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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

“Karl Amadeus Hartmann is known as the one ‘good German’ composer of the Nazi period,” writes music critic Alex Ross of *The New York Times* in 1996, echoing sentiment common among the few who know of Hartmann; “he was a man of astonishing integrity and a composer of considerable talent…”¹ Ross’ comment, which makes no attempt at academic neutrality, is an example of the enthusiasm that characterizes Hartmann’s limited popularity. In a slightly more scholarly comment, John Warnaby, writing in a 1992 *Tempo* article, suggests that “his music has not received the recognition it deserves as one of the most important continuations of the German symphonic tradition in the 20th century,” largely because he chose not to go the way of serialism like most of his contemporaries, choosing instead to draw on a variety of styles. “In the ‘post-Modern’ hindsight of the last decade or so,” he continues, “this creative approach has now assumed complete respectability.”² Whether or not his lack of repute may be attributed to a serialist stronghold within the musical academy is not to be debated here. What is clear is that Hartmann’s fame was finally on the rise at the end of the twentieth century, and with it new opportunities for serious academic discussion of the man and his works.

When Hartmann’s First Symphony was finally published in 1956, it was already a twenty-year-old composition. It had endured a decade of National Socialism (including six years of Allied bombardment buried in the Bavarian mountainside), half a decade of Denazification,

twelve years without a premier, four title changes, and in the end was the composer’s third choice for his official Symphony no. 1. It is unique as the only one among Hartmann’s eight numbered symphonies to include the solo voice, and thus is often cited as evidence of Hartmann’s inheritance of the grand Germanic symphonic tradition as represented by Mahler’s Das Lied von der Erde and Kindertotenlieder. Its subtitle, Versuch eines Requiems (Attempt at a Requiem), is especially provocative: as a post-war symphony it comments rather clearly on the physical and spiritual devastation that remained after Nazi Regime and the Second World War.

This thesis seeks to identify the personal forces that motivated the creation and evolution of the First Symphony, and how these may inform an interpretation of the Symphony today. Issues to be teased out along the way include the influences that led to Hartmann’s unique style in the 1930s, the politics of the work’s would-be reception in the early years of the Reich, and the changes in the composer’s own interpretation of the work. The following introduction serves to orient the reader to both the layout of the work itself and to the current scholarship that will inform the following chapters.

Description of the Symphony

Hartmann’s Symphony no. 1, Versuch eines Requiems, begins in movement one, Introduktion: Elend (Misery), with a jarring barrage of drums and dissonant fanfare. This “Attempt at a Requiem,” as the symphony is labeled in its subtitle, does not begin with a traditional requiem introit – a muted prayer for eternal rest (Requiem aeternam) from which the special service gets its name – but in a manner more suggestive of the terrifying sequence Dies irae… Tuba miram. When the solo voice soon enters, the contrast could not be more severe: the alto utters the opening words unaccompanied and in a low, monotone recitative. Who is this
singer in Hartmann’s symphony? As she begins to describe the human costs of such misery (
*Märtyrer und Gefangene* – “martyrs and prisoners”), her melodic line breaks from its less
colorful monotony. The emotional outburst in the text is emphasized by an expressively
countoured melody and rapid declamation of the text, disconnecting the vocal line from the slow
orchestral ostinato underneath. The melody reaches its apex and the movement closes with a
return to the opening monotone style.

The second movement, *Frühling* (“Spring”), opens with another loud orchestral
introduction, more swarming and polyphonic than pounding; this is not the sweet and Romantic
spring of nineteenth century *Lieder*, but rather like that of Stravinsky’s *The Rite of Spring*;
indeed, while not a direct quotation, the orchestral density may remind the listener of the closing
section of *The Augurs of Spring* section of the famous ballet. (See Example 1.1.) It might be said
that Hartmann’s *Spring*, like Stravinsky’s, is not a representation of the natural phenomenon of
the season, but an expression of ritualistic violence cast in sharp relief against the fleeting
tenderness and beauty of the season.

The vocal setting in the second movement is formally constructed in three distinct parts,
A-B-C. Section A is comprised of three unaccompanied phrases, set apart by chorale-like
passage in the winds and brass. The text of these three phrases establish Whitman’s secular
“trinity:” the lilacs, as harbingers of the returning spring, and the “star early droop’d in the night”
(*der Stern am Himmel früh in die Nacht sank*) combine to bring the third member – mournful
memory.

At the beginning of the second (B) section, marked *Molto espressivo*, the orchestra
interacts musically with the voice for the first time. Until this point, the vocal entrances have
remained essentially independent of the orchestra, accompanied in the first movement by an
Example 1.1
Hartmann’s Representation of Spring: Sym. no. 1, mvt. II, mm. 1-2

Hartmann SYMPHONY NO. 1
© 1957 Schott Music, GmbH & Co. KG, Mainz
© renewed
All Rights Reserved
Used by permission of European American Music Distributors LLC,
U.S. and Canadian agent for Schott Music, Mainz
ostinato that was rather detached from the pathos of the voice, and in the second not accompanied at all. When the text begins here to refer to the lilacs in the second person, the strings mark the important poetic moment by tracing the melodic line. Musically these two phrases are exactly parallel, both containing the same melodic material, one of the few exact repetitions in the symphony.

The secular “trinity” that opened the movement is not quite the same at the end of the movement, neither is it identical to the one originally mentioned by Walt Whitman. Whitman’s “drooping star in the west” was an allegory for the recently slain President, Abraham Lincoln, who is also the subject of Whitman’s “thoughts of him” at the end of the poem. These references to Lincoln are understandably removed from this “trinity,” which as we see in Example 1.2 is now comprised of the lilacs, to whom the middle section is addressed; misery, the subtitle and expressive context for the movement; and death, surely referring to the “martyrs” who evoked such passion from the voice in the first movement, and for whom the symphony is an Attempt at a Requiem.

Example 1.2
The Secular “Trinity:” Sym. no. 1, mvt. II, mm. 52-62, voice

Hartmann SYMPHONY NO. 1
© 1957 Schott Music, GmbH & Co. KG, Mainz
© renewed
All Rights Reserved
Used by permission of European American Music Distributors LLC,
U.S. and Canadian agent for Schott Music, Mainz
The middle movement is a mystery, being particularly conspicuous for its extreme contrast from the rest of the symphony. It is the only movement in which the voice is silent, and the instrumental texture shifts from the large orchestra toward a chamber setting.\(^3\) Even the title, *Thema mit vier Variationen*, avoids the expressive suggestiveness of the other movement titles. However, we know that the theme for this movement (Example 1.3), which enters in the solo cello after a short introduction, was of particular significance for Hartmann, appearing in one form or another in all of his extant works from the Nazi period.\(^4\) It is especially important to take note of the character of this theme if we are to make sense of the movement and its position within the symphony as a whole. It has a wandering, extemporaneous quality and a sad expressivity, similar in quality to Eastern European and Jewish folk music. The theme is first played by the solo viola in two parallel phrases and is repeated slightly lower by the solo cello.

