

The Concept of the Modern in European Art Music, 1885-1914: A Reconfiguration of the Issues¹

Few problems are more complex or ideologically charged within the humanities than that of the concept of the modern in the decades around the turn of the century. The struggle surrounding the concept is perhaps most noticeable in the raging postmodernist debate, which has spawned innumerable treatments of the topic—nearly all of them, it seems, contentious and bluntly politicized. In short, modernism has taken on new life as a significant conceptual problem. Yet for some time now English-language musicology has insufficiently resisted the temptation of continuing to pass on a clichéd, reductive view of its own sector of modernism. (We all know the story: Debussy, Mahler, Schoenberg, and Stravinsky as individual geniuses, emancipating the dissonance, boldly confronting modern *Angst*, advancing the history of style, and so on.) And it is only recently [remember: this is 1993!] that the legitimacy of this simplistic version of the story—with its four or five predictable superheroes, its barely mentioned bit players, and its patronized also-rans—has been called into serious question.

¹ 2016 Note: This 1993 paper—never published or developed further (do not cite from it without permission—was initially given as a presentation at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, in 1993. At the time it represented the direction that I was thinking my subsequent work would take. I apparently provided minor retouchings to it in 1995 and 1997 but never worked it into a publishable essay. From time to time in the later 1990s and very early 2000s (by which time the Sonata Theory project had taken over my work) it occurred to me to revise and publish it, but that never happened, and from 1997 to the present it has lain dormant. By this point—2016—the paper has too much of the flavor of the early 1990s to be publishable, nor is it now *au courant* with the current state of academic play. Still, at the time it coordinated a number of my thoughts—dealing with Strauss and Sibelius (and Elgar and Mahler) and beginning to work through a broader concept of modernism, early modernism, and sonata deformations, just before the classical-style Sonata Theory project was launched in earnest. In its current state it still bears obvious traces of its original talk-format—most notably the absence of footnote citations (which in 1993 were right at hand, though they would have to be recovered today). I have included two 1993 handouts as Tables 1 and 2 at the end. I remain curious with regard to whether there is anything still salvageable from it.

For me, the first signs that this conceptual logjam was breaking up were sounded by Carl Dahlhaus, who argued, initially in an important 1976 essay in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, “Musikalische Moderne und Neue Musik,” that the concept of the musically modern actually emerged as a driving concept a decade or two earlier than most historians had normally suggested: it emerged, that is, in the late 1880s and early 1890s. Here and in subsequent writings Dahlhaus argued in favor of a self-standing “period of musical modernism,” a “breakaway mood” dating from around 1889 to 1914, from Strauss’s *Don Juan* and Mahler’s First Symphony to the onset of the First World War. By 1914, argued Dahlhaus, this first modernism had been displaced by the cultural politics of a second, the “new music,” which promptly appropriated for itself the earlier “modernist” label. The prior modernism, though, was the product of what he called the “Generation of the 1860s,” those composers born in and around that decade. These were the first to come of age in the context of Bayreuth and the now-firmly established challenges of the symphonic Liszt. Moreover, again as Dahlhaus noted, the modernists’ sense of self-awareness and group difference was heightened by a perception of the relative lack of musical distinction of their parents’ generation. That generation had produced only three or four major (and then still hotly debatable) figures—Bruckner, Brahms, Tchaikovsky perhaps Dvořák, and so on. As was apparent to all, the real musical giants who set the seal of the nineteenth century belonged to an even earlier generation and were born, in fact, in a five-year span between 1809 and 1813—Mendelssohn, Schumann, Chopin, Liszt, Wagner, and Verdi.

I have arranged Dahlhaus’s own selection of generationally modernist composers on the first page of your handout [Table 1 at the end of this draft]: this is based on his discussion in *Nineteenth-Century Music*. An interesting list but I find Dahlhaus’s selection random and generationally confused. I would prefer to confine the list of the first generation of self-consciously modernist composers to include only those born between about 1854 and 1866. My list would therefore include, in birth order: Janacek, Chausson, Bruneau, Leoncavallo, Elgar, Puccini, Mahler, Wolf, Charpentier, Albeniz, Debussy, Delius, Mascagni, Richard Strauss,

Dukas, Glazunov, Nielsen, Sibelius, Busoni, and Satie—the more inclusiveness the better. Moreover, I have argued elsewhere that this generational wave of modernists is best considered as a cultural group facing similar social and compositional problems. In many respects this early modernism—as I now call it (to distinguish it from the later high modernism of the succeeding generation) is a generational, group phenomenon: to restrict one’s interest to one or two individual composers alone is to risk missing the larger, generational point. My concern today is exclusively with this earlier, pre-Schoenbergian/pre-Stravinskian modernism.

Dahlhaus’s observation, though, taken together with the impact that literary- and culture-critical studies in other disciplines have recently had on traditional musicology, suggests that the whole matter in which we confront European art music around the turn of the century deserves a thorough rethinking and reconstruction. My argument is that what is needed is to recover the complexity and the ambiguity of this period’s musical discourse network. We need to reawaken these decades’ uncertainties, their aesthetic arguments, their unsettled contradictions, their complex social, economic, and aesthetic tensions. And then we need to use these things as the raw materials for a framework within which to approach that music. Moreover, those tensions cannot be gauged properly unless we acknowledge them as fundamentally mediated through institutions fueled by instincts of self-interest and self-preservation (vested interests, if you like) in a world in which the liberal-humanist consensus, along with its hard-won conception of “Autonomous Art,” was palpably and rapidly decaying. These self-interested and preservational institutions include our own discipline and its traditional modes of inquiry, themselves implicated in this generational wave of early modernism.

What follows is the sketching out of a rough overview of what I currently consider to be the central issues of the problem of early modernism in European (and especially Germanic) art music. (We should not expect logical consistency or resolving closure among these issues: all are best considered as constellations of suspended inner tensions, sometimes contradictory

tensions. Remaining willing to sustain the contradictions is the most difficult aspect of studying this topic as a whole.)

I propose, then, to deal with three broad issues or categories. First, I shall start with a large, grounding concern: “‘Modernism’ as a General Cultural Phenomenon: The ‘Generational Breakaway’ from Past Culture and Traditions.” Second, I shall move to a subset within it: “The Intensification of the Commodity Character of Art Music and the Rise of the ‘Modern,’ Fully Developed Institution of Art Music.” As will emerge, certain key features of the second category or subset, early musical modernism, are dialectically opposed to those of the general pull of the first, the larger concept of cultural modernism. These strains, I argue, are part of the energy core powering musical modernism. Following this I shall move to a third topic—a smaller subset—in order to sample some of the critical music-style-specific issues within musical modernism: “The Concept of *Fortschritt* [Progress] and Heightened Technical/Technological Development.” The attempt here will be to reframe standard musicological questions in more productive ways.

