methods of his first mature instrumental works, notably with the slow movement of the Piano Concerto. The loose sonata structure of the Elegy is delineated more sectionally than the Concerto movement, but it does share the same ‘recomposed’ approach to the recapitulation with the second group establishing the tonic outright.\(^\text{13}\)

Dibbles assessment of Parry’s use of key in the Elegy is a logical one, based on the A minor tonalities of the Overture discussed previously. The work opens with the following theme in the violins:

\(^{13}\) Ibid.
Parry subjects this to a Brahmsian style variation simultaneously in the bass instruments:

Figure 6.40: Bars 10-11 of the Bassoon and Contrabass parts of Parry’s Elegy for Brahms

The bassoon and contrabass parts shown in figure 6.40 demonstrate the inversion of the principal motivic idea, a technique which is commonplace in much of Brahms’s music and one which was discussed by both Parry and Stanford in their various written works. Furthermore, before the entry of the first subject idea in bar 2 (figure 6.39), Parry actually hints at the material of the second subject group in the opening two bars:

Figure 6.41: The motive in the clarinet in the first 2 bars of Parry’s Elegy for Brahms

The second subject group material is as follows:
The beginning of the second subject material which is shown in figure 6.42 contains an augmentation and partial inversion of the opening clarinet motive (see figure 6.41). This motive is repeated several times in an ascending sequence throughout the second subject material in bars 92-95, which acts as an answer to the descending sequence of the first subject material (see figure 6.39). The second subject also contains an augmentation of the crucial rhythmic motive from the first subject group:

![Figure 6.43: The rhythmic idea in the descending sequence of the opening subject material in Parry's Elegy for Brahms](image)

The rhythm bracketed in figure 6.43 can be seen in augmented form in bars 86 and 90 of the second subject group. This subtle variation of the rhythmic material from the first subject provides subtle Brahmsian continuity into the second subject group.
There are many aspects of the work however, which do not reflect the Brahmsian aesthetic and technique, some of which are described by Dibble:

Other unusual events occur in the development. One is the incorporation of a new theme (initially in F sharp minor – bars 104-108) at the outset which, after a brief extension, is never recalled. Another is the almost literal repeat of second group material between bars 141-151 (cf. bars 84-100) transposed into the subdominant.¹⁴

The inclusion of a new and seemingly unrelated theme at the beginning of the development would seem rather out of place in the context of a dedication to Brahms, in that Brahms never introduces unrelated material in the development sections of his works. The theme in question is as follows:

![Figure 6.44: The ‘unrelated’ theme in Parry’s Elegy for Brahms (clarinets, bars 104-108)](image)

Whilst the idea in figure 6.44 is seemingly unrelated to the first or second subject areas as one might expect, in its opening bars, it does include metrical displacement, which has the effect of speeding the material up gradually, which was a technique used frequently by Brahms. More significantly, the ‘almost literal repeat of the second group material’ is another very un-Brahmsian feature. In all the pieces examined, Brahms rarely (if ever) repeats material in literally the same form as it has been heard previously:

¹⁴ Ibid.
Figure 6.45: The repeat of the second group material in the ‘development’ section of Parry’s Elegy for Brahms

As figure 6.45 demonstrates, this reiteration of the second group material is very close to its original form (see figure 6.42). However, further detailed examination is more revealing. Whilst the basic motivic shape of the group (see bar 141 of figure 6.45) is still unchanged, the connecting material is subjected to subtle variation, particularly in the realm of rhythmic changes. For example, Parry changes the initial ascent to the higher register in bar 141 with the addition of demisemiquavers. He also adds an elaborate ascending scalic passage in bar 144, which appears to be a continuing variation of that in bar 142 because of the added triplet rhythm at the beginning instead of duplet quavers. Therefore, even though the overall shape of the passage is very similar, there is perhaps a little more in the way of variation and motivic evolution than Dibble initially suggests.

Harmonically, there are some surprises, considering what one might expect in a work dedicated to Brahms. Dibble provides a discussion of this idea:

Besides the structural sophistication of the Elegy, one other point of great interest lies in the integration of style. In one sense the work reveals Parry’s obvious deference to Brahms, a fact evinced by such instances as the second group material (which even resembles Brahms’s style of orchestration), and the strong vein of metrical opposition that runs through the development and coda.
Yet beyond these deliberate reverential gestures, the full blooded passion of the piece is couched, perhaps ironically, in Wagnerian terms.¹⁵

This is a rather unexpected suggestion. However, if one examines the score in a little more detail, using examples suggested in Dibble’s text, this conclusion is not as surprising as it first appears. The principal example Dibble refers to is what he calls ‘the ejaculatory dominant eleventh’ which occurs in bar 176:

![Figure 6.46: The dominant eleventh from bar 176 of Parry’s Elegy for Brahms](image)

Figure 6.46 shows the chord to which Dibble refers in bar 176. Indeed, one need only look at the Liebestod from *Tristan und Isolde* to realise the Wagnerian implications of the chord:

![Figure 6.47: A reduction of bars 77-78 of the ‘Liebestod’ from Wagner’s *Tristan und Isolde*, Act III](image)

Dibble acknowledges that Parry’s dominant eleventh chord in the Elegy belongs ‘to the sensuous world of Tristan’. In the example from the opera in figure 6.47, it is easy

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 347
to see the basis of Dibble’s argument, particularly when one considers the beginning of bar 78 where the C sharp resolves to B on the second quaver beat. It is perhaps rather ironic that in many ways, the Elegy for Brahms is one of Parry’s more un-Brahmsian works. The reason for this is likely to be that, in analysing such a work, the musicologist is likely to be searching for an exact or close copy of a Brahms work. However, Dibble’s brief analysis, coupled with the more extensive analysis in this chapter, proves that this is far from the truth. Whilst the work does contain elements of Brahmsian motivic evolution, there are other elements such as the Wagnerian climaxes and harmonic progressions, as well as thematic elements, which are obviously not Brahmsian. In fact, this work indicates that whilst retaining many techniques used by Brahms, Parry was starting to develop a new aspect to his composition, incorporating the more dramatic programmatic techniques of figures such as Wagner, Mahler and Strauss. The next section of this chapter takes its lead from this notion and examines the possibility that Parry and Stanford actually went above and beyond the Romantic Brahmsian aesthetic of motivic organicism in their later works, creating compositions that were actually more concise and organically conceived than those in Brahms’s later output.

6.5: Parry and Stanford’s Late Orchestral Work: Late Romanticism or Early Modernism?

Both Parry and Stanford produced orchestral works well into the twentieth century. Their last contributions in the symphonic medium were their Fifth and Seventh Symphonies respectively. Both pieces were composed at around the same time (Stanford’s work was completed in February 1911, and Parry’s in 1912), thus making them an ideal comparative analytical conclusion to this chapter. The two symphonies
were both commissioned by the Philharmonic Society for their centenary celebrations in 1912.\textsuperscript{16}

It has been tentatively suggested by Parry and Stanford’s recent biographers that their later works perhaps go beyond the music of Brahms, possibly crossing over stylistically into the realm of Schoenberg’s early work. In relation to Parry’s Fifth Symphony, Dibble produces the following assessment:

The complex cyclic procedures essayed in Schoenberg’s Quartet No. 1 in D minor, Op. 7 and the Kammersymphonie, Op. 9 show a fascinating affinity with the processes revealed in Parry’s Fifth Symphony, particularly in the manner in which material undergoes constant transformation. Certainly all Parry’s restatements (including the Scherzo) follow this trend either through the use of new consequent material, new tonal developments, or through thematic transformation which is especially telling in the last movement, final recapitulation and coda. It seems unlikely that Parry knew either of Schoenberg’s works. It is remotely possible that he may have seen a score of the Quartet… but a performance in London was not forthcoming until November 1913… Nevertheless, even if he had no knowledge of these works, it is still remarkable (perhaps even more so) that the Symphonic Fantasia should show such a forward looking attitude to modern structural procedures and exhibit such an advance on nineteenth century techniques.\textsuperscript{17}

Based on Dibble’s assessment at this point, it would seem likely that Parry was not familiar with these early works of Schoenberg. However, as Dibble later points out, Parry was certainly aware of Schoenberg as a composer, as his unfavourable comments at a concert containing the \textit{Fünf Orchesterstücke} demonstrate. Parry describes the work as an ‘elaboration of noises which reminded me of the Nursery

\textsuperscript{16} Dibble, \textit{Stanford}, 2002, p. 397
\textsuperscript{17} Dibble, \textit{Parry}, 1991, p. 462
when children play with toy instruments”\textsuperscript{18}. Such comments would suggest that, if Parry was incorporating elements of Schonberg’s early aesthetic, it was certainly not acknowledged as such. As discussed in Chapter 3 of this study, Stanford’s Seventh Symphony has been analysed by Rodmell in relation to the vexed notion of Schoenberg’s ‘developing variation’ technique, suggesting that, at the very least, the piece matches the sophistication of the music of Brahms in terms of motivic development and variation. However, the term is not an analytically viable one as a result of Schoenberg’s lack of formal theoretical explanation. Also, it seems very likely as in the case of Parry that Stanford was aware of Schoenberg’s compositional output even if only on a very rudimentary level. The evidence to support this is Stanford and Cecil Forsyth’s \textit{A History of Music}, initially published in 1916. The penultimate chapter of the book is written by Stanford and is entitled ‘The Post Beethoven Period’. In it he briefly covers the contributions of most of the fashionable names in composition at this time from Mendelssohn to Sterndale Bennett. The final chapter of the book is written by Forsyth and is entitled ‘Nationalism and Modern Schools’. In that, Forsyth examines what were current composers at the time of the books publication, including the music of Schoenberg. As co-writer, Stanford may not have been intimately acquainted with Schoenberg, but he would at least have been aware of his existence as a composer. Based on the analytical findings already presented in Chapters 5 and earlier in this chapter, the strongly Brahmsian/Schoenbergian conclusions of Dibble and Rodmell’s relatively short analyses on the last symphonic utterances by Parry and Stanford require further investigation at this point. Beginning with Stanford’s Seventh Symphony, the rest of this chapter examines these two monumental pieces in Parry and Stanford’s outputs in

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., p. 466
order to assess how far the supposed Brahmsian influence had developed since their earlier works.


Stanford’s last Symphony is outwardly very traditional, with four ‘movements’. Indeed, Dibble refers to it as being perceived as ‘more regressively classical’ than some of his earlier works.\(^{19}\) Certainly the overall structure of the work and the tonal relationships are very traditional. The first movement is in the tonic key of D minor, with the second movement in B flat major (the submediant as has been discussed is a very Brahmsian relative key). The Variations and Finale begin in F major (the relative), with the work concluding in D major.

However, one does not need to go very far inside the work to realise that the motivic development and cyclical nature of the work makes it one of the most organic Stanford ever produced. The first movement is a concise sonata form, which has a greatly shortened transition and development section. The intense Brahmsian variation is apparent in this movement from the outset:

\[\text{Figure 6.48: The opening thematic idea of the first movement of Stanford’s Seventh Symphony in D minor, Op. 124}\]

\(^{19}\) Dibble, Stanford, 2002, p. 397
As figure 6.48 shows, the second violin introduces a motive (A) in the first bar, which is repeated three times, but also appears in retrograde form in the principal thematic idea in bar 4. Indeed, it is motive A which seems to be the domineering force of the first subject group, as it appears in various instrumental parts, occasionally with varied intervals, although by and large it mostly retains its original quaver rhythmic form. Interestingly, this small motive is the same one which formed much of the thematic unity in Stanford’s Third Symphony discussed earlier in the chapter, demonstrating once again the possible influence of Irish folk music. Motive A continues to be used through the transition. However, it is subjected to more substantial variation and development in the second subject group:

Figure 6.49: A reduction of the second subject group of the first movement of Stanford’s Seventh Symphony in D minor, Op. 124 (bars 109-114)
Figure 6.49 demonstrates the second subject group of the first movement and the different variations of motive A. The retrograde appears again with a rhythmically augmented last note. The note sequence of A is also used in the violins in bars 112 and 113. In bar 112, the notes are rhythmically augmented stretching across the entire bar with the A flat and the B flat changed round. The motive in bar 113 can be interpreted in two possible ways. First one could argue that it starts on the minim F, which would make it a simple rhythmically augmented inversion of A. On the other hand, it could be argued that the crotchet C at the beginning of the bar is also a part of its shape, which given the articulation markings is probably the more likely answer.

Motive A continues to be a prominent feature of the second movement which is essentially a set of five variations. The principal theme is as follows:

![Image of the opening theme of the second movement of Stanford's Seventh Symphony in D minor, Op. 124](image)

Figure 6.50: The opening theme of the second movement of Stanford's Seventh Symphony in D minor, Op. 124

As figure 6.50 demonstrates, there are five versions of motive A in the opening theme alone. The first four are retrogrades of the original, retaining the original rhythms, whilst the final one in bar 6 is a retrograde inversion. One need only look a few bars ahead to see development of A. Figure 6.51 (p. 369) shows the saturation of the movement with the motive and its variants. Most of the variants in this instance are retrograde and retrograde inversions of A (shown in brackets). There is also a version of A with an intervallic change in the viola part in bar 11. These uses of different versions of the motive correlate with Stanford’s ideas on variation of melodies.
discussed in Chapter 4. Furthermore, the motivic counterpoint between the woodwind and string instrumental groups is very reminiscent of similar activity discussed in Chapter 4 in relation to Brahms’s *Haydn Variations*. All of the parts in figure 6.51 are crucial in terms of motivic material and the counterpoint, and none is irrelevant infill, demonstrating the strong Brahmsian trait of dividing the motivic material equally amongst all the instruments. There is also tonal interplay between the tonic of B flat major and the relative minor (G), another common Brahmsian feature.