Variations 1 through 3 may be seen as one continuous unit, rather than as three distinct and closed sections. They are unified by a single teleology, an orientation toward a dramatic climax in the third variation at m. 73, each variation building on the previous and gradually increasing in dynamic level, expressive ‘agitation,’ and textural density. Variation 1 begins with the expressive marking, ‘somewhat faster – shadowy,’ and later ‘misterioso;’ the variation generally stays in softest dynamic range.\(^5\) Variation 2 is marked *bewegter*, ‘more animated,’ and

---

\(^3\) The second movement of the First String Quartet is the model and precedent for this movement. Manuscript evidence shows Hartmann even considered labeling the theme *Solo Streichquartett* in the score, but eventually ruled it out. Karl Amadeus Hartmann, “[Sinfonie Nr. 1 (Neufassung; Autograph B)], Mus. Mss. 12954,” [ca. 1957], AMs (microfilm), p. 24a, Hartmann Nachlaß, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich.

\(^4\) See Joseph Distefano, “The Symphonies of Karl Amadeus Hartmann” (Ph.D. diss., Florida State University, 1972), 49-50.

\(^5\) Hartmann attempted in at least one sketch for the variations to give each variation a title of its own: in the upper margins of a sketch corresponding to the beginning of the variation movement is written *Thema, Marcia funebre, Improvisation, Pastorale,* and *Chorale.* Karl Amadeus Hartmann, “Mus. Mss. 12954,” p. 23b.
trades the steady 4/4 for a lop-sided and unsettling 7/8, rendering the theme frenetic and tense. Several short martial bursts by the snare transitions into Variation 3, once again in quadruple meter and marked sehr bewegt ("very animated"). The climax of these three variations occurs as the dynamic level reaches fortississimo (fff) midway through Variation 3; the horn is abandoned by the orchestra as all other instruments drop out, rendering the solo horn exposed and conspicuous. The fourth and final variation is marked Choral: it is homophonic in texture, in stark contrast to the rather dense polyphony of the rest of the movement. Compositionally, Hartmann used mirror writing for this variation, each chromatic line mirrored (inverted by exact interval) by another – highly dissonant yet hymn-like. The movement concludes quietly and peacefully, and the symphony itself seems to end and start again with the opening of the next movement.

Example 1.3
Middle Movement Theme: Sym. no. 1, mvt. III, mm. 9-16, viola

Hartmann SYMPHONY NO. 1
© 1957 Schott Music, GmbH & Co. KG, Mainz
© renewed
All Rights Reserved
Used by permission of European American Music Distributors LLC,
U.S. and Canadian agent for Schott Music, Mainz

6 Only the last variation retained its expressive label.
7 Judging from the number and transitional nature of the sketches for the fourth variation in the autographs, it appears that it was probably not written until around 1955, during final edits for the 1956 Schott print. The contrapuntal technique used is particularly characteristic of Hartmann’s compositional style in the mid-1950s, among which archivists originally found the fourth variation sketches.
The fourth movement opens with the single word – Tränen (“Tears!”) – repeated three times in a particularly low register for the alto singer, while fragments of the middle movement’s theme and variations may be heard in the orchestral setting. This repetitive quality carries over into the second section (B), as the text describes a starless night on a white beach, the tears from the opening phrase absorbed into the sand. This section is comprised of five parallel phrases, with a lullaby calmness and comforting predictability. The sorrowful and descriptive text sets the scene for the dramatic scenario that follows in Section C.

The centerpiece of the fourth movement is the description of the ghostly vision in Section C, marked dramatico and significantly more dissonant and vigorous, nearly Expressionistic in its textual and musical description of the eerie scene. The orchestra seems to imitate the shrieks and wails of the text’s schluchzende Tränen, wilde Schreie (“sobbing tears… wild cries”). A large outburst from the orchestra, reminiscent of the opening fanfare, forms the climax of the symphony – it is even marked “Höhepunkt” in the score – generating a mass of expressive energy diffused and brought to an end by a piano solo. The last two sections of the fourth movement addresses to the apparition, describing the sadness brought on by the loneliness of night. The movement closes with the repetition of the opening section (Tränen! Tränen! Tränen!) to close the movement.

The fifth movement begins attacca, though a Generalpause in the first measure breaks the effect of the continuation. The vocal setting for the first section of this movement incorporates the Sprechgesang style made famous by Schoenberg and the Second Viennese School. This passage is exclusively accompanied by percussion instruments, rendering the

---

*Sprechgesang* is used here to refer to the ‘parlando’ manner of singing, and not in the normal speaking voice implied by the term, *Sprechstimme*, although Schoenberg was known to use the
passage skeletal and haunting. The accompanying text also adopts a new tone, observing and commenting on a newly named dramatic character, “Ich hörte die Allmutter, als sie gedankenvoll auf ihre Toten schaute.”³ When the poetry begins to quote her, the voice resumes its traditional singing tone, though in a fairly static melody reminiscent of the recitative of the first movement. Why is the Sprechgesang passage so disconnected from the tone of the previous movements? How are we to interpret this switch: is it mere technical novelty, or is it somehow related to the rest of the vocal part? The answers to these questions will figure prominently in the interpretation to be presented in Chapter Four.

The symphony closes with a prayer, the “Request” suggested in the movement’s subtitle, that the earth would receive the dead and exhale them out, “years, centuries hence.” Such a request serves as a final connection to the requiem tradition, a prayer for the rest of those that sleep in death to rest eternally, with the hope of future resurrection.

The preceding description has highlighted several unusual features – troubling anomalies that force the listener into a questioning, critical stance: why are these here? The presence of the texted voice, while not unheard of in symphonic tradition, is unusual enough to provoke questions about intent and meaning. Even more mysterious is the inclusion of the untexted variation movement and the Sprechgesang switch near the end. Before these questions can be addressed in detail it will be useful to review how other scholars have pondered this work and its composer.