Throughout, my essential argument will be this: Whenever one approaches music from this period qua historian, all three broad categories—the entire discourse network (the grounding cultural situation and its various subsets)—should be at least kept actively in mind. To focus only on one aspect, only on one composer, one problem, and so on, distorts the inquiry. Instead of looking only at individual composers and individual pieces, we need more seriously to integrate into our research the social dynamics of the groups, institutions, and generic traditions that both set the terms of, then put their stamps on, the products of early modernism.

My larger concern here and elsewhere is to challenge the assumption that the methodological procedures of the supposedly new sociocultural and socioeconomic approaches (neo-Marxist, New Historicist, poststructuralist, postmodernist, the politics of race, class, gender, and so on) are by their natures irreconcilable with the techniques and interests of more traditional musicology, ethnomusicology, and music theory—to challenge the assumption that to accept the concerns of one side means politically to be committed not merely to a needed critique but to a full delegitimization of the other side. My goal is to steer clear of the beckoning

reductiveness, partialisms, and simplifications of either side alone—of either the new or the old musicology. In my scheme, one should embrace both sides. One should look even further ahead, trying to grasp in advance the merging and inevitable synthesis of the new and the old that will doubtless struggle into existence over the next several years. It is reductionism that is to be avoided, no matter from which side it stems. In confronting the musicological problems at hand we should select and blend the best aspects of both sides and sharply reduce the current levels of unproductive antagonism and positional posturing. My appeal throughout is not either/or; rather, it is both/and.

Category 1. “Modernism as a General Cultural Phenomenon: The “Generational Breakaway” from Past Culture and Traditions.

In the most general sense the emerging of a self-conscious, late nineteenth-century European modernism (Ibsen, Strindberg, the Nietzsche wave of the 1890s, Edvard Munch, Richard Strauss) represents a distinctly new, generational sense of difference, liberation, and challenge. Exactly why this happened has been a major area of analysis and speculation from several vantage points, most of which have been sociologically or economically grounded. No analysis finds it coincidental, for example, that this new world emerged simultaneously with the numerous changes wrought by the modern international economic, technological, and political systems—and in particular with a cycle of economic depression and edgy nationalist politics during the later 1870s, 1880s, and early 1890s. The controversies, rather, are about how all of this is to be interpreted. (Not surprisingly, it has been a favorite, even an obsessive, topic among Marxist and *marxisant* commentators of various stripes.) However we choose to frame it, this emerging world of the 1870s, 80s and 90s was one that the modernists, as a general movement, tended to confront with extreme, unpredictable shifts of mood, from exuberance and vigorous challenge to fatalism, pessimism, or skepticism. This was a world either whose reigning systems of power the modernists often wished to correct or from whose supposedly corroding banality

they often wished to compensate by strategies of escape (with varying degrees of intensity and permanence). The world of art, and especially of music, was one of those escape routes. As has been widely noted, such considerations provide even the art with the strongest claims to autonomy with a tacit culture-critical content.

By way of illustration we might recall an often-cited analysis of the problem. In his famous 1939 essay on Baudelaire Walter Benjamin suggested that mid- and late-nineteenth-century modernism in the arts was in large part the opening up of an appropriate cultural space in response to the new mechanization and impersonality of the emerging city technology of the bourgeoisie. Benjamin stressed in particular the impact of three central categories: 1) shock, or the inevitability of sudden, jarring, sensory impacts and discontinuities; 2) the mass anonymity of swelling city crowds; and 3) an unsettling sense of profound impermanence—coming to terms with the fleeting flashpoint of the now, that which Hofmannsthal would in 1905 call *das Gleitende* (the “slipping-away”) and Benjamin himself would identify as an embrace of the transitory *Jetztzeit* (the “now-time”). We should notice that all three categories—shock, the urban crowd, and the new sense of cultural flux or impermanence—concern the recognition of the loss of a central organizing control or set of values from above. This was the recognition that social life was becoming increasingly decentered, slipping inexorably toward a dissolution into a fully differentiated system of individual transactions and cybernetic subsystems. Those seeking to grasp or articulate the whole soon found themselves lost in a maze of contradictory, unresolved values. It may be that the essence of being a modernist in this sense was becoming aware of the need to establish some sort of dialogical relationship to this process of economic and industrial modernization (partially or fully accommodating, resolutely oppositional, or whatever), as Marshall Berman has suggested. If this general line of analysis is on the right track, it follows that any serious consideration of modernism in any field, cannot afford to ignore or downplay the economic and technological networks that sustained it and made it possible.

As for the term “modernism” itself, following some famous individual precedents in literary France—Baudelaire, Rimbaud, and so on—it broke into the discourse surrounding new

Germanic and North-European literature in the 1880s. This was about a decade before the term began to be applied to certain styles of Germanic music. The term “modern” seems first to have been self-consciously used in a generational way (us versus them) by the Danish critic and Ibsen champion, Georg Brandes (1883, *Men of the Modern Breakthrough*, something of a realist or naturalist manifesto). Brandes’s book was followed up in 1885 by an anthology of current poetry edited by Hermann Conradi and Karl Henckell, *Moderne Dichtercharaktere* (Modern Poet Characters); and by such things as the influential periodical *Die Gesellschaft* founded in 1885, self-styled as “ein Organ der modernen Bewegung in der Literatur.” By this time the adjective “modern” had become a “rallying slogan” associated with oppositional realism throughout Germany (37), along with its nominative form, “Die Moderne,” characterizing the entire generational movement, which seems to have been coined in 1886 by Eugen Wolff in a lecture to the Berlin literary circle, *Durch* (“Through”).

Forged in the wake especially of Ibsen and Zola, literary realism in the German mid-1880s had a notable realistic, scientific-rational, and often anti-bourgeois/socialist bent to it (this in an age when Bismarck’s anti-socialist laws were still in force), but by the end of the decade and into the 1890s this realism soon fused with a new irrationalism, Nietzscheanism, and anti-positivism. (This new inlaying of the irrational may be regarded as an initial stage of what Fredric Jameson has called the modernist resacralization of an art previously desacralized though the realist critique: this resacralization is often the overlay of *ad hoc* or uneasy myths of escape on a naturalist, realistic, and anti-bourgeois base.)