Figure 6.51: Bars 9-12 of the second movement of Stanford’s Seventh Symphony in D minor, Op. 124
Stanford also incorporates rhythmic variations in his use and development of motive A in this movement. This can be seen prominently in the second variation:

Even thought there is seemingly new thematic material in the oboe part in figure 6.52, motive A is included in inverted form using its original quaver note values in bar 54.
However, as with the previous example, the accompanying string parts are also not left without thematic material. As one can see in figure 6.52, in bar 51, violin 1 contains a retrograde version of the motive, which stretches across the full bar using the new semiquaver/quaver rhythmic pattern. At the same point, violin 2 contains a version of A which would be in retrograde form, but the first two notes are exchanged. Even more significantly, the same type of variation of A occurs in the strings in bar 54 whilst the oboe plays the more straightforward inversion in the melody over the top. This demonstrates Stanford’s Brahmsian ability to vary and develop a motive or thematic cell in order to correlate with the general character of a variation or section of a piece. Indeed, with the tonic minor tonality at this point in the piece, one is strongly reminded of the second variation of Brahms’s *Haydn Variations*, Op. 56.

However, it is the third and fourth movements of Stanford’s Seventh Symphony which really represent the pinnacle of his achievement in the realm of motivic process and variation. These movements have been the subject of relatively detailed analyses by both Rodmell and Dibble, which, given the biographical nature of their publications, demonstrates the importance and impressiveness of this piece in Stanford’s output as a whole. The two movements are collectively entitled ‘Variations and Finale’. Their structure has been described concisely by Rodmell:

The third movement comprises a theme followed by six variations, each of which develops material in the Brahmsian manner… Stanford took this process much further however: Variations V and VI act not only as an integral part of the preceding but as a transition into the Finale (by virtue of a change of
tempo and time signature, previously consistent). The finale itself has a dual personality: it is a sonata-form movement, but also a massive seventh variation of the third movement.\textsuperscript{20}

Rodmell’s brief description indicates the extreme complexity of the two final interrelated movements of this symphony. The theme of the variations is relatively simple, serenely played in the first violins at the beginning of the movement:

![Figure 6.53: The opening theme of the Variations and Finale of Stanford’s Seventh Symphony in D minor, Op. 124](image)

As figure 6.53 shows, the theme is flowing and lyrical. It could be argued that there are elements of motive A from earlier in the work (they have been bracketed and their forms indicated in the figure). However, as one can see, their appearances are concealed within the contour of the theme. Therefore their appearance may not be as significant as one might first think. It is this material, however, which serves as a basis for the rest of the work.

The theme can be divided into 5 principal phrases:

\textsuperscript{20} Rodmell, Stanford, 2002, p. 269
Rodmell provides an overview of the symphony in terms of the use of the phrases of the theme. However, he does not venture to suggest exactly what he means by the ‘Brahmsian’ variations. Yet they relate to the style of variations discussed by Stanford in *Musical Composition*. However, unlike Brahms’s *Haydn Variations*, and indeed the passacaglia variations of the Fourth Symphony, the variations in Stanford’s work do not occupy the same number of bars in each case. For example, the theme is of 14 bars, the first variation is 13 bars and the second variation is 23 bars. However, in terms of motivic process and variation, if one looks at the first variation, the similarities with Brahms are very apparent:
Both motives U and V are presented by Stanford in the first violin part. They are both rhythmically diminished, although as a result of augmentation of the final note in the case of U, and repetition in the case of V, the variation of the two motivic sections actually lasts for the same length of time as their counterparts in the main theme. There is also very Brahmsian counterpoint occurring between violin 1 and the violoncello and contrabass parts. As soon as the violin finishes its variation of U, the motive is immediately taken up in a further varied form in the bass parts with slight adjustments to some of the pitches in order to accommodate the harmonic requirements for the violin melody. This is an excellent visible example of the discussion in Chapter 4 regarding the importance Stanford attached to harmonic and accompanying lines having motivic and melodic significance in which he refers specifically to Brahms’s Chorale Preludes, Op. 122 (see *Musical Composition*, pp. 50-51).
As the variations progress, they deviate further from the original theme. This can be seen in the third variation:

Figure 6.56: A reduction of the third variation in the Variations and Finale of Stanford’s Seventh Symphony in D minor, Op. 124
Figure 6.56 (cont)
Figure 6.56 (cont)

Figure 6.56 shows the principal parts of the third variation. The variations of the original motives U and V are evident in the clarinet and the flute as the variation progresses. The notes by and large have been rhythmically augmented with some removed so that the variation fits into the correct number of bars as its original version. The other parts in the figure at various points play a further variation on U and V by combining them into descending and ascending motions. Of these, the most impressive is for the clarinet in bars 55-56, to which Stanford adds a virtuosic flurry, but without losing the overall shape of the motivic material. Other Brahmsian elements are the prominent thematic material given to the horns (an instrument favoured by Brahms), in the form of the U and V combination (labelled on figure 6.56), and the use of triplets in the upper strings against straight rhythms in the other instruments. The combination of U and V is even visible in the triplets, once again demonstrating Stanford’s Brahmsian habit of incorporating thematic material into parts which upon first inspection appear to only be acting as accompanimental or
rhythmic devices. Based on the analytical findings in this study, Rodmell’s assertion that the material in the variations is developed in the Brahmsian manner is an eminently appropriate description of this portion of the work.

The third variation is an ideal turning point in the discussion to consider the finale, as its material provides an important thematic constituent of the sonata form of the movement. It is in the finale that Stanford maintains and advances Brahmsian organism and development, since the thematic material of the sonata is derived from the theme and variations, thereby creating, as Rodmell says, ‘a massive seventh variation of the third movement’\textsuperscript{21}. Furthermore, there is no formal separation of the third movement from the fourth. The sixth variation of the third movement and the beginning of the sonata finale are separated only by a double bar line. Indeed, one need only look at the first and second subject groups of the movement to see the close relationship with the variations:

![Figure 6.57: The first subject group material of the finale of Stanford’s Seventh Symphony in D minor, Op. 124](image)

In the first subject, shown in figure 6.57, the flute and oboe present as the first subject a variation of the material from U identified in the theme. When the flute and oboe move on to the second variation, the trombone plays the line from the oboe in the first

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
(demonstrated by the arrow in figure 6.57). Figure 6.58 (page 388) shows a reduction of the material in the second subject. The relationship with the third variation discussed earlier is undeniable. The principal thematic line is now in the violoncello. The material from the third variation has been bracketed and labelled. The triplet figure in the strings is recalled again, making the parallel to the third variation even more striking. However, this time the triplets are shared between the upper strings and upper woodwind, with the interjections from the flute providing a needed variation in timbre. Coupled with the change in register of the actual thematic material itself, this second subject of the sonata (like the first in relation to motive U), is in fact a further development of the third variation in the previous movement.
Figure 6.58: A reduction of the second subject of the finale (bars 176-180) of Stanford’s Seventh Symphony in D minor, Op. 124

The development section of the sonata sees even more organic thematic activity, recalling the fourth variation of the previous movement as well as the return of the first subject of the first movement:
As well as demonstrating a quite literal return of the first subject of the first movement, figure 6.59 also demonstrates its appearance in conjunction with a variation of the theme (U) from the third movement. Such cyclical and intense development seen in the final two movements of Stanford’s Symphony, whilst possibly originating in the music of Brahms, actually goes beyond any of the motivic processes and developments witnessed in Brahms. Indeed, the only work of Brahms which comes close to this level of cyclical organicism is the final movement of the Fourth Symphony, which was discussed in this respect in Chapter 4 of this study. However, Brahms’s work does not combine two movements into one whole in the way that Stanford does. Furthermore, Brahms’s symphonic arguments are generally much longer than that in Stanford’s Symphony. One could quite justifiably say therefore, that Stanford has actually surpassed Brahms in this respect. This could be taken even further, as the cyclical nature of the Symphony is actually more akin to that found in the early tonal works of Schoenberg, for example the First String Quartet in D minor, which is composed as one long movement. It was mentioned earlier in this chapter that Stanford was almost certainly aware of Schoenberg.
However, based on the content of his theoretical writings and general style of compositions witnessed in this study, in a similar manner to Parry, one cannot imagine that he would be impressed by Schoenberg’s output, and even less so at his own compositions being directly compared to those of Schoenberg. Nonetheless it cannot be denied that the Seventh Symphony demonstrates the evolution and development of the Brahmsian aesthetic beyond the level assumed by most previous work in this field.

6.7: C. Hubert H. Parry: Fifth Symphony (Symphonic Fantasia) in B minor

The final principal analysis of this thesis is Parry’s final work in the symphonic medium. The cyclical and organic nature of the work was discussed earlier in this chapter in relation to Schoenberg’s First String Quartet in D minor. In his monograph on Parry, Dibble provides one of his largest and most detailed analyses in the work, demonstrating its importance in the context of Parry’s whole output. Interestingly, Dibble argues, with references to Parry’s entry on the Symphony in the original edition of Grove’s *Dictionary*, that the ‘principal model on which Parry based his own work’ was Schumann’s Fourth Symphony. Dibble maintains that ‘one of the most attractive constructional features of Schumann’s one-movement scheme was the element of incorporating four connected movements (i.e. the traditional constituents of a symphony – first movement *Allegro*, Slow movement, *Scherzo* and Finale) into a tautly unified cyclic structure.’ Dibble then proceeds to give a detailed tonal and motivic analysis of the movement. Whilst the parallels to Schumann’s Fourth Symphony are undeniable, in terms of motivic development, the work also incorporates many of the processes found in the music of Brahms. This is not

---

23 Ibid., p. 456-457
particularly surprising, particularly as Schumann was one of Brahms’s principal influences in the early years. Nor is it necessarily surprising that the influence of both composers should have filtered their way into Parry’s music, as both were made popular in England as a result of the various factors discussed in Chapters 1-3 of this study. However, there are some elements of the work which are definitely not Brahmsian. The first and most notable is the lack of break between the four movements. The second is that each movement is allotted a title respectively ‘Stress’, ‘Love’, ‘Play’ and ‘Now’, which apparently Parry understood as the ‘history of mental or emotional conditions such as may be grouped round one centre’\(^\text{24}\). Such an interpretation suggests that there might be programmatic elements to the work, such as might be found in Wagner’s or even Liszt’s work, but there Parry does not seem to have left any indication of what this programme might be. Such labelling of symphonic movements occurs in the music of Mahler and Richard Strauss (e.g. the pastoral titles of each movement of Mahler’s First Symphony), although Mahler’s titles tend to be a little more informative of the programme. For instance one of the movements of his First Symphony is called ‘Hunter’s Funeral’, the intended depiction being obvious from the title. All of the influences discussed in relation to the work so far provide very positive evidence that Parry was not the staunch Brahmsian that many texts have made him out to be. As a detailed basic analysis of this work has already been carried out by Dibble, the remainder of this chapter examines sections of each movement looking at the intensity of the development and motivic process resulting from these preliminary themes. Such is the intensity of the motivic development that it is unrealistic to attempt a bar by bar analysis. Therefore, examples

\(^{24}\) Ibid., p. 457
will be selected from each movement to try and demonstrate the intricacy, detail and sophistication of Parry’s workmanship.

The first movement of the work, as Dibble points out, the movement actually functions ‘as a large scale exposition’\textsuperscript{25} to the entire work, introducing all of the principal thematic ideas of which there are several:

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{first_major_thematic}
\caption{A reduction of the first major thematic idea of Parry’s Fifth Symphony in B minor (Stress, bars 1-4)}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{second_major_thematic}
\caption{A reduction of the second major thematic idea of Parry’s Fifth Symphony in B minor (Stress, bars 8-12)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid.
Figure 6.62: A reduction of the third major thematic idea of Parry’s Fifth Symphony in B minor (Stress, bars 20-21)

Figure 6.63: A reduction of the fourth major thematic idea of Parry’s Fifth Symphony in B minor (Stress, bars 32-33)

Figure 6.64: A reduction of the fifth major thematic idea of Parry’s Fifth Symphony in B minor (Stress, bars 51-54)
Figure 6.65: A reduction of the sixth major thematic idea of Parry’s Fifth Symphony in B minor (Stress, bars 55-59)

As figures 6.60 – 6.65 demonstrate, the symphony presents a wealth of thematic material. Dibble identifies the melodic lines of all of these themes in his publication on Parry. In the above figures, basic harmony has also been added to give the themes a little more contextual background. Dibble identifies motives X, Y, and Z in his publication, and it is these which form much of the basis of thematic development as the work progresses. Indeed, development can even be seen between figure 6.60 and 6.65 in the variation of motive X, particularly the elongated version which occurs between bars 56-58 in figure 6.65. The other noticeable Brahmsian feature of this first movement which can be seen in figure 6.61 is the interplay between the tonic and the relative major, as well as the lack of a strong V-I cadence in the tonic or the relative. As was demonstrated in Chapter 4, Brahms commonly avoided the platitude of the cadence, as well as creating interplay between keys. The most obvious example which springs to mind is the first movement of the Clarinet Quintet, Op. 115. One could even go as far as to say that there is more than a hint of the sequential and expressive rhetoric of composers famed for programme music, such as Mahler, Strauss and possibly even Elgar. It is probably no coincidence that Elgar completed his Second Symphony the year before this work. The sequential style of figure 6.65 can easily be compared to similar techniques used in Elgar’s Second Symphony. Perhaps at this
juncture one could suggest that the British composers were maturing and developing a more distinct sound from the favoured Austro-German tradition.