³ Whitman’s original poetry reads: “Pensive on her dead gazing I heard the Mother of All…” This line is lifted exactly from Hans Reisiger’s German translation, unaltered by the composer as are many other lines.

latter to mean the former. See Ralph Wood, “Concerning Sprechgesang,” Tempo 2 (December 1946): 3-6. While the final printed version contains suggested pitches, the autographs are not pitched, suggesting that the pitches were late additions to the score, perhaps at the publisher’s request, and that for Hartmann, as for Schoenberg, the imprecision of pitch that defined the Sprechgesang style was truly the intention. The written pitches need not be rigorously followed.
Review of Literature

The single most important resource in the Hartmann literature is the English-language *Thematic Catalogue* of Hartmann’s works, written and published in 1982 by the late Australian musicologist, Andrew McCredie.\(^{10}\) As a preface to the catalog, McCredie translated into English his 1980 biography, *Karl Amadeus Hartmann: Sein Leben und Werk*, which is largely chronological and has endured little alteration since its original publication.\(^{11}\) These two documents serve as the most thorough review of both Hartmann’s personal correspondence and the manuscripts housed at the Bavarian State Library in Munich, as well as all the published scores. While McCredie’s archival work is methodical and helpful, his biographical style tends to glorify the composer and his creative intent, as he is clearly convinced of both Hartmann’s musical genius and his unassailable politics.

In contrast to McCredie’s tendencies toward advocacy scholarship, Michael Kater treats him with considerably more neutrality. As a historian, he has published on a wide range of subjects related to National Socialism, including the history of the Hitler Youth, the organization of the Nazi Party, and the practice of medicine under the Reich. Two of the three volumes in Kater’s trilogy on music are entitled *The Twisted Muse: Musicians and Their Music in the Third Reich* (1999)\(^{12}\) and *Composers of the Nazi Era: Eight Portraits* (2002).\(^{13}\) While the former book mentions Hartmann several times in the context of other composers, the latter contains an entire

---


26-page chapter dedicated to him – one of the “Eight Portraits.” Though much of his biography is derived from McCredie’s, Kater is considerably more critical than the Australian musicologist, perhaps due to a lack of familiarity, expertise, or allegiance to musical objects. Kater rejects the “black-and-white” moralism so prevalent in historic treatment of this era, and chooses to describe his subjects as “gray people against a landscape of gray.”\(^\text{14}\) In his effort to portray a more complete picture of his subject’s humanity, he emphasizes certain events as potential evidence of Hartmann’s character flaws, and his treatment of the composer offers a unique look from the standpoint of a suspiciously glowing Nazi Party file.

The story of Hartmann, along with two of his contemporaries, received a less academic treatment in the 1995 book *Hindemith, Hartmann and Henze*, by Guy Rickards. Rickards’ book is especially useful for its informal “coffee table” presentation of the times in which these composers lived, in a writing style that is light and appealing, and includes plenty of photos from each of the composers’ lives. This book clearly has a more general, non-academic audience in mind; for this reason the lack of documentation for his historical claims is forgivable, though in the case of several rather sensational claims the lack of proof is often suspect.\(^\text{15}\)

Christoph Lucas Brehler’s dissertation, *Karl Amadeus Hartmann: Untersuchungen Zum Frühwerk Der Jahre 1927 Bis 1933* (1999), is the most detailed look at the composer’s earliest compositions up to the First String Quartet of 1933. Joseph Distefano’s *The Symphonies of Karl* ...


\(^\text{15}\) An example of such a claim is the following: “After a period which included temporary work in an office, Hartmann prevailed over his parents’ better judgement and was allowed to study music. *Richard Hartmann had even locked the piano lid to deter his son from using it* but, as part of the deal, Karl now undertook to learn an instrument in order to provide him with some sort of earning capacity.” (Emphasis mine.) Guy Rickards, *Hindemith, Hartmann and Henze* (London: Phaidon Press, 1995), 55.
Amadeus Hartmann (1972) was one of the earliest pieces of scholarly work on the composer, and was produced without many of the major resources available now. Largely based on analysis of published scores, Distefano’s dissertation briefly describes the stylistic and formal elements for each of the eight numbered symphonies, though his observations are limited due to the scope of his project and the limited number of scholarly resources on Hartmann available to him. Another treatment of Hartmann’s symphonic style is Andreas Jaschinski’s Karl Amadeus Hartmann: Symphonische Tradition und Ihre Auflösung (1982). Jaschinski’s primary objective was to demonstrate the connections between Hartmann as a mature composer and the symphonic tradition, and thus he avoids addressing in detail the materials and meaning of the First Symphony in favor of later works.

An important element in the discussion of Hartmann’s politics as seen through his music is his subtle use of Jewish melodies and musical idioms in his music. This topic was certainly suggested by Joseph Distefano in 1972, but it was Heister’s essays Elend und Befreiung and Das Fremde und das Eigene that really cemented the Jewish element as an irresistible topic in the discussion of Hartmann’s music. Christoph Lucas Brehler’s dissertation on the early works of Hartmann points to the composer’s use of Jewish musical idiom even in his earliest compositions, comparing them to several works by contemporary Jewish composers whose music Hartmann was known to have heard in the 1920s. Brehler’s thesis shows the use of Jewish melody and idiom in the music following the First String Quartet to be the crystallization of an already developing style, and not necessarily original to the post-1933 era.

The use of Walt Whitman’s poetry in the First Symphony is an issue that has been thoroughly treated by the foremost scholars on the German-language reception of Whitman, the brothers Walter and Werner Grünzweig. The essential guide to this reception history is Walter
Grünzweig’s 1995 book, *Constructing the German Walt Whitman*, which traces the major themes present in the uniquely German understanding of the American poet, especially Whitman’s modernism and his politics. Grünzweig also provided the chapter on the major figures in the history of German-language Whitman translation and reception in Gay Wilson Allen’s *Walt Whitman and the World*, also from 1995. This discussion is carried further in the Grünzweig brothers’ collaborative essay entitled “Eros, Expressionism, and Exile: Whitman in German Music,” which was published the same year in the book *Walt Whitman and Modern Music*, a text that looks at the appropriation of Whitman’s poetry by modernist composers in the early twentieth century. McCredie even weighed in on the subject in his essay, “Die Dichtung Walt Whitmans als Quelle zur deutschen Bekenntnissymphonik,” which appeared in 2003.

**Methodology**

My research for this thesis began with listening and score study, and all subsequent scholarly investigation was guided by the musical and textual object.¹⁶ This is reflected in the overall structural orientation of this thesis: all the scholarly research, though placed chronologically prior, is preparatory case building for the interpretive claims of Chapter Four. Though the composer’s motivations and intentions for the work do not fully constitute an interpretation, they do figure prominently in the final critical analysis.