In the face of this enormously complex literary and cultural history, the two central points to make here are these. First, for the Germanic nations, the implication throughout all of this is that of an exciting, somewhat dangerous, daring, and confrontational breakaway from the aesthetic traditions of the past. And, second, the whole early-modernist movement stressed by implication the growing necessity for literary, artistic, and (one would suppose) musical figures at all levels to choose sides in the dispute. In effect, it stressed the need to ally oneself generationally in an expanding culture war or struggle for artistic legitimacy.

One of the main early manifestos of Austro-Germanic literary modernism—the only one that Dahlhaus cites as a touchstone of the new 1890s mood—was that by the Viennese critic Hermann Bahr, *Studien zur Kritik der Moderne* (first edition, 1890). Bahr put a high premium on generational difference. Thus the new movement, supposedly merging naturalism and romanticism, was not so much a program as a generational attitude, that of “das jüngste Deutschland.” This attitude was characterized by the search for the new, the extreme, and the unrestrained. Its main senses were that of splitting open the old world and marching forward into history; that of searching for a fuller and richer experience than that which the existing liberal-bourgeois consensus permitted, particularly in terms of a franker confrontation with sexuality; and that of aggressively exploring what was previously off-limits or forbidden—not only the explicitly sexual, but also the exotic, the primitive, the shocking, the satanic, the seemingly tasteless or egotistically personal, the anxiety-ridden or the highly strung or nervous (“the moderns,” Bahr claimed, had “hungry nerves”). And all of this was to be done in the name of the twin imperatives of youth and aesthetic progress (*Fortschritt*—literally the “step-forward”).

This brash new spirit invaded young musicians as well. It was the spirit absorbed by the “generation of the 1860s.” Music’s world, though, was substantially different from that of literature or art. Above all, music’s potential relationship to realism and naturalism was strained and uncertain. (Throughout the nineteenth century art music’s claims had been advanced to the point where it was often believed to conjure up a world very distant from that of ordinary material reality, a world of pure idealism and beauty, a supposedly transcendent zone of escape.) Its very building material—its stuff—was non-material, and the impact of Liszt and Wagner in heightening and perpetuating this concept of transcendence and linking it to new genres—music drama, symphonic poem, poetic piano miniature, and so on—was incalculable. Even so, among musicians of the 1880s and 1890s nothing could be clearer than the emergence of a generational split, above which hovered the spirit of the recently deceased Wagner. Thus, reviewing the matter in 1901, the Strauss partisan Arthur Seidl wrote an essay, “Was ist

modern?”), in which he insisted that in the past decade music, too, had entered a watershed moment, a leap-forward into progress, “a very uncanny factor of transition from old to new.”

(10) Thus had emerged a modern musical age that Seidl called the “Period of the Wagner Schism.” He further characterized the new spirit as the “Crisis of Wagnerianism,” one which has now “invaded all corners” (33).

Nearly all music writers of the period focus on this generational split as central. In 1909, reviewing the same period of the 1880s and 1890s, the influential, Munich-centered critic Rudolf Louis, in *Die deutsche Musik der Gegenwart* (1909, pp. 159-160), recalled that there had existed two factions of conservatory students in the last third of the nineteenth century. The first type were those docile students who did what they were told—writing standardized genre pieces, such as that of the academically correct symphony (the “conservatory symphony,” Louis called it—Richard Strauss’s very traditional Symphony in F Minor, 1884, had been a good example; such examples help to suggest how much the concept of traditional symmetrical forms and practices were taken as emblems of the seeming self-confidence of the liberal-humanist consensus). A second group of students, though, reports Louis, thought of themselves as “Die Wildlinge” (“The Wild Beasts”). These were the budding modernists, the post-Wagnerian students imbibing the breakaway spirit of the times. (One thinks, for example of Mahler and Wolf in Vienna, or, outside of Austro-Germanic culture, of Debussy in Paris.) Max Steinitzer, a close friend of Richard Strauss, referred in his important 1911 biography of that composer to this split in Strauss’s own development in the 1880s and turned it into a metaphor for a whole generation: “The Turn from Classicism to Progress.” Throughout Germanic music-historical writing of the time, whenever one reached the 1880s, 1890s, and early 1900s, one was obliged to speak of the style in terms of something new: *die neudeutsche Richtung* or *die neudeutsche Tonkunst* (these were terms used both by Hans Merian, *Geschichte der Musik im 19. Jahrhundert*, 1902, and by Rudolf Louis in the 1909 book already mentioned); *die moderne Richtung* or even *die futuristische Richtung* (as used by Ludwig Nohl, *Allgemeine Musikgeschichte*, 1911); *der neue Stil* (Hans Merian again, p. 692); and so on. The new-style

composers in question were always led by Strauss—and often Mahler as well, though not so consistently—and they often included slightly younger composers, such as Reger, Schillings, Pfitzner, and the like. This, then, was the modern as generational breakaway around 1886-1914, all subsumed generationally under a supposed (or claimed) dichotomy of progressive/new on the one hand versus reactionary/traditional on the other.

Category 2. The Intensification of the Commodity Character of Art Music and the Rise of the “Modern,” Fully Developed Institution of Art Music.

Early, 1880s and 1890s cultural modernism was indeed characterized by a breakaway spirit, and at its heart was the desire to march boldly into the future through a rejection of the limits of the status quo, the comfortable, and the established. But there were special complications in the notion of musical modernism. This is a key point to which too little attention has been given—namely, that by its very nature the art-music enterprise may have been more inextricably wedded to traditional social systems than were the other arts. Art music, for instance, differed in this way from literature or visual art, that in order for its most prestigious genres to be brought to life, it was heavily dependent on the cooperation and financial support of a relatively few traditional institutions. Briefly put, art music was obliged to be filtered through a much narrower, more constraining institutional space than that required by the more flexible literature and art. Music’s lifeline or oxygen supply was always in danger of being reduced or cut off altogether. By the late nineteenth century the very possibility of an art music was dependent on such things as the availability of public and private financing, the traditions of the limited concert season, the need for concert managers and entrepreneurs to get a monetary return on their investment, the sharply limited time constraints imposed by the average concert, the existence of a prior set of canonic works also competing for time on those concerts, the social system of the training of virtuosos to study and deliver both the canonic and new repertoires, and so on. Compositional success in the world of art music meant forging a

host of potentially constraining economic relationships with institutions that by their nature sought their own legitimation and affirmation from the music that they commissioned, published, performed, and discussed. Notwithstanding its desire for controversy, novelty, shock, and breakaway, early modernism in art music, 1885 -1914, was still in large measure committed to affirming the existing liberal-bourgeois institutions that had constructed the commercial system of art music to begin with. Gustav Mahler's career as an operatic and symphonic conductor in Vienna is paradigmatic here—embracing and embodying those liberal-humanist social institutions