In the remaining three movements of the symphony (they are referred to as movements throughout this discussion for clarity and ease of analysis even through there is no break between them during performance), Parry takes various aspects of these thematic elements and subjects them to variation, particularly motives X Y and Z. The motivic unity and intensity is made very apparent even in the remainder of the first movement:

![Figure 6.66: A reduction of bars 137-139 of the first movement (Stress) of Parry’s Fifth Symphony in B minor](image)

The principal development in figure 6.66 is figure Y which appears in a rhythmically augmented form. In contrast to its first appearance, it is in the bass instead of the melody, demonstrating Parry’s careful manipulation of thematic material to ensure that even the lower parts are unified in their development of motivic cells. The violins also contain a rhythmically diminished version of Z, demonstrating the intermingling of thematic cells in the process of development. One need only look at the finale of Brahms’s Fourth Symphony to see such a technique in action.
The second movement (Love) sees the development and evolution of motives X and Y:

Figure 6.67: A reduction of bars 9-12 of the second movement (Love) of Parry’s Fifth Symphony in B minor

Figure 6.67 demonstrates the development of motive Y, which, in its appearance here is rhythmically diminished from its original form, and inverted. Parry holds the music over a strong tonic pedal in the relative major, which perhaps helps to compensate for the ambiguity of tonality in the first movement. There is also a new motivic shape in operation here, labelled A, presented in imitative counterpoint by the various parts, which provides further Brahmsian motivic unification. The other principal feature of the figure is the two voice canon between the oboe and the bassoon, which, based on the movement’s title ‘Love’, may possibly be a representation of the two intertwined voices of lovers. However, programmatic implications aside, the use of canon in this fashion is a very Brahmsian feature, and one which can be seen in many of Brahms’s works such as the opening of the Adagio movement of the Second Serenade in A, Op. 16.
Figure 6.68: A reduction of bars 33-37 of the second movement (Love) of Parry’s Fifth Symphony in B minor

Figure 6.68 demonstrates the evolution of motive X in this movement. Its distinctive rhythmic feature of the dotted quaver followed by a semiquaver is retained throughout, but the octave interval is changed in some instances, for example in the first violin in bar 33 the interval is changed to a major sixth, as also in the flute and first violin in bar 37. There is also an inverted version of motive A, identified in figure 6.67 in the bass part, once again demonstrating the unity Parry creates in this work through the manipulation of motivic material.

Motive Y is the principal subject of development in the Scherzo movement entitled ‘Play’:

Figure 6.69: The opening theme of the third movement (Play) of Parry’s Fifth Symphony in B minor
The motive is transformed by rhythmic diminution into a light 6/8 scherzo theme and, as figure 6.69 shows, appears 9 times in the opening bars. This is very reflective of its use throughout the entire movement. However, the dénouement of thematic development in the work really occurs in the final movement:

**Figure 6.70: A reduction of the opening four bars of the final movement (Now) of Parry’s Fifth Symphony in B minor**

Within the first four bars of the final movement (figure 6.70), two of the thematic ideas from the first movement are reintroduced. However, they both begin on weak beats of the bar rather than strong ones. Furthermore, as with nearly every reiteration of various thematic ideas in this symphony, their tonal context is very different, adding to the transformation and variation. In the first movement, these two ideas are presented in the tonal context of a dichotomy between B minor and D major in the case of the first idea, and the subdominant of B in the case of the second. In figure 6.70 they are both presented in the tonal context of an unstable first inversion of the dominant of B. This is an excellent example therefore of Parry’s constant tonal evolution in the development of his thematic content.

The thematic apotheosis of the movement occurs at bar 158 of the final movement when the second principal theme returns in the celestial key of F sharp major (the
dominant). Figure 6.71 (p. 400-402) shows all of the instruments involved in the grand restatement of this opening theme. It is rhythmically augmented, spanning across eight bars as opposed to the original four. Once again the tonal context of the variation is very different to its original appearance in the first movement, demonstrating the intense Brahmsian based evolution which runs through the entire work. At this point it needs to be considered, as was the case with Stanford’s Seventh Symphony, whether it in fact goes beyond the late creations of Brahms in terms of the thematic development and cyclic unity. The answer is almost certainly that, whilst the thematic and harmonic language remains faithful to that of the late nineteenth century, the actual physical development, variation and cyclical unity of the piece actually goes above and beyond anything that Brahms ever produced. As with Stanford’s work, the only piece of Brahms which is even nearly comparable is the Fourth Symphony, Op. 98. Indeed, the results of the analysis of this work seem to strongly support Dibble’s idea that structurally, the piece actually has more in common with the earlier works of Schoenberg than the later works of Brahms.
Figure 6.71: A reduction of bars 158 – 165 of the final movement of Parry’s Fifth Symphony in B minor
6.8: Conclusion

This chapter has provided a much needed insight into the supposed Brahmsian features of the orchestral works of Parry and Stanford. The results of the analysis have been extremely revealing. Certainly the earlier orchestral works, like the Irish Symphony and the Overture to an Unwritten Tragedy, demonstrate very Brahmsian motivic and thematic evolution and variation within the context of traditional orchestral forms. However, it has also been demonstrated that there were other influences in these works, particularly in the instrumentation and harmonic development, which in some instances, particularly in the case of Parry (ironically, in the Elegy for Brahms), are more akin to that seen in Wagner and Liszt’s music, rather than that of Brahms.

Furthermore, the last portion of the chapter, which examined Stanford’s Seventh Symphony, Op. 124, and Parry’s Fifth Symphony, demonstrates that whilst retaining many late nineteenth century features, they actually moved beyond Brahms, creating pieces that contained even more intense variation and cyclic unity. Undoubtedly the later music of Brahms served as a model for their later works, particularly in the style and methods of the variation. However, in terms of the intensity of thematic and motivic activity, and cyclical unity, Parry and Stanford did not equal Brahms – they surpassed him.
Conclusion

The reception and influence of the Music of Brahms in England in the late nineteenth century is a very complex and difficult topic to navigate. This thesis has attempted to provide a preliminary investigation into the popular and fashionable musicological notion that English composers of the nineteenth century owe at least some of their methodology to Brahms and his method of continuous motivic variation and evolution. Certainly Brahms’s music would not have attained such popularity in this era without the tireless effort of many of the individuals discussed in Chapter 1. The introduction of Brahms’s music in England occurred at a crucial time in the evolution and development of British musical composition and performance; a time where creative minds of both Teutons such as Dannreuther, and natives such as George Grove, encouraged by the monarchy, were restless and eager to improve England’s musical standing. As a result of this fusion of events, Brahms’s music had not only an excellent chance to become established in England, but also the potential to influence and shape artistic and creative endeavours in the newly revived effort in English musical composition by Parry and Stanford.

A survey of general and biographical literature on the period has revealed an almost constant recurrence of the notion that Brahms’s music influenced that of British composers. The detailed study of Parry’s articles in the original edition of Grove’s Dictionary of Music and Musicians, as well as Stanford’s Musical Composition: A Short Treatise for Students produced some extremely illuminating and interesting information. It is very clear that both composers had a deep and justified respect for Brahms. Furthermore, the publications also revealed particular aspects of Brahms’s
music that they both admired, the most prominent of which was the notion of constant motivic process, evolution and development within the contextual boundaries of outwardly traditional forms such as sonata, rondo, and variation. The comparative analysis of the chamber and orchestral music of Brahms, Parry and Stanford has revealed that there was a very strong correlation between the content of their theoretical writings and the aspects of Brahms’s music that were present in their own output.

However, it would be quite wrong to conclude, as many have done before, that Parry and Stanford were mere exclusive imitators of the Brahmsian method and aesthetic at the expense of all else. The detailed analysis of their works in this study has demonstrated that there were also different influences present in their works. For instance, one cannot fail to hear elements of Stanford’s Irish heritage throughout his music, particularly in the style and shape of his thematic ideas, which are often intertwined with subtle elements of Irish folk music. Nowhere was the fusion of Brahmsian motivic process and Irish folk music more pronounced than in the first movement of the Third Symphony. One can also not fail to notice the programmatic influence of Mahler and Strauss in Parry’s Fifth Symphony, something which was developing as early as 1893 at the beginning of the creation of the Overture to an Unwritten Tragedy. Ironically, in the case of Parry, it is his Elegy for Brahms in which other influences are most apparent. It is easy to observe the Wagnerian harmonic elements, as well as the large orchestral climaxes throughout the work. In terms of orchestration of both chamber and orchestral pieces, Parry and Stanford generally produce a much lighter effect than Brahms, in spite of the very prominent Brahmsian habit both composers demonstrate of giving all the voices and timbres a
largely equal share in the motivic counterpoint. Therefore, whilst the motivic processes within the strict formal context of the music are fundamentally Brahmsian in many cases, the actual sound of the music is very different from that of Brahms. The other principal result of the analytical findings is the clear evidence in their early twentieth century orchestral works (Parry’s Fifth and Stanford’s Seventh Symphonies) that Parry and Stanford actually produced works which are very clearly rooted in nineteenth century harmonic, developmental and structural principles, but push the boundaries of these principles further than Brahms ever did, providing very strong evidence that not only should they not be dismissed as imitators of Brahms, but that their works are actually crucially important in the progression of, and possibly ultimately represent a culmination of, late nineteenth century musical principles and aesthetics.

As a result of all the necessary preliminary work carried out in this study, the next logical research project in this area should be a more comprehensive and detailed survey of the chamber and orchestral music of Parry and Stanford. Of particular importance, however, are the sets of variations produced by both composers. Both Parry and Stanford clearly admired Brahms’s efforts in this genre. The research in Chapter 4 indicated a particular fondness for Brahms’s Variations on a Theme of Haydn, Op. 56, in the sophisticated processes demonstrated by Brahms throughout the work. Both Parry and Stanford produced sets of their own and it is also well known that Stanford encouraged his students to write variation sets, as he stated clearly in *Musical Composition*. 
On the subject of Stanford’s students, this is another topic which is in desperate need of attention in this area. It is mentioned in nearly every publication relating to the composer that Stanford had many relatively famous students whilst teaching at the Royal College of Music, such as Frank Bridge, Butterworth, Coleridge-Taylor, Dyson, Gurney, Howells, Hurlstone, Ireland, and Vaughan Williams. Parry’s students did not attain the stature of Stanford’s in the field of composition, but did include names of excellent musicians, such as Emily Daymond. It was discussed earlier in this study that Stanford encouraged his students to adhere to traditional compositional principles, particularly variation writing. This can be seen in Jeremy Dibble’s select chronology of British Variation sets between 1889 and 1922:

Table 7.1: Jeremy Dibble’s select chronology of British variation sets, 1889-1922 as detailed in his article ‘Fantasy and Hybridization in the British Variation Tradition’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parry</td>
<td>Symphony No. 3 (finale)</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurlstone</td>
<td>Variations on an Original Theme</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parry</td>
<td>Symphonic Variations</td>
<td>1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Variations on ‘Down among the Dead Men’</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurlstone</td>
<td>Variations on a Hungarian Air</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatty</td>
<td>Variations on the Air of Old King Cole</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Wood</td>
<td>Variations on an Irish Air ‘Patrick Sarsfield’</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgar</td>
<td>Variations on an Original Theme</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bantock</td>
<td>Helena Variations</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delius</td>
<td>Appalachia</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurlstone</td>
<td>Variations on a Swedish Air</td>
<td>1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleridge Taylor</td>
<td>Variations on an African Air</td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grainger</td>
<td>Green Bushes (Passacaglia)</td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delius</td>
<td>Brigg Fair</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delius</td>
<td>Dance Rhapsody No. 1</td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman O’Neill</td>
<td>Theme and Variations on an Irish Air</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somervell</td>
<td>Symphonic Variations Normandy</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Third and Fourth Movements of Symphony No. 7</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harty</td>
<td>Variations on a Dublin Air</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goossens</td>
<td>Variations on a Chinese Theme</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrar</td>
<td>Variations on a Sea Song by Dibdin</td>
<td>1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Irish Concertino (first movement)</td>
<td>1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ley</td>
<td>Variations on a Theme of Handel</td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Variations for Violin and Orchestra</td>
<td>1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie</td>
<td>London Day by Day</td>
<td>1922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One can assume that all aspects of *Musical Composition* were developed during his time teaching at the RCM, particularly as Dibble refers to the publication not only as ‘a pedagogical summary of his own aesthetic outlook’, but also as ‘an account of his own teaching imperatives and directives to his own pupils’.\(^1\) It is safe to assume therefore, that the Brahmsian aesthetics outlined in Stanford’s *Musical Composition*, as well as those found in his works throughout this study, may also have been passed on to his students. In the second half of the twentieth century, there have been detailed studies of many of Stanford’s students produced. For instance, Michael Kennedy has produced a study on Vaughan Williams and his output in 1964, Christopher Palmer wrote a study of the music of Herbert Howells, and Michael Hurd a study of Ivor Gurney.