¹⁶ In recent years several compact disc recordings of the First Symphony have been produced in the UK and Germany: Karl Amadeus Hartmann, *Symphonie nr. 1: Versuch eines Requiems*, conducted by Ingo Metzmacher with Cornelia Kallisch and the Bamberger Symphoniker, EMI Classics 5554242, 1995, compact disc; Karl Amadeus Hartmann, *8 Symphonien; Gesangs-Szene*, conducted by Fritz Rieger with Doris Soffel and the Symphonieorchester des Bayerischen Rundfunks, Wergo WER 60187-50, 1989, compact disc; Karl Amadeus Hartmann, *Symphony no. 1; Symphony no. 6; Misereae*, conducted by Leon Botstein with Jard van Nes and London Philharmonic Orchestra, Telarc CD-80528, 1999, compact disc.
Much of the research work was spent determining the trends prior to and influential in the act of composing the First Symphony. McCredie and Kater demonstrated a vital link between the composer’s art and his politics from the earliest days of his career. The more intimate writings of Hartmann’s wife, Elisabeth, and son, Richard offered several anecdotal comments that provided helpful support to McCredie’s account. Brehler’s book provided information on the composer’s developing style from the critical sarcasm of the 1920s to the politically motivated and committed works of the early-1930s. His treatment of individual early compositions constitutes the only available scholarly description of those works.

Evidence for the symphony’s compositional timeline was largely provided by the thematic catalog by Andrew McCredie, which provides reference for all references to the composition in Hartmann’s dated correspondence. The various manuscripts and sketches housed at the Bavarian State Library in Munich offered additional information regarding the extent and manner of the revisions immediately preceding the final 1956 print. McCredie’s biographical work on Hartmann provided a few paragraphs on the compositional chronology, largely derived from the composer’s letters.

My contextual interpretation of the work was based on a close study of the score, with particular attention given to the vocal treatment and the compositional techniques employed in the middle movement. Because of the unusual nature of the symphony and the extreme constraints on artistic expression that existed in the National Socialist era, it was necessary to go beyond a tradition approach to the text-music relationship limited to instances of word painting, and to explore a critical set of musical moments that were not fully explained by local textual cues. I made use of the narrative cues present in the symphony’s various subtitles (Versuch eines Requiems; Introduktion; Epilog), the musical text settings (including recitative, lied, folksong
quotation, and *Sprechgesang*), and the developmental characteristics of the middle movement variations. Though the First Symphony is usually only marginally addressed in scholarly discussions of Hartmann’s symphonic style, in this reading it emerges as a convincing and sophisticated expression of a distressed young modernist composer commenting on his deeply troubled times.

**Chapter Breakdown**

The chapters of this thesis replicate three phases in the composer’s career, namely the years before, during, and after the composition of the First Symphony. The second chapter, entitled “Influences and Precedents,” examines the life and works of the composer prior to the First Symphony, tracing those threads that may be seen as presaging and participating in the final composition. The title reflects the chapter’s internal division. “Influences” begins with a discussion of Friedrich Richard Hartmann, the composer’s father, whose commitment to progressive politics and contemporary art (though not at the same time) were an inheritance enthusiastically assumed by his four sons. Hermann Scherchen, Hartmann’s mentor, also played an enormous role in motivating and suggesting nearly all of the compositions written in the 1930s and 40s. Scherchen’s own political commitment as a performer, though different from Hartmann’s as a composer, became a vital resource for the young composer’s effort to make his own personal stand in ways that were poignant and relevant to his time, yet universal enough to last well beyond the years of their particular crises. Strange perhaps is the inclusion of Hartmann’s “inner immigration,” another frequently cited aspect of the composer’s biography.

---

17 “‘Inner immigration’ is the process of maintaining one’s true convictions, one’s true self, and one’s identity, but concealing them from the outside world. The alternative is to run the risk of being destroyed, even physically. In Germany, ‘inner immigration’ is a commonly used
as a major influence on the composition of the First Symphony. Hartmann’s self-imposed withdrawal from public musical life was certainly an act of political commitment, though in its passivity difficult is to call resistance; this withdrawal simultaneously led him to look outside of his native country for performance opportunity and collegial interaction, creating a major compositional motivation for many of the works of this period.

The second half of the chapter, “Precedents,” addresses specific works by Hartmann that both predate the First Symphony and foreshadow its principal topics, including the invocation of sacred music traditions, the use of Jewish musical materials, and the large ensemble stage as podium for political ideas.

The third chapter, entitled “Evolution of a Symphony,” contains a thorough review of the compositional timeline of the First Symphony and the questions that relate to it: the evolution of Hartmann’s expressive intent for the work, the choice of Whitman’s text and its implications, and genre problems associated with the changing title, especially the interaction with symphonic tradition and the aesthetic of the fragment.

The fourth chapter, entitled “Interpretation,” begins with an analysis of the symphony’s musical material, which emphasizes the middle movement as both temporally and musically central to the five-movement whole. The more dramatic aspects of the text settings will be shown to suggest an interpretive paradigm that effectively incorporates all the preceding discussions – including the composer’s intent for the work, the use of Jewish musical elements and Walt Whitman’s poetry, and the symphony’s significant musical and dramatic events. This expression for people who did not emigrate from Nazi Germany (e.g., Thomas Mann), but instead kept their regime-opposing convictions to themselves.” Robert H. Klein and Victor L. Schermer, ed., Group Psychotherapy for Psychological Trauma (New York: Guilford Press, 2000), 295n4.
interpretive model will be seen to have important implications for performance practice as well as critical reception.
CHAPTER TWO

INFLUENCES AND PRECEDENTS

Influences

Friedrich Richard Hartmann

Karl Amadeus’ father, Friedrich Richard Hartmann, may be credited with shaping much of his son’s personality and many of his convictions. Hartmann remembered his father as “a quiet man, absorbed in a deeply meditative world of ideas… He was an early riser and I never saw him in the morning without a book in his hand.”¹ Among his favorite literary figures were Maupassant, Jack London, and Gogol, and he was fascinated with historical accounts of the French revolution and the peasant wars of the sixteenth century. Friedrich Richard was a schoolteacher by profession, but enjoyed a reputation around Munich as a painter of still life and florals. His artistic style and subjects were more traditional, and Hartmann later noted that in all of his father’s floral paintings there was not found a single reflection of his “world of ideas.”² However, he was an enthusiastic observer of the latest trends in art, and he encouraged young artists to be aware of the stylistic changes of their time.