The musical world faced by the modernist generation of the 1860s was substantially different from that faced by the preceding generation. No difference was greater than that of its commercial and institutional aspects, for it was in the last forty years of the nineteenth century that the social institution of art music (I use the term in the sense elaborated by Peter and Christa Bürger) started to gell—even to crystallize—into its definitive pattern. First, for example, we might mention in the later nineteenth century the founding throughout Europe of hundreds of civically or privately funded orchestras with a now international repertory and more or less regularized seasons: the Russian Musical Society in Moscow (1859); the Vienna Philharmonic (regular concerts from 1860 onward); Paris's Padeloup Concerts (1861); the Budapest Philharmonic (legally established in 1867); the Zürich Tonhalle Gesellschaft (1868); the Dresden Philharmonic (1870); the professional concerts of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde (1870); the founding of the French *Société nationale de musique* (1871), the Parisian Colonne Concerts (1873); the Meiningen Court Orchestra (elevated in stature through von Bülow's appointment there in 1880); the Lamoureux Concerts (1881); the Berlin Philharmonic (1882); the Moscow Philharmonic (1883); the Russian Public Symphony Concerts in St. Petersburg (1885); the new concert hall for the Leipzig Gewandhaus (1884); the Concertgebouw Orchestra in Amsterdam (1888); and so on. Many of these were privately or civically run, obviously with profitability—or at least stability and aesthetic prestige—in mind. A few were even sponsored by businessmen

(Belyayev in St. Petersburg, 1885) and/or publishing houses (for example, the publishers Chappell funded the famous London Popular Concerts at St. James Hall beginning in 1858.)

Second, we should also notice the rise of modern or newly reformed conservatories and universities geared to supply this enterprise with performers and armed with massive textbook instruction in everything from harmony and counterpoint to history to music appreciation (to help ensure an audience). Here we can mention: Hanslick's appointment at the University of Vienna (1856); the founding of the Dresden Conservatory (1856); the St. Petersburg and Moscow Conservatories (1862 and 1866); the Berlin Hochschule für Musik (1869), the new building of the Vienna Conservatory and the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde (1870, a part of the whole *Ringstrasse* project); the Hamburg Musikakademie (1873); the Leipzig Conservatory's new modern status as a royal institution (1876); and so on.

Third (and more briefly), we have the project of solidifying the musical canon through critical edition projects, studies or biographies of the composers, and the like. Fourth, we have the standardization of the practice of journalistic music criticism (often linking art music with nationalistic ends). Fifth, we have the international network of music publishers, aesthetic power brokers deciding which music will make it into the marketplace, modernizing the technology of music engraving and printing, managing the new international realities of the 1886 Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works and the American copyright law of 1892—the whole notion of intellectual property—and so on. And as if all this were not enough, as Leon Botstein has reminded us in an article in the current issue of *19th-Century Music*, “During the second half of the nineteenth century, a real explosion in the development of amateur clubs and societies took place.” (133)

Thus the gelling of the modern institution of art music. What is commonly referred to in textbooks as “Late Romanticism,” “Post Romanticism,” or “The Age of Brahms and Bruckner, Mahler and Strauss,” and so on, could from a more inclusive perspective be characterized as “The Age of Institutional Consolidation.” It was in the last forty years of the nineteenth century that music as a high-tech, commercially efficient business came into its own—an art-music

system striving to marry a culture of beauty (characterized by Carl Schorske as a *Gefühlkultur*) with modern, hard-headed business practices that we would recognize today. Taken as a whole, this could well have been the most significant music-historical feature of the late nineteenth century, and any broad history of music needs to take special note of it. From certain angles within such a history, the “heroic” figures of composition, Mahler, Strauss, Debussy, and so on, could be seen primarily as particularly successful careerists within the existing system. (Pierre Bourdieu and Fredric Jameson have recently called for a postmodernist reconstruction of artistic periods in which the primary category is not genius but rather the building of a career within a given social institution. We might also adapt along these lines the current arguments of the New Historicist Stephen Greenblatt that it would be useful to view the compositions of the period not exclusively as autonomous artworks but also as musical texts defined by their roles within a network of economic circulation and exchange.)

(Once again I should stress that my larger point is not that a piece of music is either an autonomous artwork to be savored primarily as an exemplar of beauty and expression or a marketplace commodity involved in economic and social power-networks [the old musicology versus the new]. Not either/or but both/and—with room for plenty of important individual differences and nuances among composers and regional cultures. Pieces of music have coexisting, multiple meanings, not infrequently multiple, conflicting meanings, that we should not try to bring to a premature closure.)

In the final decades of the nineteenth century not only had there had emerged a new commercial reality of art-music distribution, but this modern reality was also inscribed on musical style and musical consciousness. Merely to call attention to the new commercial realities, of course, is to say nothing new; my point, though, is that all of it is more important—more central to the relevant music—than we have normally been prepared to admit. True to its time, by the late nineteenth century the institution of art music was organized essentially as a competitive marketplace. The concert or recital hall or opera stage was the final component of a large-scale delivery system. It was a marketplace in artistic commodities, a marketplace

constructed and held in place largely to uphold the liberal-humanist consensus regarding the accepted norms of beauty and the value and scope of its own social construction of art, culture, and education. To participate in this system, as did the early modernists, was simultaneously to affirm these values, and this is at least a tacit component of every piece written for that system. For example, *Till Eulenspiegel* is not only about its program, Till Eulenspiegel, or about music-structural problems: it is also about the state of modernist art music and its relationship to the socially grounded, existing institutions that make the concept of art music possible. It is about supplying the institution with material to demonstrate its continuing validity in new, sharply challenging times, and in that sense, at least, *Till* is a deeply affirmational work.

Thus in the final decades of the nineteenth century arose what Theodor Adorno—and so many others, particularly of neo-Marxist persuasions—would later deride as the culture industry, the turning of art music into a salable product for mass distribution through advertising and public relations. One of the essential problems, of course, is that to make the system work, the various constituents of the institution of art music were obliged to convince a paying public that this music was much simpler than it actually was. One goal of the institution, then—still very much in evidence today, particularly among popular commentators, journalistic critics, conductors, and performers—is to hide music’s actual complexity in order to assure others (or to assure themselves?) of the validity of intuitive, non-reflective, emotional, or easy-access understandings of the music at hand. Lacking the lubricating myth of direct, non-reflective, or easy access—music as an immediate, universal language—the whole system would have shut down at once. (Once again, Leon Botstein’s recent article is relevant, for he demonstrates that the rise of a mass-marketed musical experience in the later nineteenth century—the rise of the listener as consumer—may be almost precisely correlated with a general decline or blunting of musical literacy.) In futile opposition to all of this, Adorno’s utopian dream, although profoundly unrealistic and incapable of fulfillment, was to keep a higher sense of culture (whatever that might be) as separate as possible from the promotion and distribution mechanisms of capitalism—marketing mechanisms, he argued, that were

driven by false values (for example, those of simplification and false assurances) that could only debase the actual value of any truly artistic production.