One student of Stanford who has been inexplicably ignored, yet based on his three appearances in Table 7.1 was almost certainly important in relation to this study, is William Hurlstone. Apart from one relatively small biographical publication produced by H. G. Newell in 1936, there has been virtually no work carried out on Hurlstone’s life and music since. Jeremy Dibble has produced a short article for the current edition of the New Grove *Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, in which he tellingly says that Stanford ‘thought him his best pupil’\(^2\), as well as Coleridge Taylor, which was ‘corroborated by the numerous performances Stanford gave of his orchestral works at the RCM’\(^3\). Hurlstone’s obituary in *The Musical Times* say that Hurlstone was ‘a man who, in the full flush of early manhood, had achieved great things in music and in

---


\(^3\) Dibble, *Stanford*, 2002, p. 370
whom greater promise was never to receive its expected and eagerly anticipated fulfilment.⁴ In order to achieve such a reputation, particularly as one of Stanford’s best pupils, one assumes that Hurlstone’s grasp and practical use of Stanford’s favoured compositional principles, including those relating to Brahmsian motivic process and variation, must have been sound. Pascall and Dibble very tellingly say that ’his chamber works, particularly the Cello Sonata, the Piano Quartet and the Phantasie Quartet, exude a confidence in their fertile treatment of structure and thematic manipulation which drew enthusiastic praise from Parry and Cobbett.”⁵

A preliminary examination of Hurlstone’s chamber works makes it possible to see exactly what Dibble and Pascall mean. The first movement of Hurlstone’s Pianoforte Quartet in E minor, Op. 43, is a very concise and tight knit sonata structure. Tonally, the movement presents some unusual turns. The first subject group is in the tonic of E minor, whilst the second group is in E flat major. When the second group returns in the recapitulation, it is in the more expected relative major (although one might have expected it to be in E major according to standard sonata convention). However, it is Hurlstone’s Brahmsian manipulation of thematic material which really stands out in this work. The first and second subjects are as follows:

![Figure 7.1: The first subject group of the first movement of Hurlstone’s Piano Quintet, Op. 43](image)

---

⁴ ‘Obituary: William Yeats Hurlstone’, *The Musical Times*, 47 (1906), 482
⁵ Pascall and Dibble, ‘Hurlstone’, *Oxford Music Online*, para. 3 of 3
As well as showing the opening subject groups, figures 7.1 and 7.2 also show the key motivic elements of the quartet which are subject to the sophisticated Brahmsian development and manipulation by Hurlstone as the piece progresses. They have been labelled A to F across the two figures. Hurlstone’s thematic development is best seen during the development section of the sonata form:

Figure 7.3 shows the type of development which occurs in the movement. Motives A, B and C appear more or less in their original rhythmic forms with variations to the pitches. However, the impressive feature of this development is that Hurlstone manages to amalgamate elements of the first and second subjects into a seamless melodic line, thereby creating completely organic variation. Such seamless variation and development was witnessed in Brahms’s music in Chapter 4 in pieces such as the Piano Quintet, Op. 34. The first movement also contains a Brahmsian false recapitulation which recalls the E flat tonality of the second subject.
The climax of the Quartet however, occurs in the final movement in a most Brahmsian fashion, when the material of the first movement re-appears towards the end:

Figure 7.4: Bars 146-149 of the final movement of Hurlstone's Piano Quartet in E minor, Op. 43
Figure 7.4 shows the return of the first subject group material from the first movement. It has been rhythmically augmented, and the strings are playing the material in canon with the piano, demonstrating the Brahmsian habit of allocating thematic material to all the instruments. As the figure demonstrates, Hurlstone uses the shape of the motivic material to move tonally from F sharp minor to C major, which continues in bars 150-157, until he reaches his goal of E major to conclude the work. The processes seen here are exactly the kind of variation that has been constantly seen in the music of Brahms, Parry and Stanford during the course of this study, suggesting that the music of Hurlstone is likely to be fertile territory for future analytical investigations of this type.

Hurlstone’s natural use of organic Brahmsian thematic unity is confirmed further when one considers the opening movement of the Sonata in D for Violoncello and Pianoforte. The movement is an even more concise sonata form than that of the Piano Quartet, Op. 43. Its principal subject groups are as follows:

![Figure 7.5: The first subject of the first movement of Hurlstone’s Cello Sonata in D](image)

![Figure 7.6: The second subject of the first movement of Hurlstone’s Cello Sonata in D](image)
Motives X and Y (labelled in figure 7.5) provide much of the motivic unity and consistency throughout the work. The sonata structure is very defined in the first movement, with the variation being more tonal rather than rhythmic or intervallic variations of the motivic cells. However, it is once again in the final movement that motive X makes a transformed re-appearance. The movement is in rondo form, with the A section being comprised of the following thematic material:

Figure 7.7: The opening bars of the final movement of Hurlstone’s Cello Sonata in D

Figure 7.7 demonstrates yet again a fusion of the principal cells from the first and second subject groups in the first movement to create aspects of the final movement. Bar 2 shows an inversion of the original motive Z, with motive X appearing in two forms, both rhythmically augmented in relation to their original appearances in the first movement. This provides more promising evidence that the Brahmsian principles of intricate organic thematic development within the boundaries of a traditional form or genre were almost definitely passed on in Stanford’s teaching.