Though he had earned the nickname “Richard the Red” on account of his leftist political sympathies,³ Friedrich Richard remained politically uncommitted and independent. He had aligned himself ideologically with the international anti-war movement during the Great War

² Ibid.
³ Richard Hartmann, “Mein Vater und mein Onkel, der Maler,” Karl Amadeus Hartmann: Komponist im Widerstreit (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2004), 204.
years of 1914-18, and it was likely with a great deal of satisfaction that the senior Hartmann watched as coordinated worker strikes and socialist revolutions in several cities, including Munich, crippled the German empire’s war effort in November of 1918. In February of 1919, Friedrich Richard Hartmann and his four sons were among the estimated 100,000 mourners who attended the state funeral of Bavaria’s first socialist Minister-President, Kurt Eisner, who had been assassinated by a political rival. It is likely due to Friedrich Richard’s lack of direct political commitment that, in the dangerous political atmosphere following the Great War, the Hartmann family was able to avoid the deadly reprisals routinely being made against leftist and communist sympathizers.

Although Friedrich Richard’s artistic output was characterized by relative neutrality, this was not to be the case with his sons. Each of Hartmann’s older brothers continued the artistic tradition of their father, though, according to Andrew McCredie, “combined with varying complexions of religious, social and political commitment.” Adolf, the eldest, became the most skilled and well known of the artist brothers. Adolf demonstrated a mastery of painting technique very early, with a specialty in oils and portraiture, and by the age of 21 regularly presented his work in local galleries. Karl Amadeus also pursued painting, but found his aesthetic imagination more engaged by music than by visual art. While several of the Hartmann sons would go on to be very politically active, Karl Amadeus’ personal politics would be most like his father’s – passionate, full of conviction, yet largely non-committal with respect to party affiliation.

4 Richard Hartmann, “Mein Vater,” 205. Kurt Eisner, poet-politician and socialist-democrat, had served for just over three months as Bavaria’s first Minister-President following Germany’s “November Revolution,” before losing his post in elections; he was assassinated in the streets of Munich on February 21, 1919, while on his way to deliver a letter of resignation to the Bavarian Parliament. His funeral was held on February 26, 1919.
5 McCredie, Thematic Catalogue, 7.
It is unclear to what extent Hartmann’s father encouraged him to pursue music as a career. In his book *Hindemith, Hartmann and Henze*, Guy Rickards describes Friedrich Richard as being so opposed to his son’s musical pursuits that he locked the lid to the piano to keep him from studying music.\(^6\) While Rickard provides no support this claim, it is clear that Friedrich Richard did encourage his son to pursue a more professional career path, one with considerably more security than the field of music. He had pursued such a strategy himself, becoming a schoolteacher to support his family and his art, and at least one of his sons went on to be respectably employed as a teacher. Second son Fritz had begun studies at the Teacher’s Training College in Pasing in 1917, and at his father’s request, Karl also enrolled there in 1919.\(^7\) Fritz apparently completed his training and enjoyed a long career employed as a teacher; Karl withdrew from the college in 1922 without finishing and found temporary work as a clerical assistant. When he enrolled in the Academy of Musical Arts in February of 1924, it was his older brother Adolf who paid his tuition. According to McCredie, Karl received parental support for this decision only after assuring them “his curriculum incorporated such instrumental studies as would enable him to earn a future professional subsistence.”\(^8\) Friedrich Richard passed away the following year.

Karl’s career in the Academy was characterized by excellent marks and good comments from a majority of his instructors. However, he found himself constantly at odds with professor Joseph Haas, his composition instructor. According to McCredie’s rather lionized account, Hartmann’s disagreements with Haas and the Academy were typical of “the familiar conflicts of the gifted, if uncompromising individualist within a conservative academic institution either ill-
equipped or at least reluctant to recognize, accommodate and foster provocatively innovative talent.”9 Haas was a traditionalist of the Max Reger school, and wrote primarily chamber art pieces and sacred music. But such traditionalism was not peculiar to Haas. The music scene in Munich had been criticized for several decades for what was perceived to be a regressive anti-modernism, especially when compared to the progressive environment of Berlin, Frankfurt, and Dresden. The music academy in Munich was not exempt, and in Hartmann’s own words, “I foresaw that [my compositions] would not get a good response, and so did not even bother the professors with them, letting the door fall shut easily behind me.”10 Hartmann left the Academy in early 1929. It was Hartmann’s first experience with an aesthetically conservative institution, an environment that, as he perceived it, suppressed creativity and free expression in favor of accepted, traditional idioms and forms.

Hermann Scherchen

The Vereinigung für Zeitgenössische Musik (VZM) was founded in 1927 by two local Munich musicians and composers, Fritz Büchtger and Carl Orff, and presented contemporary works of a much larger scale than the Juryfreien chamber concerts, employing full orchestral forces, large choruses, and often even an opera company. Between 1929 and 1932, the VZM held a series of music festivals, presenting such works as Hindemith’s Kammermusik no. 5, Stravinsky's L’histoire du Soldat, and Alois Hába’s Matka to Munich’s largely conservative audience.

10 Karl Amadeus Hartmann, “Autobiographische Skizze,” 11-12.
Hermann Scherchen usually conducted the VZM festivals, and it was at one of these that Hartmann and the famous conductor met. While the young composer was impressed by Scherchen's passionate musicality, it was his "It's about people!" approach to art, as well as his rejection of absolute music and art-for-art's-sake,\textsuperscript{11} that would prove most resonant. Hartmann later confessed, "In no conservatory or academy have I learned anything close to what Scherchen instilled in me, and this is simply because the practice of music was his starting place, and because he placed the human element in the foreground."\textsuperscript{12}

Three aspects of Scherchen’s personality and reputation would characterize the relationship between Hartmann and Scherchen. First, Scherchen was Europe’s foremost champion of modern music. He had been a student of Arnold Schoenberg in the early 1910s, and had helped him prepare his seminal \textit{Pierrot lunaire} for performance in the summer of 1912. Scherchen, along with Ferruccio Busoni, Artur Schnabel, and Alexander Jemnitz, was counted among Schoenberg’s inner circle until the outbreak of war in 1914 scattered them abroad. He took a post as director of an orchestra in Latvia, but was interned by the Russians following the revolutions in 1917. After returning to Berlin in 1918, he founded the \textit{Neue Musikgesellschaft} (1919), the Scherchen Quartet (1918), the \textit{Melos-Gemeinschaft} (1920), and, most significantly, the avant-garde music journal, \textit{Melos} (1920). The latter enterprise is largely responsible for shaping the contemporary discourse on modern music. In 1923 he helped establish the International Society for Contemporary Music (ISCM) and thereafter served as juror and conductor at many of its festivals.