Nearly all of the generation of the 1860s unhesitatingly accepted as a given—though of course with varying degrees of enthusiasm—the new game of the marketplace of art. (Strauss, the quintessential modernist, is the paradigm here, although Puccini, Glazunov, and Elgar might also serve well; Mahler, Busoni, and Sibelius were perhaps somewhat more uncomfortable with marketplace realities; the earlier, pre-*Pelléas* Debussy was perhaps the most uncomfortable.) Whatever the individual solution, for the individual composer the trick—and the great balancing act—was to produce pieces of music with an attractive, enhanced commodity-character—progressivist acoustic surfaces or attention-getters within the marketplace—while still affirming, to whatever degree, the sustaining myth that the music at hand was nonetheless conceived essentially out of an inner necessity, that it had by no means relinquished its most primary claims to the status of an autonomous art object worthy of one's time and contemplative study. Nevertheless, nearly all of the early modernists wished to prosper within the existing system, not to reject it or to create new, alternative institutions outside of the traditional libera-humanist system—this would be a more characteristic feature of the later, high modernists of the succeeding generations.

But now—here's the key point: Around 1900 such a willingness to pursue institutional success was not only dialectically at odds with the nineteenth-century conviction that art is to be understood as a sacralized, healing, or redemptive space to be considered apart from the world of everyday transactions; it was also dialectically at odds with the emerging spirit of generational, breakaway modernism and its suspicion of liberal bourgeois institutions and comfortably established aesthetic delivery systems. Restated in slightly differing terms, the essential contradiction for early modernist composers was that the social delivery of these quasi-utopian redemptive spaces was of necessity interwoven—increasingly interwoven—with the everyday world of commerce, competition, legal contracts, marketplace salability, and practical rationality. The ever-sharper dialectic that emerged in the second half of the

nineteenth century consisted of these two terms: on the one hand, the exalted traditional claims of art music as a socially and morally untainted redemptive space (music as metaphysics); on the other, the reality of the far more practical, prosaic, and legal-commercial world on whose terms this music was obliged to be marketed in order to survive.

In such a situation it is not difficult to perceive an anxiety gnawing at the heart of early modern art music: This *heilige Kunst* seemed perpetually in danger of being desacralized, of being drawn inexorably into the whirlpool of mere marketing. For some critics, music's very success in the marketplace seemed simultaneously to work toward the undermining of its redemptive claims as art, as a space set apart from the everyday world—to work toward the casual treating of it as a mere commodity or as an exchangeable species of utilitarian entertainment. Out of these social and aesthetic tensions—cranked up to new levels—arose this phenomenon that I am calling musical early modernism. And the larger point is that within it, the whole sustainability of the nineteenth-century concept of music as metaphysics was beginning inexorably to become endangered.

This, after all, was the primary challenge that Richard Strauss, the most extreme of the early modernists, offered to his critics of the 1890s and early 1900s. The problem with Strauss, argued Georg Goehler, was that he had a “complete lack of any metaphysical disposition, no inner vision for the great secrets of life.” In 1906 Friedrich Brandes saw the problem as this: “[Strauss] is a person who can do much, but he's also one who has no reverence before art.” In the same year Karl Grunsky reacted to *Salome* by asserting that the opera arose not out of a “reverent spirit” but rather for the desire “for the applause of the broad masses and the ring of the cash register—at least until something even more sensationalistic arrives.” Or—to shift our glance elsewhere, to a current examination of Mahler, for example—we may elect to read his exaggeratedly metaphysical posture as an act of extreme, desperate compensation in the face of an entropic predicament in which the very liberal-humanist concept of art, as a marker of both social sensibility and aesthetic *Bildung*, was inexorably melting away.

There is no time here to do justice to these thorny, yet essential problems. For now we need only note the more general point that this musical early modernism, for all of its claims to be high art and for all of its claims to share the breakway mood of the literary modernists, pulls in several different directions simultaneously. It is in the constellation of these unresolvable, contradictory tugs that much of the core of musical early modernism lies—Mahler, Strauss, Debussy, Nielsen, Sibelius, Elgar, Glazunov, and so on. And it is one reason why any monodimensional summary of these composers, their works, and their musical epoch is insufficient.

Category 3. The Concept of *Fortschritt* and Heightened Technical/ Technological Development.

It is perhaps not too much to claim that the central stylistic problem within the institution of art music in the burgeoning age of early modernism was that of the seeming imperative for expressive and technical progress. Stemming directly from earlier nineteenth-century musical attitudes (mainly Wagnerian and Lisztian), the term *Fortschritt* appeared either implicitly or explicitly as a driving concept through every major discussion of the current trends in music around the turn of the century. The main issue seems to have been this: could the now-established institution of art music survive and absorb the growing internal threats of modernism and progress? Not surprisingly, at the same time that the word *Fortschritt* was brandished by the aggressive modernists and their ardent champions, it was simultaneously viewed with varying degrees of suspicion, anxiety, or skepticism by large numbers of the conservators of the liberal-humanist institution (performers, critics, professors, theorists). Quite rightly, the skeptics or qualifiers saw in the concept a dangerous solvent that could ultimately erode the institution into social insignificance. And along with the institution, of course, would also go the whole notion of the legitimacy of the concept of an institutionally contained and mediated High-Art. (We are still living in the final stages of this liquidation.)

To all contending sides in the issue in the 1890s and early 1900s, the stylistic implications of the word “progress” were fairly clear. Richard Strauss, of course, was its principal banner-carrier and chief radical, with each new work dividing audiences and critics further on the twin issues of modernism and progress. The widely read, Munich-centered critic Rudolf Louis, for example, had been a Strauss supporter up to the point of *Zarathustra*, following which, like many others, he began to become increasingly uneasy about the direction this new music was taking. By 1909, in a provocative overview of the state of current German music, Louis complained that “the musical present is the time . . . [in which we are] living under the rule of a dogma—the dogma of musical progress.” A central component of this progress, he remarked, consisted of its unquestioned conviction that it was only by accepting—then extending—the most radical or controversial trends of the most immediate past that the grand march of history was to be furthered: not to do so was to step backward. Today we might recognize the position that Louis was challenging as articulating the familiar romantic and modernist postulate that judgments of aesthetic validity are to be made principally in reference to their congruence—or lack of congruence—with a previously accepted master narrative assumed to provide the grand explanation of History (capital-H). Further, we should also observe that more current, postmodern historical work—for example, that of Jean-Francois Lyotard—has been skeptical of any appeals to presumed master narratives or metanarratives. As is widely acknowledged within the humanities today, such metanarratives—such as the appeal to progress—are rapidly becoming the problematized subject of historical inquiry rather than their unquestioned base. This is, in fact, precisely what I am urging here: the concept of stylistic progress needs to be reawakened as a problem in concept-history, not left dormant to serve as an axiom that we, too, choose unreflectively to accept.