The foregoing suggest that there is evidently much more scope for further study and discussion in relation to the reception and influence of Brahms’s music on composers of late nineteenth and early twentieth century England. This study has uncovered very
strong evidence in favour of the existence of Brahmsian processes within the music of such composers – an impressive achievement considering that Brahms never visited England. It would not be unreasonable to suggest that the next step in the research into this topic should be an analytical assessment of Hurlstone’s output in relation to Brahmsian thematic process. Whatever results maybe yielded in future research, this project has undoubtedly brought much needed clarity and definition to the popular notion that the music of Johannes Brahms influenced the output of Charles Hubert Hastings Parry and Charles Villiers Stanford. In fact, one could now comfortably state that they are inextricably linked and that, consequently, the indirect pervasive influence of Brahms may well yet prove to be even wider.
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## Appendix I: Complete List of Known Premières of Brahms’s Music in England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Opus Number</th>
<th>Performer/Conductor/Group/Location</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sarabande and Gavotte in the Style of Bach | WWO        | Hanover Square Rooms  
Piano: Clara Schumann                                                             | ‘Madame Schumann’s Recital’, *MW* 34/25 (21 June, 1856), p. 395  
‘Brief Chronicle of Last Month’, *MT* 7/161 (1 July, 1856), pp. 262-267-268 (p. 267)  
Musgrave, ‘Brahms and England’, p. 5 | 17 June, 1856 |
| Serenade in D                         | 11          | Crystal Palace Orchestra  
Conductor: August Manns                                                              | Sax-Wyndham, p. 66 and Musgrave, ‘Brahms and England’, p. 4-5                                | 25 April, 1863     |
| Ave Maria                             | 12          | Crystal Palace Orchestra  
Female chorus from the Royal Italian Opera  
Conductor: August Manns                                                              | ‘Crystal Palace’, *MW* 41/40 (3 October, 1863), p. 637                                      | Last week in September, 1863 |
<p>| Piano Quartet in A major | 26 | Piano: Agnes Zimmerman (performance informally observed by Florence May) | Florence May Brahms, II, p. 451, given in Musgrave, ‘Brahms and England’, p. 3 (this reference given by Musgrave does not appear to exist) | 6 July, 1865 |
| Piano Quartet in G minor | 25 | Hanover Square Rooms Piano: Willem Coenen Violin: Mr Wiener Viola: Mr Zerbini Violoncello: Herr Daubert | See date column | No exact date given, but the performance was reviewed in The Musical World journal (49/17), dated 29 April, 1871, p. 258 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Artists</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano Quartet in A major</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Hanover Square Rooms</td>
<td>Piano: Willem Coenen Violin: Mr Wiener Viola: Mr Zerbini Violoncello: Herr Daubert</td>
<td>See date column No exact date given, but the performance was reviewed in <em>The Musical World</em> journal (49/17), dated 29 April, 1871, p. 258 (this is the first officially noted performance of this piece)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Quintet in F minor</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Hanover Square Rooms</td>
<td>Piano: Willem Coenen Violin: Mr Wiener Viola: Mr Zerbini Violoncello: Herr Daubert</td>
<td>See date column No exact date given, but the performance was reviewed in <em>The Musical World</em> journal (49/17), dated 29 April, 1871, p. 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ein Deutsches Requiem</em> Piano Duet Version</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Private performance at the house of Lady Thompson, a teacher at the Royal Academy of Music</td>
<td>Musgrave, ‘Brahms and England’, p. 6 CV Stanford <em>Pages from an Unwritten Diary</em>, p 166</td>
<td>10 July, 1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Performance Details</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Piano Concerto</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Piano: Miss Bagelhole (a student from the Royal Academy of Music)</td>
<td>Crystal Palace Orchestra, Conductor: August Manns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Music’ The Graphic, 16 March, 1872, p. 255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 March, 1872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sextet in G</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Violin: Henry Holmes and Mr Folkes</td>
<td>Violoncello: Mr Ould and Mr Pezze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Viola: Mr Burnett and Mr Hann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 November, 1872 (also heard on a previous, unknown date at Holmes’s private musical evenings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Performers</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Serenade in A, following movements: Adagio Non Troppo, Menuetto, and Rondo AlLEGRO</td>
<td>16 March</td>
<td>The Hallé Orchestra in Manchester</td>
<td>Conductor: Charles Hallé</td>
<td>Thomas Batley, <em>Sir Charles Hallé's Concerts in Manchester</em>, p. 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(incorrectly cited as 29 June, 1874 under Cusins at the Philharmonic Society in Manchester, ‘Brahms and England’, p. 7)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballades for Pianoforte (Nos: 2 and 3)</td>
<td>10 March</td>
<td>Monday Popular Concerts at St James’s Hall</td>
<td>Piano: Clara Schumann</td>
<td>May, <em>Brahms</em>, II, p. 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Music’, <em>The Graphic</em>, 22 March, 1873, p. 278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ein Deutsches Requiem (Full Orchestral Version)</td>
<td>4 April</td>
<td>Philharmonic Society</td>
<td>Conductor: WG Cusins</td>
<td>Musgrave, ‘Brahms and England’, p. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soprano: Miss Sophie Ferrari</td>
<td>‘Philharmonic Society’, <em>MT</em>, 16/363, 1 May, 1873, p. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baritone: Mr Santley</td>
<td>‘Philharmonic Society’, <em>MMR</em>, 1 May, 1873, p. 66-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Serenade in A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Daily Orchestral Concerts at the Royal Albert Hall</td>
<td>‘Miscellaneous’, <em>MT</em>, 16/369, 1 November, 1873, p. 280 (incorrectly cited as 29 June, 1874 under Cusins at the Philharmonic Society in Musgrave, ‘Brahms and England’, p. 7)</td>
<td>Some time during October, 1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variations and Fugue on a Theme by Handel</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Crystal Palace</td>
<td>Musgrave, ‘Brahms and England’, p. 5</td>
<td>12 November, 1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variations on a Theme by Haydn (Pianoforte version)</td>
<td>56b</td>
<td>Hallé concerts in Manchester</td>
<td>Thomas Batley, <em>Sir Charles Hallé’s Concerts in Manchester</em>, p. 219</td>
<td>12 February, 1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piano: Dr. Hans von Bülow and Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dances, composed by Brahms, arranged by Joachim for violin and piano. Nos. 1, 5 and 6</td>
<td>WoO</td>
<td>Crystal Palace</td>
<td>‘Crystal Palace Concerts’, <em>MW</em>, 52/8, 21 February, 1874, p. 115</td>
<td>14 February, 1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piano: Mr Franklin Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| String Quartet in C minor | 51/1 | Mr Coenen’s Concert  
Instrumentalists: Mr Coenen, Mr Wiener, Mr Amor, Mr Zerbini, Mr Daubert and Mr Schlosser | ‘Mr Coenen’s Concerts’, *MMR*, 1 March, 1874, p. 44 | 20 February, 1874 |
| Variations on a Theme by Haydn | 56a | Crystal Palace orchestra  
Conductor: August Manns | Musgrave, ‘Brahms and England’, p. 7 (*Musgrave does not acknowledge the earlier première of the piano arrangement*)  
‘Crystal Palace’, *MT*, 16/374, 1 April, 1874, 447-448  
‘Crystal Palace’, *MMR*, 4, 1 April, 1874, 59-60  
‘Music of the Fortnight’, *The Examiner*, Saturday 14 March, 1874, p. 267  
‘Crystal Palace’, *Daily News*, Tuesday 17 March, 1874, p. 2 | 7 March, 1874 |
| **Schicksalslied** | 54 | Crystal Palace  
Conductor: August Manns | ‘Crystal Palace’, *MT*, 16/374, 1 April, 1874, 447-448 (p. 447)  
‘Crystal Palace’, *MMR*, 1 April, 1874, 59-60 (p. 60)  
‘Brahms’ *Schicksalslied*, *MW*, 52/14, 4 April, 1874, p. 208  
‘Music of the Fortnight’, *The Examiner*, Saturday 28 March, 1874, p. 324 | 21 March 1874 |
| **Variations on a Theme by Schumann** | 23 | Saturday Popular Concerts in St James’s Hall  
Piano: Agnes Zimmerman and Franklin Taylor  
(Joachim was also present at concert – played some Hungarian Dances) | ‘Monday Popular Concerts’  
*MMR*, 1 May, 1874, p. 76  
‘Saturday Popular Concerts’,  
*MW*, 52/14, 4 April, 1874, 210-211 (p. 210) | 30 March, 1874 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Conductor/Performers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dances, arranged by Brahms for Orchestra, Nos. 1, 3, and 6 (according to MMR) or 1, 2, and 3 (according to Daily News of November 2, 1874) from the original set for Piano.</td>
<td>Saturday, 31 October, 1874</td>
<td>Crystal Palace Orchestra&lt;br&gt;Conductor: August Manns&lt;br&gt;‘Crystal Palace’, MMR, 1 December, 1874, 171-172 (p. 171)&lt;br&gt;‘Music- Crystal Palace’, Daily News, Monday, 2 November, 1874, p 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liebeslieder Waltzer</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Henry Leslie’s concerts</td>
<td>‘Mr. Henry Leslie’s Concerts’, MT, 17/385, 1 March, 1875, 11-12 (p. 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quartet in A minor</td>
<td>51/2</td>
<td>Willem Coenen’s Musical Evenings at St. George’s Hall&lt;br&gt;Instrumentalists: Mr Coenen, Mr Wiener, Mr Amor, Mr Zerbini and Mr Lasserre</td>
<td>‘Miscellaneous Concerts, MT, 17/386, 1 April, 1875, 51-53 (p. 51)&lt;br&gt;‘Mr Willem Coenen’s Concerts’, MMR, 1 April, 1875, p. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Quartet in C minor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Willem Coenen’s Musical Evenings&lt;br&gt;Instrumentalists: Mr Coenen, Mr Wiener, Mr Amor, Mr Zerbini and Mr Daubert</td>
<td>‘Miscellaneous Concerts’, MT, 17/398, 1 April, 1876, 437-438 (p. 437)&lt;br&gt;‘Mr Willem Coenen’s Concert’, MMR, 1 April, 1876, 63-64 (p.63-64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Performance Details</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rinaldo</em></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Crystal Palace</td>
<td>‘Theatrical Entertainments’, <em>Morning Post</em>, 17 April, 1876, p. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conductor: August Manns</td>
<td>‘Crystal Palace Concerts’, <em>The Standard</em>, 17 April, 1876, p. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quartet in B flat</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Herr Hermann Franke at the RAM (unofficial performance)</td>
<td>‘Monday Popular Concerts’, <em>MT</em>, 18/409, 1 March, 1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joachim (with Ries, Straus and Piatti) at the Monday Popular Concerts (first official performance)</td>
<td>‘Monday and Saturday Popular Concerts’, <em>MMR</em>, 1 March, 1877 (48-49), p. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Brahms’s Quartet in B flat’, <em>MW</em> 55/8, 24 February, 1877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *MT* report indicates that 19 February, 1877 was the British premier, with Joachim however, reports in the *MMR* and *MW*, suggest that it was played at one of Hermann Franke’s semi-private musical evenings at the RAM at some point before this.
| Symphony No. 1 in C minor | 68 | CUMS | Musgrave, ‘Brahms and England’, pp. 8-10  
‘Josef Joachim, Mus. Doc., Cantab’, MT, 18/410, 1 April, 1877 170-172  
‘Music at Cambridge’, MMR, 1 April, 1877, 51-52  
‘Joachim at Cambridge’, MW, 55/11, 17 March, 1877, 191-194 | 8 March, 1877 |
|--------------------------|----|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Alto Rhapsody            | 53 | CUMS | ‘Cambridge University Music Society’, MT, 18/412, 1 June, 1877, 279-280  
‘Cambridge University Musical Society’, Daily News, 23 May, 1877, p. 2  
‘Cambridge University Musical Society’, The Standard, 23 May, 1877, p. 3  
‘Music at Cambridge’, The Examiner, 26 May, 1877, p. 662 | 22 May, 1877 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neue Liebeslieder</strong>&lt;br&gt;Walzer</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Monday Popular Concert at St James’s Hall under Mr. Arthur Chappell&lt;br&gt;Piano: Agnes Zimmermann, Ida Henry&lt;br&gt;Vocals: Mme Sophie Lowe, Mdlle Redeker, Messrs Shakespeare and Pyatt</td>
<td>‘Monday Popular Concerts’, <em>Pall Mall Gazette</em>, Thursday 29 November, 1877, p.11-12</td>
<td>25 November, 1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four Ballades</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Charles Hallé’s pianoforte recitals</td>
<td>‘Multiple Arts and Popular Culture items’, <em>The Standard</em>, 20 June, 1878, p. 3</td>
<td>No exact date given but within a few days of the publication of the article. This is the first recorded public performance, but the report indicates that the pieces had been played frequently by piano students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Second Symphony in D | 73 | Crystal Palace Orchestra  
‘Crystal Palace’, *MT*, 19/429, 1 November, 1878, p. 598-599  
‘Crystal Palace Concerts’,  
*MMR*, 8, 1 November, 1878, 172-173  
‘Crystal Palace Saturday Concerts’, *MW*, 56/41, 12 October, 1878, 653-654  
‘Music’, *The Graphic*, 12 October, 1878, p. 371  
‘Multiple Arts and Popular Culture Items’, *The Standard*, 7 October, 1878, p. 6  
‘Crystal Palace Saturday Concerts’, *The Era*, 13 October, p. 5 | 5 October, 1878 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violin Concerto</th>
<th>77</th>
<th>Violin: Joseph Joachim</th>
<th>Musgrave, ‘Brahms at the Crystal Palace’, p. 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Palace Orchestra</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Crystal Palace’, <em>MT</em>, 20/433, 1 March, 1879, 145-146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductor: August Manns</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Crystal Palace’, <em>MMR</em>, 9, 1 March, 1879, 46-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Crystal Palace Concerts’, <em>MW</em>, 57/9, 1 March, 1879, 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Crystal Palace’ <em>The Morning Post</em>, 24 February, 1879, p. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Music’, <em>The Examiner</em>, 1 March, 1879, p. 274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piece</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sixteen Waltzes for Piano</em></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Herr Lehmeyer’s concert at Langham Hall Piano: Miss Bessie Richards</td>
<td>New concert series on which no major journal reported. Based on this date, the piece could only have been Op. 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Es ist das Heil</em> (unaccompanied motet)</td>
<td>29/1</td>
<td>The Bach Choir</td>
<td>‘The Bach Choir’, <em>MT</em>, 20/436, 1 June, 1879, 311-312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Triumphlied</em></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Herr Henschel at St James’s Hall (charity concert)</td>
<td>‘Herr Henschel’s Concert’, <em>MT</em>, 21/443, 1 January, 1880, p. 20+27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piece</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin Sonata</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>The Monday Popular Concerts</td>
<td>‘Monday Popular Concerts’, <em>MT</em>, 21/445, 1 March, 1880, 125-126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Music’, <em>The Graphic</em> Saturday 7 February, 1880, p. 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Music – Gossip’ <em>The Examiner</em> Saturday 14 February, 1880, p. 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 February, 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monday 1 March, 1880 (first officially noted performance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variations on a Theme of Paganini for</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Monday Popular Concerts</td>
<td>‘Monday Popular Concerts’, <em>MT</em>, 21/446, 1 April, 1880, 172-173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pianoforte alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Music’, <em>Daily News</em>, Wednesday 3 March, 1880, p. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(full composition was not played but</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a selection of the variations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two horns and harp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sunday 21 November, 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piece</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Conductor: August Manns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Academic Festival Overture</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Crystal Palace Orchestra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conductor: August Manns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tragic Overture</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Crystal Palace Orchestra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conductor: August Manns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhapsody in B minor</td>
<td>79/1</td>
<td>Monday Popular concerts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>under Arthur Chappell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piano: Mdlle. Janothe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some publications also maintained that this was the premier of Op. 51/2 – this piece was actually premiered in 1875.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece/Event</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piece</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pianoforte Trio in C</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Monday Popular Concerts</td>
<td>‘Monday and Saturday Popular Concerts’, <em>MT</em>, 24/480, 1 February, 1883, 78-79</td>
<td>Monday 22 January, 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quintet in F</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Henry Holmes’s Musical Evenings at the RAM</td>
<td>‘Music – Mr Holmes Musical Evenings’, <em>Daily News</em>, Friday 26 January, 1883, p. 6</td>
<td>Wednesday 24 January, 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Instrumentalists: Mr Henry Holmes, Mr W. F. Parker, Mr A. Gibson, Mr W. H. Hill, Mr E. Howell)</td>
<td>‘Recent Music’, <em>Pall Mall Gazette</em>, 26 January, 1883, p. 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Gesang der Parzen**  
*(Song of the fates)* | 89  | The Richter Concerts            | ‘Richter Concerts’, *MT*, 25/496, 1 June, 1884, 335-336                                | 5 May, 1884                                                     |
|                   |     | Conductor: Hans Richter         | ‘Richter Concerts’, *MMR*, 1 June, 1884, 136-137                                           |                                                                 |
|                   |     |                                 | ‘Current Music’ *Pall Mall Gazette*, 6 May, 1884, p. 4                                     |                                                                 |
|                   |     |                                 | ‘Music’ *The Graphic*, 10 May, 1884, p. 4                                                  |                                                                 |
|                   |     |                                 | ‘Music’ *Daily News*, 15 May, 1884, p. 3                                                   |                                                                 |
|                   |     |                                 | ‘Music’, *The Graphic*, 17 May, 1884, p. 4                                                 |                                                                 |
|                   |     |                                 | ‘Music and the Drama’, *Glasgow Herald*, 19 May, 1874, p. 7                               |                                                                 |
|                   |     |                                 | ‘Musical Notes’, *The Liverpool Mercury*, 21 May, 1884, p. 5                              |                                                                 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symphony No. 3 in F</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>The Richter Concerts</th>
<th>‘Richter Concerts’, <em>MT</em>, 25/496, 1 June, 1884, 335-336</th>
<th>Monday 12 May, 1884</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conductor: Hans Richter</td>
<td>‘Richter Concerts’, <em>MMR</em>, 1 June, 1884, 136-137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Music’ <em>The Graphic</em>, 17 May, 1884, p. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Music and the Drama’, <em>Glasgow Herald</em>, 19 May, 1874, p. 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Musical Notes’, <em>The Liverpool Mercury</em>, 21 May, 1884, p. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Songs for Contralto with Viola Obligato</td>
<td>‘Literature and Art’&lt;br&gt;Nottinghamshire Guardian 23 May, 1884, p. 3</td>
<td>23 May, 1884, p. 3</td>
<td>The Sheffield and Rotherham Independent, 24 May, 1884, p. 4</td>
<td>It is not altogether certain whether this was actually the first performance in England, as there is no known documented record of the British premier of this work. However, when this piece was performed in the same concert series just over a year later on 16 December 1886, there is a note in Dannreuther’s programme of the evening under this piece saying ‘Second performance’, which would suggest that this one was in fact the British premier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Dannreuther’s Musical Evenings at Orme Square</td>
<td>Concert programme of the evening at Orme Square</td>
<td>Thursday 5 November, 1885</td>
<td>Vocals: Miss Lena Little</td>
<td>‘Mr Dannreuther’s Musical Evening’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Violoncello Sonata in F | 99 | Princes Hall  
Violoncello: Mr Hausmann  
Piano: Mr Pauer | ‘Mr Hausmann’s Violoncello Recitals’, *MT*, 28/531, 1 May, 1887, 282  
‘Music’, *The Graphic*, 9 April, 1887, p. 378 | 6 April, 1887 |
|------------------------|----|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Symphony No. 4 in E Minor | 98 | The Richter Concerts  
Conductor: Hans Richter | ‘Richter Concerts’, *MT*, 27/520, 1 June, 1886, 333-334  
‘Richter Concerts’, *MMR*, 1 June, 1886, 139  
‘Music’, *Daily News*, 13 May, 1886, p. 6  
‘Music and the Drama’, *The Glasgow Herald*, 17 May, 1886, p. 8 | Monday 10 May, 1886 |
<p>| Evenings’, <em>MT</em>, 26/514, 1 December, 1885, 721 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Instrumentalists</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trio in C minor</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Princes Hall</td>
<td>Mr Kwast, Mr Deichmann and Mr Fuchs</td>
<td>‘Chamber Concerts’, <em>MT</em>, 28/532, 1 June, 1887, 344-345 * ‘Music and the Drama’, <em>Glasgow Herald</em>, 16 May, 1887, p. 7</td>
<td>30 April, 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata in A for Violin and Piano</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Summer Concert at St James’s Hall</td>
<td>Piano: Charles Hallé Violin: Madame Norman-Néruda</td>
<td>‘Recent Concerts’, <em>The Morning Post</em>, 24 May, 1887, p. 3</td>
<td>20 May, 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Double Concerto for</strong></td>
<td>102</td>
<td><strong>Mr. Henschel’s Concert</strong></td>
<td><strong>Wednesday 15 February, 1888</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violin and Violoncello</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘London Symphony Concerts’, <em>MT</em>, 29/541, 1 March, 1888, 150-151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Music’, <em>Daily News</em>, 16 February, 1888, p. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘London Symphony Concerts’, <em>The Standard</em>, 16 February, 1888, p. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zigeunerlieder</strong></td>
<td>103</td>
<td><strong>Monday Popular Concerts.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocals: Mr and Mrs Henschel, Mr. Shakespeare, Miss Lena Little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piano: Fanny Davies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Monday and Saturday Popular Concerts’, <em>MT</em>, 29/550, 1 December, 1888, 725-726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘The Year 1888’, <em>MMR</em>, 1 January, 1889, 1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Monday Popular Concerts’, <em>The Morning Post</em>, Wednesday 28 November, 1888, p. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Instruments</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata for Violin and Piano in D minor</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Piano: Fanny Davies Violin: Ludwig Straus</td>
<td>‘Miss Fanny Davies’s Concert’, <em>MT</em>, 30/556, 1 June, 1889, 345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Miscellaneous Concerts’, <em>MMR</em>, 1 June, 1889, 136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Princes Hall’, <em>The Standard</em>, 9 May, 1889, p. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quintet in G major</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Monday and Saturday Popular Concerts Violin: Unknown, but probably Joseph Joachim</td>
<td>‘Monday and Saturday Popular Concerts’, <em>MT</em>, 32/578, 1 April, 1891, 215-217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘The Popular Concerts’, <em>MMR</em>, 1 April, 1891, 66-67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Music’, <em>Daily News</em>, 3 March, 1891, p. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Music and the Theatre’, <em>The Pall Mall Gazette</em>, 3 March, 1891, p. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Monday Popular Concerts’,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Violin: Joseph Joachim  
Violoncello: Piatti  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Compiler</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three Motets: ‘Fest und Gedenksprüche’</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>The Bach Choir</td>
<td>‘The Bach Choir’, MT, 32/580, 1 June, 1891, 339</td>
<td>Wednesday 13 May, 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conductor: Charles Villiers Stanford</td>
<td>‘Concerts’, The Standard, 13 May, 1891, p. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Music’, The Graphic, 16 May, 1891, p. 558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Music and the Drama’, The Glasgow Herald, 18 May, 1891, p. 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Four Part Songs</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Monday and Saturday Popular Concerts</td>
<td>‘Monday and Saturday Popular Concerts’, MT, 33/587, 1 January, 1892, 22-23</td>
<td>Monday 14 December, 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocals: Mr and Mrs Henschel, Madame Fassett, and Mr Shakespeare</td>
<td>‘Popular Concerts’, MMR, 1 January, 1892, 17-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Monday Popular Concerts’, Morning Post, 15 December, 1891, p. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 28 March, 1892</td>
<td><strong>Clarinet Quintet</strong> &lt;br&gt;115&lt;br&gt;Clarinet: Herr Mühlfeld&lt;br&gt;Violin: Joseph Joachim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ‘Monday Popular Concerts’, *The Standard*, 15 December, 1891, p. 3