\textsuperscript{12} Karl Amadeus Hartmann, “Autobiographische Skizze,” 11-12.
The second aspect of Scherchen’s reputation that would be relevant to Hartmann’s development was the conductor’s outspoken leftist and socialist leanings. Such a political orientation was hardly uncommon among the avant-garde modernists of the twentieth century. Within the Socialist-modernist aesthetic, traditional (Romantic) aesthetic means were considered institutional (bourgeois) and overvalued (commodified). The very notion of art as entertainment stemmed from courtly tradition: in this sense, art ought to be a portrayal of life rather than its beautification – harsh and uncomfortable times called for an art that was not sweet and comforting. Art as message was an anti-bourgeois concept and had often been used as a tool of the lower classes to strike back at their lords and barons. Scherchen’s personal philosophy and politics were intimately tied to his love for contemporary artistic trends.

But Scherchen's politics were even more controversial due to his highly visible friendship with the Soviet Union. Thanks in large part to the Marxist-socialist revolutions in Germany in 1918, inspired by the Russian revolutions the year before, the Great War had ended and the Kaiser had abdicated the throne; when in 1919 Scherchen arranged several Russian revolutionary anthems to be sung by his workingman’s choir in Berlin, his motivation could not have been more clear. But communist leadership in Germany was not to last long, as within months the people elected themselves a more Anglo-American styled democracy, popularly known as the Weimar Republic. Communists, especially Soviet Russia, were increasingly seen as a major enemy of the new German Republic. Yet in such an environment, Scherchen continued to insist on having major cities in the Soviet Union among his concert tour stops, prompting many to
protest the implied politics. After the rise of National Socialism, Scherchen’s communist leanings would get him banned from the country.

Finally, Scherchen was also possessed by a frightening charisma and an explosive temper: Karl later wrote of Scherchen's "fluctuations in character and intellect," as well as the "absurdity of his spontaneous ideas," while Elizabeth Hartmann remembered, "it was terrible to see how mean Scherchen could be." The poet Elias Canetti, writing about Scherchen in his book, *The Play of the Eyes*, describes Scherchen as a man of icy demeanor, refusing to offer compliment or praise to anyone, and unwilling to accommodate anyone but himself. With such a personality, it is not surprising that much of Hartmann’s motivation and inspiration for new compositions during the 1930s came as a result from Scherchen’s suggestion and insistence. It was surely flattering for a young composer like Hartmann to have received from Scherchen the level of attention that he did; the relationship between the two men, while long and fruitful, would be a rocky one, filled with broken promises and bitter disappointments, harsh invective and hurt feelings.

Inner Immigration

According to Andrew McCredie, “up until this point in time, Hartmann’s own articulated position was that of a left-wing radical socialist, given to the practice of social parody, satire, and

---

13 In contrast to Scherchen, Hartmann’s personal politics were generally a private matter and he was rarely if ever known to overtly promote one political party or position. In spite of this difference, the two men were largely in agreement philosophically.


persiflage in his music.”¹⁷ But the events of 1933 precipitated a major personal shift for Hartmann, not necessarily in worldview, but in mood. As his friend, Max See, recalled nearly two decades later:

When I returned to Munich in 1935 for a longer period I found Hartmann completely changed. From the former musical enfant terrible playing around [austoben] in burlesque and persiflage emerged the introvert [Pathetiker]. The death of his mother under the hopeless conditions of the Hitler dictatorship hit him with doubly hard. What merely embittered other like-minded individuals compelled him to express his anger and his abysmal [abgründtief] sadness in music.¹⁸

In one of the most frequently quoted paragraphs ever written by Hartmann, he later explained that the events of 1933 – the rise of National Socialism and Adolf Hitler – led him to a morbidly defiant resolve.

In this year I realized that it would be necessary to set down a commitment, not out of despair and fear before that power, but as a confrontation. I told myself that freedom would triumph, even if it meant our destruction – that is what I always believed then. During that period I wrote my first string quartet, the symphonic poem “Miseræ,” and the first symphony…¹⁹

History tends to be cast in moral terms when dealing with events in Germany in the 1930s and 40s. Individuals are often separated into categories of evil perpetrators, innocent victims, or heroic resisters, and there is a great deal at stake for individuals to secure for themselves a reputation that places them in the second or third category. But as Richard Taruskin explains, while one’s own account of such times may paint things as black-and-white, the truth is likely in “shades of gray.” “One’s tendency in retrospect is to imagine life under totalitarianism

¹⁹ McCredie, Thematic Catalogue, 14.
in terms of stark choices and moral extremes. Real-life conditions and alternatives are seldom so
clear-cut.”

However complex moral decisions may be, what is apparent is that Hartmann chose to
completely remove himself from public life during the Third Reich, refusing to allow his works
to be publicly performed within Germany or any other Nazi-controlled country. This process of
withdrawing from public life is often referred to as “inner immigration,” a subject well addressed
by several other scholars. When one speaks of Hartmann’s resistance against the regime, it is not
meant that he made himself a great threat or annoyance to the Party leadership. External
expression of his beliefs tended to be written into his compositions, though never exactly overtly
stated. This aspect of Hartmann’s style – art as outlet for suppressed conviction – is important
when seeking to understand the motivations for his First Symphony.

A final note regarding this “inner immigration” is in order. With this removal from public
life, it was desperately important for the young composer to make connections with musicians
and musical organizations outside of Nazi-controlled countries in order to secure for himself a
post-Nazi career, however far-fetched it may have seemed at the time to imagine life after the
Reich. In actions which Michael Kater has chalked up to narcissism and self-absorption,
Hartmann is known to have corresponded with festival judges in order to try and convince them
to hear and perform his compositions. Perhaps these pleas are evidence of character flaws;
however, it seems nearly as likely they are the actions of lonely composer, reaching out for some
acknowledgement of his ongoing, though increasingly private, musical life.

---

20 Taruskin, 772.
Precedents

Several compositions serve as important precedents for the First Symphony. The following discussion looks briefly at several of these works and the ways they presage the aesthetic and expressive content of the First Symphony.