In any event, the construction of the concept of progress around the turn of the century was normally linked to measurable issues of stylistic and technical development. Thus in 1906 the Berlin modernist and critic Oscar Bie defined the modern as a strengthened musical materialism (p. 25). In the new, material, post-Nietzschean world, he argued, individual works of

art music no longer arose directly out of the natural human spirit—as they had up through Wagner—but rather out of the technical possibilities of music’s raw material, what we might think of as its basic technological stuff at any given historical point. According to Bie in 1906, then, Wagner had been the last progressive to enjoy the luxury of subordinating the material and technique of his music to his own personal experience, to the rule of his own humanness. But the technical demands of the material had now grown, become more complex, and the composers succeeding Wagner—most characteristically, Richard Strauss, who grasped this problem in its fullness—were now obliged to subordinate the vagaries of mere personality and a threadbare, old-fashioned idealism to the more impersonal demands of the technical material for evolution and expansion. What had once been a means to a general humanistic end had now become something to be served for its own sake, for the sake of progress.

This general argument may be most familiar to us in the extreme formulation elaborated so brilliantly by Adorno in the post-World-War-II period, the last gasp of high modernism: this is the notion of “the objective state of the material,” or the total state of technique available at a given historical moment. Adorno repeatedly insisted that only those composers should be considered to be aesthetically and morally valid who have grasped the state of the musical material where it was, objectively, and who have then pushed it forward, essentially as a culture-critical gesture, an embrace of something that challenges the existing bureaucratic order. According to Adorno’s unflinching “material-aesthetic” composers must be “obedient” to the demands of the material—wherever the technique is now. (Again, from the postmodern perspective all of this seems far more to be a symptom to be diagnosed than an axiom to be accepted.)

However we might choose to assess Adorno’s highly problematic argument (I reject it as it stands), when Germanic writers in the 1890s came to discuss the actual elements of technique and progress that defined the new modernism of Strauss, Mahler, and others, they seem to have been in remarkable agreement. The most common description of *die neudeutsche Richtung* was the claim that orchestral splendor and color, dazzling complexity, and naturalistic

tone-painting had now superseded the demands for symmetrical or traditional form. In his important 1899 commentary on Strauss's *Zarathustra*, the Swiss musicologist Hans Merian enthusiastically claimed that the essence of the modern was the liberation from the architectonic in favor of precise color and naturalistic depiction: in Merian's analysis the move of History (capital-H) had thus been out of the shackles of architecture into the splendidly free and pictorial. Similarly, for Arthur Seidl in the mid-1890s, one of the catchphrases of musical modernity was the "emancipation of color" (a catchphrase anticipating Schoenberg's perhaps related, famous phrase about dissonance—in this formulation, dissonance could be understood as a harmonic color.) Writing in 1903-04 in the Berlin journal *Die Musik*, Max Graf claimed that in modern music coloristic splendor was overwhelming; it relies on the high technology of the grand modern orchestra; it explores greater extremes and differentiations of orchestral sound; "feeling has won over form" (22), and this "free form" (21) is above all a shattering or negligence of traditional concepts of musical architecture. Ludwig Nohl (1911) wrote of the modern emphasis on "malerische Naturalismus," "Kolorit," and "Farbenpracht," a sense of color that revels in technical surfaces while inverting the traditional relationship between form and content. Walter Niemann (1913) wrote that in modern music "color outweighs contour and [formal] outline" (176); "the inner logical development is placed behind the impressionistically free arrangement of impressions and ideas" (176); works are now "improvisations"; they are "sketch-like," and so on.

What all of this suggests is that, as conceived around the turn of the century, musical modernism and technical, technological, and coloristic progress themselves were perceived to usher in a crisis of the architectonic, one that the institution as a whole was obliged to face and to resolve. In the hands of Strauss and others—and especially from the point of *Zarathustra* and Mahler's Third Symphony onward—musical modernism in this early phase was understood primarily as a centrifugal spinning away from any centered conception of musical form in the name of color, technique, musical description, shifting, instantaneous effects, and theatrical display. The result was to challenge the institution of art music with what seemed to be a

veering into formal vertigo. The institution's head was beginning to spin: this was a formal vertigo that in many ways paralleled the social erosion of confidence in the metaphysics of art music, or, for that matter, the inexorable social erosion of the liberal-humanist consensus itself.

Musical modernism, then—the immediate heritage of the Lisztian and Wagnerian conception of form—was thus widely understood as a decentering gesture. Through its persistent dissolution of symmetrical structures in favor of coloristic freedom, musical modernism, working from within the liberal-humanist institution, was now beginning to challenge that institution's sense of wholeness, purpose, and identity. Considerations along this line, I suggest, deserve a more central position in our historical study of this period today. To many—perhaps most—of the observers around the turn of the century, Mahler, Strauss, Debussy—and much of the “generation of the 1860s”—were seeming from within to embrace a radically decentering principle, a disconnectedness that challenged the integrity and effective mediation of the economic, academic, and critical wings of the institution of art music.

All of this is an enormously complex turn-of-the-century social and institutional crisis that I cannot hope to solve or even present adequately here. Indeed, it needs far more detailing and nuancing than I have given it in this rough-hewn overview. But in conclusion I would like to mention three central problems that are crucial to it, each of which would also require volumes to deal with adequately.

The first is the problem of coming to grips on more fruitful grounds with the musical structures that actually were employed in the works of the early modernists in the 1885-1914 period. This seems to me to be the bedrock of any serious study into the matter of musical style, and to this end I have been developing for several years now an expanded theory of what I call nineteenth- and twentieth-century sonata deformations (or even more generally, generic deformations). In brief, a sonata deformation is a structure that, while it relies on the generic expectations of the standard *Formenlehre* sonata to be adequately understood or read (the textbook sonata from A.B. Marx onward), nevertheless violates or overrides one or more of the crucial defaults that define traditional sonata-ness. (As I have suggested earlier in this paper, the

symmetrical sonata—and even certain deformations of it—may be profitably considered both as musical and as social categories. My own graduate musicology seminar at present has “Sonata Deformations” as its topic; it is almost exclusively analytical and generic, and is devoted to recognizing and cataloguing the main structural issues involved with the concept.) Moreover—and in brief—there appear to be certain recognizable families of deformational procedures, and, in my view, unless one understands these generic family-traditions, one is, at best, ill-equipped to deal with the structures found in Strauss, Mahler, Elgar, Sibelius, Nielsen, Debussy, Glazunov, and so on. Some of the families include: the single- or double-developmental episode; the breakthrough deformation; the introduction-coda frame; the non-resolving recapitulation; the exposition ending in the tonic; various unusual block-repetition schemes; the off-tonic sonata; and so forth. (I have dozens of such categories and subcategories, with examples and expansions.)