- ‘Monday and Saturday Popular Concerts’, *MT*, 33/591, 1 May, 1892, 277
- ‘Music and the Theatres’, *Pall Mall Gazette*, 29 March, 1892, p. 2
- ‘Monday Popular Concerts’, *The Morning Post*, 29 March, 1892, p. 3
- ‘Monday Popular Concerts’, *The Standard*, 29 March, 1892, p. 3
- ‘Music’, *The Graphic*, 2 April, 1892, p. 434
- ‘Music and the Drama’, *The Glasgow Herald*, 4 April, 1892, p. 9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Concert Details</th>
<th>Source Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarinet Trio</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Monday and Saturday Popular Concerts, Piano: Fanny Davies, Violoncello: Piatti, and Clarinet: Herr Mühlfeld</td>
<td>‘Monday and Saturday Popular Concerts’, <em>MT</em>, 33/591, 1 May, 1892, 277 ‘Music and the Drama’, <em>Glasgow Herald</em>, 4 April, 1892, p. 9 ‘Recent Concerts’, <em>Morning Post</em>, 4 April, 1892, p. 3 ‘Saturday Popular Concerts’, <em>The Standard</em>, 4 April, 1892, p. 3</td>
<td>Saturday 2 April, 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Fantasias for Piano</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Monday and Saturday Popular Concerts, Piano: Fanny Davies</td>
<td>‘Monday and Saturday Popular Concerts’, <em>MT</em>, 34/601, 1 March, 1893, 151-152</td>
<td>Monday 30 January, 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Piano Performer</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Clavierstücke (of which 5 were selected from the total of 10) | Monday and Saturday Popular Concerts  
                               Piano: Miss Eibenschütz | ‘Monday and Saturday Popular Concerts’, *MT*, 35/612, 1 February, 1894, 97  
‘Music and the Drama’, *Berrow’s Worcester Journal*, 27 January, 1894, p. 6  
‘Music of the Week’, *The Graphic*, 27 January, 1894, p. 87 | Monday 22 January 1894 |
| Clavierstücke (complete works)                         | Recital in St James’s Hall  
                               Piano: Miss Eibenschütz | ‘Music and the Drama’, *Berrow’s Worcester Journal*, 10 March, 1894, p. 6  
Musgrave, p. 12 *(Musgrave does not acknowledge the concert on 22 January 1894 when each of these works were partially performed)* | Wednesday 7 March, 1894 |
| Two Clarinet Sonatas | 120 | Fanny Davies’s concert at St James’s Hall  
| | | Piano: Fanny Davies  
| | | Clarinet: Herr Mühlfeld  
| | | ‘Miscellaneous Concerts’, *MT*, 36/629, 1 July, 1895, 478-480  
| | | ‘Yesterday’s Concerts’, *The Standard*, 25 June, 1895, p. 3  
| | | ‘Concerts’, *The Morning Post*, 26 June, 1895, p. 5  
| | | ‘Music and the Drama’, *Berrow’s Worcester Journal*, 29 June, 1895, p. 6  
| | | ‘Music’, *Lloyd’s Weekly Newspaper*, 30 June, 1895, p. 9  
| | | 24 June, 1895  |
| **Vier Ernste Gesänge**  
| (Four Serious Songs) | 121 | St James’s Hall  
| Vocals: Mr David Bispham |  | ‘Miscellaneous Concerts’, *MT*, 37/646, 1 December, 1896, 829-831  
|  |  | ‘Musical Notes’, *The Era*, 31 October, 1896, p. 9  
|  |  | ‘Concerts’, *The Morning Post*, 2 November, 1896, p. 6  
|  |  | ‘Saturday’s Concerts’, *The Standard*, 2 November, 1896, p. 3  
|  |  | ‘Musical Notes’, *The Era*, 7 November, 1896, p. 9  
|  |  | **Saturday 31 October, 1896** |
| Eleven Chorale Preludes | 122 | No specific première performance of the pieces, as they were compiled and published posthumously in April, 1902 and began to appear in organ recitals towards the end of that year | N/A | N/A |
Appendix II: Complete List of performances of Brahms’s music at Charles Hallé’s Concerts in Manchester as listed in Thomas Batley’s Monograph Sir Charles Hallé’s Concerts in Manchester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Opus Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Artist/Conductor</th>
<th>Date of original premier in England (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dances 1,3 and 6 (Joachim’s arrangement for violin and piano)</td>
<td>WoO</td>
<td>Thursday 22 February, 1872</td>
<td>Violin: Joseph Joachim, Piano: Charles Hallé</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serenade in D</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Thursday 12 December, 1872</td>
<td>Orchestra, Conductor: Charles Hallé</td>
<td>25 April 1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Hungarian Dances (no numbers given)</td>
<td>WoO</td>
<td>Thursday 20 February, 1873</td>
<td>Violin: Joseph Joachim, Piano: Charles Hallé</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adagio Non Troppò, Menuetto, and Rondo Allegro from the Second Serenade in A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Thursday 6 March, 1873</td>
<td>Orchestra, Conductor: Charles Hallé</td>
<td>This was the premier performance of these movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variations on a Theme by Haydn (two pianofortes)</td>
<td>56b</td>
<td>Thursday 12 February, 1874</td>
<td>Piano: Dr. Hans von Bülow and Mr Charles Hallé</td>
<td>This was the premier performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piece</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Artists and Details</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *Ein Deutsches Requiem*           | 45  | Thursday 26 November, 1874 | Orchestra and Chorus  
Conductor: Charles Hallé,  
Soprano: Johanna Levier  
Baritone: Edward Lloyd | 10 July, 1871 |
| Three Hungarian Dances (no numbers given) | WoO | Thursday 24 December, 1874 | Violin: Madame Norman-Néruda | N/A |
| Lieder: ‘Sonntag’                 | 47/3| Thursday 4 March, 1875  | Vocals: Mdlle. Sophie Lowe  
Piano: unknown but probably Charles Hallé |            |
| Variations on a Theme by Haydn (orchestra) | 56a | Thursday 27 January, 1876 | Orchestra  
Conductor: Charles Hallé | 7 March, 1874 |
| ‘Golden Days’ from Rinaldo         | 50  | Thursday 28 December, 1876 | Orchestra  
Vocals: Mr Edward Lloyd  
Conductor: Charles Hallé | 15 April, 1876 |
| Liebeslieder Walzer (four hands on the pianoforte and four voices) | 52  | Thursday 8 March, 1877  | Piano: Charles Hallé and Edward Hecht  
Vocals: Mdlles. Friedländer and H. Von Arnim, Messrs. W Shakespeare and Pyatt | 18 February, 1875 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hungarian Dance in G Minor (no. 1)</th>
<th>WoO</th>
<th>Thursday 13 December, 1877</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>14 February, 1874</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Symphony in C minor</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Thursday 3 January, 1878</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>8 March, 1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conductor: Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Symphony in D</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Thursday 21 November, 1878</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>5 October, 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conductor: Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songs: ‘Wie bist du, meine Königin’ and ‘Meine Lieb’ ist grün’</td>
<td>32/9 and 63/5</td>
<td>Thursday 28 November, 1878</td>
<td>Vocals: Mdlle. Fides Keller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piano: Dr Hans von Bülow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song: ‘Liebestreu’</td>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>Thursday 11 December, 1879</td>
<td>Vocals: Mdlle. Friedländer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piano: Unknown, but probably Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song: Unüberwindlich</td>
<td>72/5</td>
<td>Thursday 26 December, 1879</td>
<td>Vocals: Herr Henschel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piano: Unknown, but probably Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Hungarian Dances (5 and 6)</td>
<td>WoO</td>
<td>Thursday 15 January, 1880</td>
<td>Piano: Unknown, but probably Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scherzo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Thursday 29 January, 1880</td>
<td>Piano: Dr. Hans von Bülow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Op.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Performance Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Symphony in D</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Thursday 4 March, 1880</td>
<td>Orchestra Conductor: Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Festival Overture</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Thursday 27 October, 1881</td>
<td>Orchestra Conductor: Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Hungarian Dances (Pianoforte Version), nos. 7,4, and 6</td>
<td>WoO</td>
<td>Thursday 24 November, 1881</td>
<td>Piano: Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song: ‘Sonntag’</td>
<td>47/3</td>
<td>Thursday 15 December, 1881</td>
<td>Vocals: Mdlle. Louisa Pyk Piano: Unknown, but probably Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin Concerto in D</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Thursday 23 February, 1882</td>
<td>Violin: Joseph Joachim Orchestra Conductor: Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Hungarian Dances (numbers not given)</td>
<td>WoO</td>
<td>Thursday 6 March, 1884</td>
<td>Violin: Joseph Joachim Piano: Unknown, but probably Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Third Symphony in F             | 90   | Thursday 6 November, 1884 | Orchestra  
Conductor: Charles Hallé | Monday, 12 May, 1884 |
|--------------------------------|------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Hungarian Dance in G Minor (no. 1) | WoO  | Thursday 29 Jan, 1885    | Violin: Mme. Norman Néruda  
Piano: Charles Hallé | 14 February, 1874   |
| Variations on a Theme by Haydn | 56a  | Thursday 10 December, 1885 | Orchestra  
Conductor: Charles Hallé | 7 March, 1874       |
| Scherzo in E flat minor        | 4    | Thursday 24 December, 1885 | Piano: Charles Hallé        |                     |
| Violin Concerto in D           | 77   | Thursday 16 February, 1888 | Violin: Joseph Joachim  
Orchestra  
Conductor: Charles Hallé | 22 February, 1879 |
| Academic Festival Overture     | 80   | Thursday 22 November, 1888 | Orchestra  
Conductor: Charles Hallé | 30 April, 1881      |
| Fourth Symphony in E minor     | 98   | Thursday 24 January, 1889 | Orchestra  
Conductor: Charles Hallé | Monday 10 May, 1886 |
| Concerto in A minor for violin and violoncello | 102 | Thursday 7 February, 1889 | Violin: Lady Hallé (Norman Néruda)  
Violoncello: Signor Piatti  
Orchestra  
Conductor: Charles Hallé | Wednesday 15 February 1888 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hungarian Dance in G minor (no. 1) | WoO | Thursday 12 December, 1889 | Violin: Herr Willy Hess  
Piano: Unknown, but probably Charles Hallé | |
| Song: ‘Feldeinsamkeit’ | 86/2 | Thursday, 9 January, 1890 | Vocals: Mr. Plunkett-Greene  
Piano: Unknown, but probably Charles Hallé | |
| Song: ‘Wiegenlied’ | 49/4 | Thursday 30 January, 1890 | Vocals: Mme. De Swaitlowsky  
Piano: Unknown, but probably Charles Hallé | |
| Song: ‘Dort in den Weiden’ | 97/4 | Thursday 11 December, 1890 | Vocals: Mme. Schmidt-Köhne  
Piano: Unknown, but probably Charles Hallé | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date of Performance</th>
<th>Orchestra/Conductor</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Symphony in D</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Thursday 8 January, 1891</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>5 October, 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conductor: Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song: ‘Junge Lieder’</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Thursday 29 January, 1891</td>
<td>Vocals: Mme. Stavenhagen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piano: Unknown but probably Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song: ‘Ruhe süss Liebchen’</td>
<td>33/9</td>
<td>Thursday 12 March, 1891</td>
<td>Vocals: Mme. Schmidt-Köhne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piano: Unknown, but probably Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dance No. 3</td>
<td>WoO</td>
<td>Thursday 14 January, 1892</td>
<td>Piano: Mme Sophie Menter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto for Violin and Violoncello</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Thursday 9 February, 1893</td>
<td>Violin: Lady Hallé (Norman-Néruda)</td>
<td>Wednesday 15 February, 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violoncello: Herr Hugo Becker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conductor: Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dance in G minor (no. 1)</td>
<td>WoO</td>
<td>Thursday 14 December, 1893</td>
<td>Piano: Mr. Leonard Borwick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhapsodie in G minor</td>
<td>79/2</td>
<td>Thursday 22 November, 1894</td>
<td>Piano: Mr Leonard Borwick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song: ‘Mainacht’</td>
<td>42/2</td>
<td>Thursday 29 November, 1894</td>
<td>Vocals: Miss Brema, Piano: Unknown, but probably Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song: Feldeinsamkeit</td>
<td>86/2</td>
<td>Thursday 17 Jan, 1895</td>
<td>Vocals: Mdle. Hiller, Piano: Unknown, but probably Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variations on a Theme by Haydn</td>
<td>56a</td>
<td>Thursday 31 January, 1895</td>
<td>Orchestra, Conductor: Charles Hallé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III: The Performances of Brahms’s Music at the Dannreuther’s Musical Evenings at Orme Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Performers</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Wiegenlied</em> (Op. 49, No. 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trio in E flat for Horn Violin and Piano (Op. 40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trio in E flat for Horn Violin and Piano (Op. 40)</td>
<td>Horn: Herr Wendland</td>
<td>Thursday 16 November 1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violin: Mr G. Dannreuther</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piano: Mr E. Dannreuther</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Piano Quintet in F minor (Op. 34)</td>
<td>Violins: Herr Kummer and Mr Lane</td>