*Profane Messe* and *Kantate: the Sacred and the Profane*

Hartmann’s *Profane Messe* (1929) and *Kantate für Männerchor a cappella* (1929) are early examples of the sacred/profane dichotomy that will later be seen in the First Symphony. McCredie describes these two works as “strongly contrasted” from the sarcastic iconoclasm that typifies other Hartmann compositions from this time, which tended more toward jazz and burlesque. Both these are acapella choral works that in their titles invoke church music traditions, yet in their texts are prominently secular. These works, the first a setting of text by Max See and the second by Johannes R. Becher and a single line from Karl Marx’s *Communist Manifesto*, serve as early examples of the sacred/profane dialectic. Rather than – or perhaps more than – an attempt to offend religious sensibilities by profaning sacred musical forms, Christoph Lucas Brehler has described this relationship as an attempt to elevate the common and non-religious to the celebratory and ritual status of the religious ceremony, a common feature of the Socialist and Communist worldviews and aesthetics. Hartmann’s use of the religious is a demonstration of the seriousness with which he treats his otherwise commonplace subject.21

This context places these works firmly within the style and spirit of the workingmen’s chorus movement of the 1920s, whose self-appointed goal was to improve the quality of life for

---

German workers through the shared practice of art. The choir was viewed as a representation of “the people”, an ensemble that consists of the collective and unadulterated human voice, a metaphor for socialist democracy. In this sense these works may also be compared to Bartók’s \textit{Cantata profane} (1930), written a year after Hartmann’s choir works, with its emphasis on the performance of amateurs and the gravity and ritual of the everyday life situation of the individual. Hindemith’s \textit{Lieder nach alten Texten} (1923), \textit{Männerchoir a cappella}(1929/30), and \textit{Der Tod} (1931) may also be mentioned in this category, as works shaped by a consciousness of and commitment to broad concepts of humanitarianism.

The Operas: Social Commentary and Political Commitment

Hartmann’s five chamber operas, grouped under the title \textit{Wachsfigurenkabinett} (“Waxworks” or “Wax Museum”), are early examples of social criticism. \textit{Chaplin-Ford-Trott}, the second opera in the set, is subtitled “scenic jazz cantata,” and satirizes the American materialism and optimism of the 1920s, represented by three of the most exported institutions of American consumerism: the cinema (Charlie Chaplin), the automobile (Henry Ford), and popular music (the foxtrot dance). \textit{Der Mann, der vom Tode aufstand} (“The man who rose from the dead”) tells the story of an industrial tycoon who fearfully imagines that a worker’s revolt threatens to bring down his business. The final two operas, \textit{Fürwahr!}? (“For real!?”) and \textit{Die Witwe von Ephesus} (“The widow of Ephesus”), are both critical of the prevailing traditions of familial and marital values.

\textsuperscript{22} “We will live better,” states See’s text confidently. It has already been mentioned that Scherchen himself led such a chorus in Berlin in the late 1910s and early 20s.

\textsuperscript{23} Brehler, 67.
Hartmann’s larger (though still considered chamber) opera, *Simplicius Simplicissimus*, also attempt similar social critiques, only this time against the miseries of life under National Socialism. Yet another work suggested by Scherchen, this opera is based on the late seventeenth-century novel by Johann von Grimmelhausen, in which a peasant boy who comes of age during the Thirty Years War (1618-48) and is able to survive the horrors that surround him only because his simple mind has only the loosest grasp on reality. The libretto, which Hartmann assembled with the help of Scherchen and Munich dramaturge Wolfgang Petzet, is loosely based on Book One of Grimmelshausen’s novel, and emphasizes the suffering of the poorest members of society under sustained tyranny and long-term war. Hartmann later described the contemporary parallel that he saw between the novel’s account and life under National Socialism, as well as the potential cultural work such a production could do:

> Sadly, the world today is in a condition that we are now able to sympathize with the unrest, fears, and sadness of those times. In holding up a mirror to the world so that it can behold its hideous face, it may once again choose a better way. Despite all political storm clouds, I believe in a better future; it is this that the closing apotheosis of my “Simplicius” is supposed to express.  

---

*String Quartet no. 1: “Jewish” themes*

The First String Quartet was written in 1933, and is the first of a series of compositions to prominently feature two specific melodies with connections to Jewish musical tradition.  

In the early 1930s, Hartmann developed an interest in non-Western-European music systems, especially those traditions associated with Eastern European and Jewish communities, as

---

25 In a chapter entitled “Provenienz und Verwendung Jüdischer Musikelemente,” Brehler provides evidence of Hartmann’s interest in Jewish music within even the earliest of Hartmann’s compositions. See Brehler, 140-150. However, the First String Quartet was the first to feature two specific melodies which reappear in several later works, including the First Symphony.
documented by Béla Bartók, A. Z. Idelsohn, and others. While Hartmann never explicitly stated his motivations for doing so, several scholars have suggested that his incorporation of these musical elements was an act of defiance against Nazi aesthetic and cultural policy through identification (however subtle) with those groups who were most hated and persecuted by the Reich.26

Example 2.1
Fugato Theme: St. Qt. no. 1, mvt. I, mm. 1-7, viola

Hartmann FIRST STRING QUARTET
© 1953 Schott Music, GmbH & Co. KG, Mainz
© renewed
All Rights Reserved
Used by permission of European American Music Distributors LLC,
U.S. and Canadian agent for Schott Music, Mainz

The first Jewish musical connection is found in the first movement as the theme for the opening fugato. (See Example 2.1. The X’s allow for easy comparison between the various versions of the melody employed by Hartmann.) Example 2.2 shows the Jewish folksong, *Elijahu hanavi*, as it appears in Idelsohn’s anthologies of Jewish tunes published in 1932. The tune is not explicitly marked or labeled in the score, nor identified in any description of the work, and for many years the composer did not openly reveal the name of the tune. Several years after

the fall of National Socialism, the quartet received the label “The Jewish Quartet” after the quotation became more widely known and discussed by the composer and his inner circle.27

Example 2.2
Jewish folksong, “Elijahu hanavi”28

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
\text{\textit{x x x}} & \text{\textit{x x x}} & \text{\textit{x x}} & \text{\textit{x x}} & \text{\textit{x x}} & \text{\textit{x x}} & \text{\textit{x x}} & \text{\textit{x x}} & \text{\textit{x}} & \text{\textit{x}} & \text{\textit{x}} & \text{\textit{x}} & \text{\textit{x}}
\end{array}
\]

Scholars have identified this melodic theme in two of Hartmann’s compositions from this era.29 As mentioned previously, it first appears in his String Quartet no. 1 (1933), as the basis for the fugato in the first movement. It is used again in Hartmann’s 1934 opera, *Simplicius Simplicissimus*, in the finale of Part II, as a funeral song (*Trauergesang*) at the death of the hermit, the beloved mentor of the title character. (See Example 2.3.) It is significant that this particular use of the melody is as a song of grief sung by a chorus of common farm folk.