The second central problem involves challenging the whole notion of technical progress and Adorno’s concept of material. We need to reconfront more seriously the very real possibility that whatever we might find on a given piece of music’s acoustic surface (the notes that we actually hear or see on paper) is only a fragment of what is needed to come to terms with any adequate understanding of that piece’s broader utterance. It seems obvious that we need also to try to reconstruct the social and conceptual framework under which those notes were to be understood, for the notes themselves—at the time—could have meant nothing apart from that framework.

This would mean, then, that it is entirely possible—even likely—that any posited state of the material must exist as a tacit presupposition for the production and understanding of any work from this period, regardless of the intensity of dissonance or level of apparent formal challenge that we might happen to find on that work’s acoustic surface. In instances of compositions often judged off-handedly to be non-progressive—Strauss from *Der Rosenkavalier* onward has come to be the unfortunate archetype here, but Rachmaninoff, the later Sibelius, Elgar, and so on, would also do—I would argue that such a judgment is scandalously surface

oriented, short-sighted, and usually committed unreflectively to an outdated metanarrative of supposed progress that needs serious rethinking. In such cases, considered from the larger standpoint of the social institution of art music and the state of the existing traditions—by the second decade of this century in serious decline and under severe challenge—such music might well be (and often is) thematizing a musical culture and language deeply aware that it is being eclipsed, eroded away. To frame the more traditional or the historically remembered by the tacit awareness of what now is can be to employ (for any number of expressive reasons) a language of loss, and this choice is by no means ipso facto either progressive or reactionary. Indeed, whenever the inquiry becomes broader, these simplistic terms simply become less helpful and fall away.

As Ives once remarked, “What music sounds like might not be what it is.” This is why an attention only to the literal events registered on a work’s acoustic surface—the mainstay of traditional theory—is inadequate: it overlooks the dialogue that each work carries on with the current state of its genre and with the historical state of the material, a dialogue that I now view as the most central stylistic feature of any piece of music, a dialogue also prominently including features of allusion and intertextuality. This also is why the mere insertion of a dissonance-probe into a composition—merely metering its level of dissonance emancipation (or other simply technical feature)—and then pronouncing portentously on a work’s progressive or conservative tendencies is at best a naive endeavor. We need to get beyond that, into far larger, more complex and socially grounded issues.

The third central problem is to confront more honestly one of the main currents of structural thought within the institution of art music under the challenge of the formal vertigo posed by early modernism. This is to thematize the numerous voices that around the turn of the century began to call for a restabilizing of the formal principle on undeniably modern grounds (to try to find a legitimate, new modernist classicism, if you like—I suspect that you can see where all of this will head in the 1910s and 1920s). This recovery of the formal principle is what Rudolf Louis, in 1909, articulated as the quest for a legitimate *Reaktion als Fortschritt*. In the

most general terms, the post-1900 problem of style could be phrased in this way: What kinds of force (power) and concentration are required both to acknowledge the dizzying, centrifugal qualities of the modern style and nevertheless to repack them all in again, centripetally, with a new paradigm of centered form and wholeness? As I have argued elsewhere, probably the most cogent early modernist solution to this enormous problem is found in Sibelius from the Third Symphony onward; among the most convincing of the highmodernist solutions—those coming from the next generational wave—would be that of Schoenberg.

Table 1: A Map of Carl Dahlhaus's "Period of 'Musical Modernism,'" 1889-1914.

[Principal Source: Dahlhaus, *Nineteenth-Century Music* [1980], trans. J. Bradford Robinson (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1989, pp. 330-88.)

[Cf. "Musikalische Moderne und Neue Musik," *Melos/Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 2 (1976), 90.; *Between Romanticism and Modernism* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1980), pp. 14, 17.]

(Parentheses: birth-years)

Austro-Germanic (and related)
Orchestral/Symphonic

Opera (Austro-Germanic)

Strauss (1864) primary figures
Mahler (1860)

Pfitzner (1869) [*Der arme Heinrich*]
Wolf (1860) [*Der Corregidor*]
Humperdinck (1854)
R. Strauss (1864)
Schreker (1878) [*Der ferne Klang*]

Sibelius (1865)

[also: orchestral **Reger** (1873)
and, one presumes, early,
pre-atonal **Schoenberg** (1874)]

Austro-Germanic (and related)
Non-symphonic

Opera (Non-Austro-Germanic)

Wolf (1860) [Lieder]
Reger (1873) [chamber music, Lieder]
early **Schoenberg** (1874) [Lieder,
Piano Pieces]
Busoni (1866)
Szymanowski (1882)

1890s "Realists"/"Naturalists"
Bruneau (1857)
Charpentier (1860)
Mascagni (1863)

"Realist"/Exotic
Puccini (1858)

Other (not clearly classified)

"Symbolist"
Debussy (1862)

Scriabin (1872)
Satie (1866)
Ives (1874)

Other
Janáček (1854)

Some others, not emphasized in this context by Dahlhaus, but probably also relevant: **Elgar** (1857), **Leoncavallo** (1857), **Albeniz** (1860), **Delius** (1862), **Dukas** (1865), **Glazunov** (1865), **Nielsen** (1865), **Roussel** (1869). From the 1870s: **Schmitt** (1870), **Zemlinsky** (1871), **Vaughan Williams** (1872), **Rachmaninoff** (1873), **Ravel** (1875), **De Falla** (1876), **Respighi** (1879).