<td>Thursday 14 December 1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Viola: Mr G. Dannreuther</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violoncello: Herr Daubert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piano: Mr E. Dannreuther</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Work Description</td>
<td>Performers</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3   | Piano Quartet in G minor (Op. 25) | Violin: Mr H. Holmes  
Viola: Herr Stehlig  
Violoncello: Signor Pezze  
Pianoforte: Mr E. Dannreuther | Thursday 15 February 1877 |
| 3   | Piano Quartet in A major (Op. 26) | Violin: Mr H. Holmes  
Viola: Mr Frank Amor  
Violoncello: Signor Pezze  
Pianoforte: Mr E. Dannreuther | Thursday 15 March, 1877 |
| 4   | ‘Der Gang zum Lieben’ (Op. 48, No. 1)  
‘Sonntag’ (Op. 47, No 3)  
‘Ruhe Süssliebchen’ (Op. 33, No. 9) | Vocalists: Miss Anna Williams and Miss Annie Butterworth  
Piano: Mr E. Dannreuther | Thursday 31 January, 1878 |
| 6   | Piano Quartet in A major (Op. 26) | Violin: Mr H Holmes  
Viola: Herr Carl Jung  
Violoncello: Mons. Lasserre  
Pianoforte: Mr E. Dannreuther | Thursday 16 January, 1879 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Performers</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7 | ‘Mainacht’ (Op. 43, No. 2)  
Romanzen aus ‘Magelone’ No. 12 (Op. 33)  
‘Wie bist du meine Königin’, (Op. 32, No. 9)  
Pianoforte Quintet in F minor (Op. 34) | Vocals: Miss Anna Williams and Mr Barnard Lane  
Violin: Herr Ludwig and Mr Gibson  
Viola: Herr Jung  
Violoncello: Herr Daubert  
Pianoforte: Mr E. Dannreuther | Thursday 5 January, 1880 |
| 8 | Piano Quartet in A Major (Op. 26) | Violin: Mr H. Holmes and Mr A. Gibson  
Viola: Herr Jung  
Violoncello: Mons. Lasserre  
Pianoforte: Mr E. Dannreuther | |
| 9 | Romanzen aus ‘Magelone’ (Op. 33 No. 12)  
‘Mainacht’ (Op. 43, No. 2)  
Piano Quartet in G Minor (Op. 25) | Vocals: Anna Williams  
Violin: Mr H. Holmes and Mr A. Gibson  
Viola: Herr Jung  
Violoncello: Mons. Lasserre  
Pianoforte: Mr E. Dannreuther | Thursday 17 November, 1881 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Instrumentation</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Piano Quartet in A (Op. 26)</td>
<td>Violin: Mr Holmes and Mr Gibson</td>
<td>Thursday 16 December, 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Viola: Herr Jung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violoncello: Albert, Egerton?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violoncello: Albert, Egerton?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pianoforte: Mr E. Dannreuther</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Piano Quintet in F minor (Op. 34)</td>
<td>Violin: Mr Holmes and Mr Gibson</td>
<td>Thursday 21 December, 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Viola: Herr Jung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violoncello: Albert, Egerton?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violoncello: Albert, Egerton?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pianoforte: Mr E. Dannreuther</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Piano Trio in C (Op. 87)</td>
<td>Violin: Mr H. Holmes</td>
<td>Thursday 8 February, 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violoncello: Mons. Lasserre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pianoforte: Mr E. Dannreuther</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cello Sonata in E minor (Op. 38)</td>
<td>Violoncello: Mons. Lasserre</td>
<td>Thursday 15 February, 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pianoforte: Mr E. Dannreuther</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Performers</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>String Quintet in F (Op. 88)</td>
<td>Violin: Herr Ludwig, Mr Gibson Viola: Herr Jung, Mr Hill Violoncello: Mons. Lasserre</td>
<td>Thursday, 22 February, 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Two Rhapsodies for Piano (Op. 79)</td>
<td>Pianoforte: Mr E. Dannreuther</td>
<td>Thursday 18 March, 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Piano Trio in C (Op. 87)</td>
<td>NO RECORD</td>
<td>Thursday 27 January 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cello Sonata in E minor (Op. 38)</td>
<td>NO RECORD</td>
<td>Thursday 10 February 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Duet: ‘I know a maiden fair to see’ (Op. 66, No. 5)</td>
<td>Vocals: Miss Louise Phillips and Miss Lena Little Pianoforte: Mr E. Dannreuther</td>
<td>Thursday 24 February 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Junge Lieder (Op. 63, No. 5)</td>
<td>Vocals: Miss Anna Williams and Miss Annie Butterworth Piano: Mr E. Dannreuther</td>
<td>Thursday 10 March 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Two Songs for Contralto with Viola Obligato (Op. 91)</td>
<td>Dannreuther and Lena Little (Recorded in ‘Mr Dannreuther’s Musical Evenings’, MT, 26/514, Dec 1, 1885, 721)</td>
<td>Thursday 5 November, 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Piano Trio in C (Op. 87)</td>
<td>NO RECORD</td>
<td>Thursday 19 November 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Performers</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>‘Wie rafft ich mich auf in der nacht’ (Op 32, No. 1)</td>
<td>NO RECORD</td>
<td>Thursday 3 December 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘So willst du des Armen dich gnädig erbarmen’ (Op. 33, No. 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Piano Quintet in F minor (Op. 34)</td>
<td>Holmes, Gomperz, Betjemann, Gibson, Ould, Joseph Smith (Horn), E. Dannreuther, Anna Williams, Miss Damian, Lena Little and Herbert Thorndike</td>
<td>Thursday 4 November 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Violin Sonata in G (Op. 78)</td>
<td>Holmes, Gomperz, Betjemann, Gibson, Ould, Joseph Smith (Horn), E. Dannreuther, Anna Williams, Miss Damian, Lena Little and Herbert Thorndike</td>
<td>Thursday 18 November 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Horn Trio in E flat (Op. 40)</td>
<td>Holmes, Gomperz, Betjemann, Gibson, Ould, Joseph Smith (Horn), E. Dannreuther, Anna Williams, Miss Damian, Lena Little and Herbert Thorndike</td>
<td>Thursday 2 December 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duets for Soprano and Contralto:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) ‘Phänomen’ (Op. 61, No 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) ‘Weg der Liebe’ I and II (Op. 20, No. 1 and 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Two Songs for Contralto with Viola Obligato (Op. 91)</td>
<td>Holmes, Gomperz, Betjemann, Gibson, Ould, Joseph Smith (Horn), E. Dannreuther, Anna Williams, Miss Damian, Lena Little and Herbert Thorndike</td>
<td>Thursday 16 December 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Second Performance</em> (suggesting that the first British performance was a year earlier in 1885, 16th series, at Orme Square)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>‘Der Tod das ist die kühle Nacht’ (Op. 96, No. 1)</td>
<td>Vocals: Miss Lena Little</td>
<td>Thursday 5 January, 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Meerfahrt’ (Op. 96, No. 4)</td>
<td>Pianoforte: Mr E. Dannreuther</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Performers</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Piano Trio in C minor (Op. 101)</td>
<td>Gibson, Gompertz, Grimson, Kreutz, Ould, E. Dannreuther</td>
<td>Thursday 2 February 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Cello Sonata No. 2 in F (Op. 99)</td>
<td>Gibson, Gompertz, Grimson, Kreutz, Ould, E. Dannreuther</td>
<td>Thursday 16 February 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>‘O Kühler Wald’ (Op. 72, No. 3)</td>
<td>Miss Anna Williams, Miss Lena Little, Madame Marion Mackenzie, Mr E. Dannreuther</td>
<td>Thursday 31 January 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Salome’ (Op. 69, No. 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Piano Trio in C minor (Op. 101)</td>
<td>Gibson, Gompertz, Grimson, Kreutz, Ould, E. Dannreuther</td>
<td>Thursday 14 February 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Piano Quartet in G minor (Op. 25)</td>
<td>Gibson, Gompertz, Grimson, Kreutz, Ould, E. Dannreuther</td>
<td>Thursday 28 February 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>‘Liebestreu’ (Op. 3, No. 1)</td>
<td>Vocals: Miss Anna Williams</td>
<td>Thursday 16 January 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Feldeinsamkeit’ (Op. 86, No. 2)</td>
<td>Pianoforte: Mr E Dannreuther</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Vergebliches Ständchen’ (Op. 84, No. 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>‘Die Mainacht’ (Op. 43, No. 2)</td>
<td>Vocals: Miss Anna Williams</td>
<td>Thursday 30 January 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Botschaft’ (Op. 47, No. 1)</td>
<td>Pianoforte: Mr E Dannreuther</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Piano Quintet in F minor (Op. 34)</td>
<td>Gibson, Grimson, Kreutz, Ould, Vivian, Malsch, Clinton, and E. Dannreuther</td>
<td>Thursday 27 February 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Piece</td>
<td>Performers</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>‘Verzagen’ (Op. 72, No. 4)</td>
<td>Vocals: Miss Anna Williams, Pianoforte: Mr E. Dannreuther</td>
<td>Thursday 19 January 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Piano Quartet in A (Op. 26)</td>
<td>Gibson, Grimson, Kreutz, Ould and Dannreuther</td>
<td>Thursday 2 February 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>‘Feldeinsamkeit’ (Op. 86, No. 2)</td>
<td>Vocals: Anna Williams, Gibson, Grimson, Kreutz, Ould, and E. Dannreuther</td>
<td>Thursday 16 February 1892 (postponed until 29 November)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘O kühler Wald’ (Op. 72. No. 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Vergebliches Ständchen’ (Op. 84, No. 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piano Quintet in F minor (Op. 34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Cello Sonata in E minor (Op. 38)</td>
<td>Gibson, Grimson, Kreutz, Ould, and E. Dannreuther</td>
<td>Thursday 26 January 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Piano Quartet in G minor (Op. 25)</td>
<td>Gibson, Grimson, Kreutz, Ould, and E. Dannreuther</td>
<td>Thursday 9 February 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Clarinet Quintet in B minor (Op. 115)</td>
<td>Gibson, Grimson, Kreutz, Ould and E. Dannreuther.</td>
<td>Thursday 23 February 1893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix IV: Pieces by Brahms performed in the Richter Concert Series at St James’s Hall in London (1879-1900)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quintet in F minor, Op. 34</td>
<td>Thursday 8 May, 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Festival Overture, Op. 80</td>
<td>16 May, 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragic Overture, Op. 81</td>
<td>23 May, 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ein Deutsches Requiem</em>, Op. 45</td>
<td>18 May, 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin Concerto, Op. 77</td>
<td>10 May, 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schicksalslied, Op. 54</td>
<td>21 May, 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 2 in D, Op. 73</td>
<td>18 June, 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gesang der Parzen</em>, Op. 89 (British Première)</td>
<td>5 May, 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 3, Op. 90 (British première)</td>
<td>12 May, 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schicksalslied, Op. 54</td>
<td>16 June, 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 3, Op. 90</td>
<td>4 November, 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alto Rhapsody</em>, Op. 53</td>
<td>11 May, 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Festival Overture, Op. 80</td>
<td>21 May, 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 2, Op. 73</td>
<td>November, 1885 (exact date not recorded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 4, Op. 98 (British Première)</td>
<td>10 May, 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 4, Op. 98</td>
<td>30 October, 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alto Rhapsody</em>, Op. 53</td>
<td>9 November, 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variations on a Theme by Haydn, Op. 56a</td>
<td>2 May, 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 2, Op. 73</td>
<td>28 May, 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variations on a Theme by Haydn, Op. 56a</td>
<td>6 May, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed song</td>
<td>3 June, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 3, Op. 90</td>
<td>3 June, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alto Rhapsody</em>, Op. 53</td>
<td>2 June, 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Concerto No. 1 in D minor, Op. 15</td>
<td>16 June, 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragic Overture, Op. 81</td>
<td>23 June, 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ein Deutsches Requiem</em>, Op. 45</td>
<td>15 June, 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 1, Op. 68</td>
<td>13 June, 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gesang der Parzen</em>, Op. 89</td>
<td>4 July, 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variations on a Theme by Haydn, Op. 56a</td>
<td>4 June, 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variations on a Theme by Haydn, Op. 56a</td>
<td>20 October, 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Festival Overture, Op. 80</td>
<td>21 October, 1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragic Overture, Op. 81</td>
<td>8 June, 1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variations on a Theme by Haydn, Op. 56a</td>
<td>24 May, 1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 4, Op. 98</td>
<td>18 October, 1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 1, Op. 68</td>
<td>23 May, 1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 1, Op. 68</td>
<td>30 October, 1899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V: ‘Dem Fernen’ – A surviving song by Prince Albert, composed in 1839
hör - et ihr sein lei - ses Wort Berg und
mir so nah und doch so fern. Schließen

1häl - ler ü - ber fle - gen nur Ge - dan - ken
sich die mü - den Blie - cke dann erst - het

nur der Blick und so gibbt mir sei - ne
Bild und Bild, und mit ihm ver leb - te

Grü - sse stum - der blas - se Mond zu - rück,
Stun - den sind - der mir der Fraum ent - hüllt,
37

Voice

stumm der, blas - se Mond zu - rück
sinds die, mir der Fraun ent hüllt

Pno.

42

Voice

Pno.

dim

pp
### Appendix VI: List of Entries in the first edition of Grove’s *Dictionary of Music and Musicians* with reference to Johannes Brahms and his music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Page References</th>
<th>Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Accent’</td>
<td>Ebenezer Prout</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>12-17</td>
<td>January, 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘A quatre mains’</td>
<td>Franklin Taylor</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>79-80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0’Arrangement’</td>
<td>C. Hubert H. Parry</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>89-95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ballade’</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>April, 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Cantata’</td>
<td>C. Hubert H. Parry</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>304-305</td>
<td>July, 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Concerto’</td>
<td>Ebenezer Prout</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>387-389</td>
<td>October, 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Couperin’</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>409-410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Figure’</td>
<td>C. Hubert H. Parry</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>520-523</td>
<td>January, 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Form’</td>
<td>C. Hubert H. Parry</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>541-555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde’</td>
<td>C. Ferdinand Pohl</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ground Bass’</td>
<td>C. Hubert H. Parry</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Harmony’</td>
<td>C. Hubert H. Parry</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>669-685</td>
<td>April, 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Holmes, William Henry’</td>
<td>George Grove</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Horn’</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Intermezzo’</td>
<td>W.S. Rockstro</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>July, 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Jaell, Alfred’</td>
<td>George Grove</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Lied’</td>
<td>Franz Gehring</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>October, 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Magyar Music’</td>
<td>J.A. Fuller Maitland</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>197-199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Marxen, Eduard’</td>
<td>Franz Gehring</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Modulation’</td>
<td>C. Hubert H. Parry</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>343-351</td>
<td>January, 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Musical Periodicals’</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>426-431</td>
<td>April, 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Paganini, Nicolo’</td>
<td>Paul David</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>628-632</td>
<td>July, 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Part-Song’</td>
<td>Henry Frederick Frost</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>657-659</td>
<td>October, 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Pianoforte Music’</td>
<td>Ernst Pauer</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>724-736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Pianoforte Playing’</td>
<td>Ernst Pauer</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>736-745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Quartet’</td>
<td>Frederick Corder</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>56-59</td>
<td>January, 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Requiem’</td>
<td>W.S. Rockstro</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>109-113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Romantic’</td>
<td>Mrs Edmond Wodehouse</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>148-152</td>
<td>July, 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Scherzo’</td>
<td>Frederick Corder</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>244-248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Schools of Composition’</td>
<td>W.S. Rockstro</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>258-314</td>
<td>August, 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Schubert’</td>
<td>George Grove</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>319-382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Score’</td>
<td>W.S. Rockstro</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>426-434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Sestet or Sextet’</td>
<td>Frederick Corder</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Sonata’</td>
<td>C. Hubert H. Parry</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>554-583</td>
<td>July, 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Stockhausen, Julius’</td>
<td>George Grove</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>715-716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Subject’</td>
<td>W.S. Rockstro</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>747-753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Symphony’</td>
<td>C. Hubert H. Parry</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>10-43</td>
<td>July, 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Trio’</td>
<td>Frederick Corder</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>171-173</td>
<td>March, 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Variations’</td>
<td>C. Hubert H. Parry</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>217-230</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Waltz’</td>
<td>W. Barclay Squire</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>385-386</td>
<td>September, 1885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Entries in the Appendix of the first edition of Grove’s Dictionary of Music and Musicians with reference to Johannes Brahms and his Music (edited by J.A. Fuller Maitland)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Page References</th>
<th>Year of Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Dance Rhythm’</td>
<td>C. Hubert H. Parry</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>605-608</td>
<td>Early 1888 to May, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Dietrich, Albert Hermann’</td>
<td>J.A. Fuller Maitland</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>614</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Dvořák, Antonin’</td>
<td>J.A. Fuller Maitland</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>621-624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Naenia’</td>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Niederrheinische Musikfeste’</td>
<td>Alexis Chitty</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Passacaglia’</td>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Rhapsody’</td>
<td>Edward Dannreuther</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>771-772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VII: Performances of Brahms’s Music at the RCM Concert Series during the ‘Grove’ years between 1884 and 1895

**Orchestral Works**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Concert Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Festival Overture (Op. 80)</td>
<td>63, 111, 145</td>
<td>1887, 1890, 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragic Overture (Op. 81)</td>
<td>69, 118</td>
<td>1888, 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 1 in C minor (Op. 68)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 2 in D major (Op. 73)</td>
<td>48, 127</td>
<td>1887, 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 3 in F (Op. 90)</td>
<td>115, 147</td>
<td>1890, 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 4 in E minor (Op. 98)</td>
<td>80, 159</td>
<td>1888, 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Concerto No. 1 in D minor (Op. 15)</td>
<td>94, 190</td>
<td>1889, 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Concerto No. 2 in B flat (Op. 83)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin Concerto in D major, (Op. 77)</td>
<td>68, 162</td>
<td>1888, 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variations on a Theme by Haydn (Op 56a)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>1893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chamber Works**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Concert Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano Trio in C major (Op. 87, No. 2)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Quartet No. 2 in A major (Op. 26)</td>
<td>47, 49, 95</td>
<td>1887, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Quartet No. 1 in G minor (Op. 25)</td>
<td>106, 125</td>
<td>1890, 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Quartet No. 3 in C minor (Op. 60)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Quintet in F minor (Op. 34)</td>
<td>79, 144, 177, 189</td>
<td>1888, 1892, 1893, 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quartet in A minor (Op. 51, No. 2)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quartet in B flat (Op. 67)</td>
<td>45, 46</td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quintet in F major (Op. 88)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarinet Quintet in B (Op. 115)</td>
<td>150, 156</td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vocal Music**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Concert Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geistliches Wiegenlied (Op. 91, No. 2)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestillt Sehnsucht (Op. 91, No. 1)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O versenk’ dein Lieb (Op. 3, No. 1)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Choral Music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Concert Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ave Maria (Op. 12)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcarolle (Op. 44, No. 3)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If through the churchyard thou goest (Op. 44)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Song (Op. 44, No. 1)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now all the roses are blooming (Op. 44)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bride (Op. 44)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bridegroom</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Meadows at Wildbach (Op. 44)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mountains are Cold (Op. 44)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nun (Op. 44, No 6)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineta (Op. 44, No. 2)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Instrumental Music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Concert Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dance in D major, arr. Joachim (WoO 1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dance in F major, arr. Joachim (WoO 1)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dance in G major, arr. Joachim (WoO 1)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dances 1 and 6, arr. Joachim (WoO 1)</td>
<td>26, 60</td>
<td>1885, 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dances 1 and 2, arr. By Joachim (WoO 1)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dances, Book 1, Nos. 5 and 2 (WoO 1)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dance No. 3, arr. Joachim (WoO 1)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dances, No. 7 and 8 (WoO 1)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dances, Nos. 8 and 6, arr. Joachim (WoO 1)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dances, No. 19 and 2, arr. Joachim (WoO1)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dances Book II, Nos 7 and 8), WoO 1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dance No. 14, (WoO 1)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin Sonata in A major (Op. 100)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin Sonata in D minor (Op. 108)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin Sonata in G major (Op.78)</td>
<td>23, 112</td>
<td>1885, 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violoncello Sonata in E minor (Op. 38)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballade in D major (Op. 10, No. 1)</td>
<td>7, 8</td>
<td>1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capriccios 1 and 2 (Op. 76)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhapsody in B minor (Op. 79, No. 1)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piece</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhapsody in G minor (Op. 79, No. 2)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scherzo in E flat minor (Op. 4)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Sonata in C major (Op. 1)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variations and Fugue on a theme of Handel (Op. 24)</td>
<td>30, 71</td>
<td>1886, 1888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix VIII: Performances of Brahms’s Music at the CUMS concerts as listed in the university concert programme archive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Concert Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ungarische Tänze</em> (WoO 1), Nos. 5 and 6</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>27 November, 1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘<em>Von Ewiger Liebe</em>’ (Op. 43, No. 1)</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>7 March, 1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘<em>Die Mainacht</em>’ (Op. 43, No. 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ein Deutsches Requiem</em> (Op. 45)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>23 May, 1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Schicksalslied</em> (Op. 54)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>8 March, 1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 1 (Op. 68)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘<em>Mein Liebe ist Grün</em>’ (Op. 63, No. 5)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>18 May, 1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Neue Liebeslieder Walzer</em> (Op. 65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rhapsodie</em> (Op. 53)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>22 May, 1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dances (arr. Joachim), Nos. 5 and 6</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>27 February, 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Piano Quintet in F minor</em> (Op. 34)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>17 May, 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Des Liebsten Schwur</em> (Op. 69, No. 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘<em>Von Ewige Liebe</em>’ (Op. 43, No. 1)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>13 March, 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘<em>Die Mainacht</em>’ (Op. 43, No. 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quartet in G minor</em> (Op. 25)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>16 May, 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘<em>Klage</em>’(Op. 69, No. 2)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4 November, 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motet: ‘A saving Health to us is Brought’ (Op. 29, No. 1)</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3 December, 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quartet in B flat major</em> (Op. 67)</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>11 March, 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Dances (WoO 1), unspecified numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Violin Sonata in G</em> (Op. 78)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>21 May, 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartet in A minor (Op. 51/2)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>10 March, 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pianoforte Quartet in A minor (Op. 26)</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>13 May, 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pianoforte Quartet in G minor (Op. 25)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>14 November, 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(misprinted as Op. 26 in the programme)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto for Violin and Orchestra (Op. 77)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>7 March, 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(played by Joachim)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trio in C major (Op. 87)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>6 June, 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schicksalslied (Op. 54)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>12 June, 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragic Overture (Op. 81)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>10 June, 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ein Deutsches Requiem (Op. 45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Sind es Schmerzen, sin des Freunden’ (Op. 33, No. 3)</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>10 June, 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Choruses for female voices with accompaniment of two horns and harp (Op. 17) (‘Come away Death’ and ‘Death of Trenar’)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>15 June, 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Song ‘In silent night’, WoO 33, No. 42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Wie bist du, meine Königen ’ (Op. 32, No. 9)</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>16 May, 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trio in C minor (Op. 101)</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>3 June, 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Wir Wandelten’ (Op. 96, No. 2)</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>15 March, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trio in C minor (Op. 101)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinaldo (Op. 50)</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>10 June, 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintet in G (Op. 111)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>20 May, 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Festival Overture (Op. 80)</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>13 June, 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pianoforte Quintet in F minor (Op. 34)</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>24 May, 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Alan Gray of Trinity College replaces Stanford as conductor at this point –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 1893 and 1894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Song: ‘Vineta’ (Op. 42, No. 2)</td>
<td>6 March, 1895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pianoforte Trio (Op. 8) revised version (1891)</td>
<td>16 May, 1895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pianoforte Quintet in F minor (Op. 34)</td>
<td>27 February, 1896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Wie bist du, meine Königen’ (Op. 32, No. 9)</td>
<td>20 May, 1886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘So willst du des Armen’ (Op. 33., No. 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schicksalslied (Op. 54)</td>
<td>15 June, 1896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ständchen’ (Op. 106, No. 1)</td>
<td>11 March, 1897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Quartet in G minor (Op. 25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quartet in B flat (Op. 67)</td>
<td>30 May, 1897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ein Deutsches Requiem (Op. 45) Memorial Concert for Brahms</td>
<td>14 June, 1897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Trio in C minor (Op. 101)</td>
<td>10 March, 1898</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vier Ernst Gesänge (Op. 121)</td>
<td>21 February, 1899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Song: ‘Vineta’ (Op. 42, No. 2)</td>
<td>15 March, 1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 2 in D (Op. 73)</td>
<td>5 June, 1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix IX: The Sixth Variation of Brahms’s Variations on a Theme by Haydn, Op. 56a