Table 2: DATES OF BIRTH

	<u>Germany/Austria</u>	<u>France</u>	<u>Italy</u>	<u>Other</u>
1797			Donizetti	
1799		Halévy		
1801	Lortzing		Bellini	
1803		A. Adam		
1803		Berlioz		
1804	Johann Strauss Sr			Glinka
1805	F. Mendel.-Hensel			
1806		H. Herz		
1809	Mendelssohn			
1810	Nicolai			Chopin
1810	Schumann			Erkel
1811	F. Hiller	Thomas		Liszt
1811	Franz Brendel			
1812	Flotow			
1812	Thalberg			
1813	Wagner	Alkan	Verdi	Dargomyzhsky
1814	Henselt			
1815	J. Lang			
1815	Volkman			
1815	Rob. Franz			
1817				Gade
1818		Gounod	Bazzini	Litolff
1819	C. Wieck	Offenbach		
1819	von Suppe			
1820		Vieuxtemps		
1821		Viardot-Garcia		
1821		Bottesini		
1822	Raff	Franck		

1822	Franz Strauss			
1823		Lalo		
1823		Reyer		
1824	Bruckner			Smetana
1824	Cornelius			
1824	Reinecke			
1825	Johann Strauss Jr			
1825	Hanslick			
1827	Josef Strauss			
1827	Julius Otto Grimm			
1828	Bargiel			
1829				Gottschalk
1829	Alb. Dietrich			Ant. Rubinstein
1830	Goldmark			
1830	Hans v. Bronsart			
1831	Jadassohn			
1831	Joachim			
1833	Brahms			Borodin
1833	A. Ritter			
1834			Ponchielli	
1835	B. Scholz			Cui
1835	Draeseke	Saint-Saëns	N. Rubinstein	
1835				Wieniawski
1836		Delibes		W.S. Gilbert
1837	Waldteufel	Guiraud		Balakirev
1837	Maz Zenger	Guilmant		
1838	Bruch	Bizet		
1839	Rheinberger			Mussorgsky
1839	Gernsheim			J.K. Paine
1840	H. Goetz		Faccio	Tchaikovsky
1841	Tausig	Chabrier	Sgambati	Dvorák Svendsen
1842	Millocker	Massenet	Boito	Sullivan
1843	H. v. Herzogenberg			Grieg
1844		Taffanel		Rimsky-Korsakov

1844	F. Nietzsche	Widor		Sarasate
1845		Fauré		
1846	Ignaz Brüll		Tosti	
1847	Rob. Fuchs			
1848		Duparc		Parry
1849	H. Riemann	Godard		
1850				Fibich
1851		D'Indy		
1852				Stanford
1853	Jean-Louis Nicodé	Messenger		Foote
1854	Humperdinck		Catalani	Janacek
1854	Moszkowski			Chadwick
1854				Sousa
1855	Arn. Mendelssohn A. Nikisch	Chausson		Liadov
1856	Paul Geisler		Martucci	Sinding
1856				Taneyev
1857		Bruneau	Leoncavallo	Elgar
1857		Chaminade		
1858		Ysaye	Puccini	E. Smyth
1859				V. Herbert
1859				Ippolitov-Ivanov
1859				Liapunov
1860	Mahler	G. Charpentier		Albeniz
1860	Wolf			MacDowell
1860	Reznicek			Paderewski
1861	Thuille	Loeffler		Arensky
1861	Fritz Volbach			
1862	Friedr. Klose	Debussy		Delius
1863	Weingartner	Pierné P. Vidal	Mascagni	H. Parker
1864	E. D'Albert			Gretchaninov
1864	Richard Strauss			J. Halvorsen
1865		Dukas		Glazunov

1865		Magnard		Nielsen
1865				Sibelius
1866	Georg Schumann		Busoni	Kallinikov
1866	Johann Strauss III	Satie	Cilea	
1867			Toscanini	Granados
1867		Koechlin		Beach
1868	H. Schenker			Bantock
1868	von Schillings			Joplin
1869	Pfitzner	Roussel		Osc. Merikanto
1870	Lehar	Lekeu		
1870	Oscar Straus	F. Schmitt		
1870		Tournemire		
1870		Vierne		
1871	Zemlinsky			Stenhammer
1872				Scriabin
1872				Vaughan Williams
1872	Siegm. v. Hausegger			H. Alfvén
1872				Casals
1872				Farwell
1873	Reger	Séverac		Rachmaninoff
1873				D.G. Mason
1874	Fr. Schmidt			Holst
1874	Schoenberg			Ives
1874				Koussevitzky
1874				Josef Suk
1875	Paul Scheinflug	Ravel		D. F. Tovey
1875	F. Kreisler	R. Hahn		E. Melartin
1876			Wolf-Ferrari	Falla
1876				J.A. Carpenter
1876				Ruggles
1877	Karg-Elert			Dohnanyi
1878	Schreker	Caplet		S. Palmgren
1879		Canteloube	Respighi	Bridge
1879	Alma Mahler			C. Scott
1879				Ireland
1880			Pratella	Bloch
1880				Medtner
1880				H. Willan
1881				Bartok

1881				Enescu
1881	K. Weigl			Miaskovsky
1882	Schnabel		Malipiero	Grainger
1882				Kodaly
1882				Stravinsky
1882				Szymanowski
1882				Turina
1883	Webern	Ansermet	Casella	Bax
1883		Varèse	Zandonai	T. Kuula
1884				Griffes
1885	Berg		Russolo	J. Kern
1885				Riegger
1885	L. Weiner			Salzedo
1885	E. Wellesz			D. Taylor
1886	Furtwängler	M. Dupré		Ch. Seeger
1886	Schoeck			Rebecca Clarke
1887	Romberg	Nadia Boulanger		Madetoja
1887	Rudi Stephan			Valen
1887	Toch			Villa-Lobos
1888		Durey		
1890		Ibert		I. Gurney
1890				F. Martin
1890				Martinu
1891				Cole Porter
1891	A. Weiss			Prokofiev
1892	E. Steuermann	Honegger		Grofe
1892		Milhaud		Kilpinen
1892		Tailleferre		Hild. Rosenberg
1892				Sorabji
1893		Lili Boulanger	Haba	
1893		Goossens		Aarre Merikanto
1893				Fed. Mompou
1893				Dougl. Moore
1893				Bern. Rogers
1894				Piston
1894				Warlock
1895	Orff			Castel.-Tedesco
1895				G. Jacob
1895				D. Rudhyar
1895				Wm Grant Still
1896				V. Thomson

1896		Sessions
1896		Szabelski
1896		J. Weinberger
1897	Korngold	Cowell
1897		Q. Porter
1897		A. Tansman
1898	Eisler	Gershwin
1898		Harris
1899		Poulenc
1899		Auric
1899		A. Tcherepnin
1899		Chavez
1899		Duke Ellington
1899		R. Thompson
1900	Krenek	Antheil
1900	Weill	Copland
1900		Luening
1900		Mosolov
1901		Tomasi
1901		R. Crawford
1901		Finzi
1901		H. Partch
1901		J. Rodrigo
1901		E. Rubbra
1902		Walton
1902		Wolpe