The second connection is the theme of the second movement, an original one to Hartmann, not quoting or paraphrasing a preexistent melody, whose melismatic (though completely instrumental) and recitational quality has been described as imitative of Hebrew chant. This theme is thought so important and personal to the composer that has been labeled the

---

29 The earliest reference to this folksong in Hartmann scholarship appears to be in the following: Andreas Jaschinski, *Karl Amadeus Hartmann: Symphonische Tradition und ihre Auflösung* (Munich: Emil Katzbichler, 1982), 12.
“Hartmann theme.” Example 2.4 is the cello theme from the second movement of the string quartet, and Example 2.5 shows how the theme is used in the opera the following year.

Example 2.3
*Trauergesang* from *Simplicius Simplicissimus* (1934), Act II, Finale, mm. 433-442

Hartmann SIMPLICIUS SIMPLICISSIMUS
© 1957 Schott Music, GmbH & Co. KG, Mainz
© renewed
All Rights Reserved
Used by permission of European American Music Distributors LLC, U.S. and Canadian agent for Schott Music, Mainz

Example 2.4
“Hartmann Theme” in St. Qtt. no. 1, mvt. II, mm. 12-19, cello

Hartmann FIRST STRING QUARTET
© 1953 Schott Music, GmbH & Co. KG, Mainz
© renewed
All Rights Reserved
Used by permission of European American Music Distributors LLC, U.S. and Canadian agent for Schott Music, Mainz

---

30 Behschnitt, “‘Wahrheit, die Freude bereitet und mit Trauer verbunden ist’,” p. 108.
Miserae: Symphonic as Humanitarian

As Hartmann further explores the political potential of his musical style, the scale of his works turn markedly larger. The symphonic poem of 1935, Miserae, is an early example of the humanitarian gesture that many scholars have read into Hartmann’s turn toward larger instrumental genres: the large stages and audiences of the symphony hall allowed for wider broadcast of his music, laden as it was with messages of misery, sadness, and therefore also resistance to National Socialism.

The dedication for Miserae famously refers to individuals who perished at Dachau, the Nazi concentration camp north of Munich. It seems clear that Hartmann had heard many of the terrible rumors coming out that camp, and likely knew several who were detained there, since the 1935 dedication refers to hundreds perishing in Dachau 1933-1934.\(^{31}\) The dedication, while

---

\(^{31}\) At the time of the 1935 ISCM festival, the camp at Dachau was a prison labor camp that primarily detained leaders and active members of workers’ parties and trade unions; at this stage, Jews were arrested sent into the camp only to the extent that they belonged to one of the banned
admirable, was not the public statement depicted by some scholars. As Fred K. Prieberg has pointed out, it was affixed only to Scherchen’s conductor’s score and was therefore not visible or known to anyone else at the ISCM festival.\(^\text{32}\) On the basis of this and other evidence, Kater raises some doubts as to Hartmann’s resistance to the *Reichsmusikkammer* given that his personal file had been “closed, in agreement with the ministry.” Kater’s questions are certainly valid; but the preponderance of evidence continues to lean in favor of Hartmann as resistant to the Reich. It was consistent with Hartmann’s personal political style to express his resistance in essentially aesthetic terms, in intensely private and passive – perhaps to a fault.

---

political groups. Punishment in Dachau, however, was exceptionally draconian, especially for Jewish prisoners. As early as May 1933, two months after the camp was created, death by hanging or firing squad was the expected penalty for infractions such as disobeying orders, disparaging guards or National Socialist leaders, attempting to organize, make speeches, distribute propaganda, or any activity that might encourage prisoners in revolt. In the early months of the camp, several accounts were leaked into the local and international press about treatment in the camp; Nazi party leaders took great pains to either refute their stories, eliminate them from their reporting posts, or both. Harold Marcuse, *Legacies of Dachau* (New York: Cambridge UP, 2001), 22-23.

CHAPTER THREE
THE EVOLUTION OF A SYMPHONY

As a prelude to discussing the First Symphony’s history, it is necessary to place the work within the context of the relatively unfamiliar composer’s life. Born in Munich, Germany, on August 2, 1905, Karl Amadeus Hartmann was nearly 13 years old when the Treaty of Versailles ended the Great War in 1918. He spent much of the decadent 1920s as an energetic youth, and was 25 years old when the Great Depression came to Germany in 1930. He was a young man of 28 when National Socialism took over in 1933 and a 40-year-old when Germany was defeated in 1945. Nearly two decades of musical career followed, and he died rather young, at the age of 58, on December 5, 1963.

Andrew McCredie has helpfully divided up Hartmann’s creative output into four principal phases: 1) the final years of the Weimar Republic (1927-1933), characterized by social criticism, sarcastic irony, and incorporation of jazz elements; 2) the years under National Socialism (1933-1945), characterized by an emphasis on misery, death, and mourning, a statement of opposition to repressive aesthetic policies; 3) years of “creative gestation, revision and consolidation” (1945-1953), in which most of the large-scale works from the previous years were revised and finally published, in addition to a handful of new works largely similar in style to those being revised; and finally 4) years of searching for a new compositional path, especially new conceptualizations of rhythm, meter, and contrapuntal techniques.1 As we shall see, the First Symphony spans the last three phases: written in isolation in the early Nazi years of Hartmann’s

second phase, renamed and premiered in the post-war third phase, and finally revised and published in the last.

The discussion of composer intent to follow addresses the ways in which the symphony may be understood as meaningful to Karl Amadeus Hartmann. Whether one believes it to be important or not, significant documentary evidence exists regarding the composer’s purpose and motivation for the work and ought not be ignored. However, this is only one strand of many in a web of contexts within which the work may be considered meaningful. The composer’s opinion of his or her own work is no less subjective than that of the performer, the listener, or the critic. It might be useful, then, to separate composer intent from one’s interpretation, each having their place and neither being requisite for the other: intent centers on the act of composition, determining potential attitudes of the creator toward the created thing; interpretation centers on the act of critical listening, determining potential modes within which that created thing is received and perceived.² With this understanding in place, intent may interact with interpretation and serve as another component in the complex act of listening to the work.

The First Symphony was originally conceived as an orchestral setting of Walt Whitman poetry during the politically charged phase in the early years of the Nazi era. The earliest evidence of the composition’s existence is in a letter to New York composer, Dante Fiorillo, dated New Years’ Eve 1935: “[I am currently working on] the libretto of a cantata for which I

² “The question of intention… centers on the genesis of the poem, the process of its coming into being. The critic’s question is somewhat different, concerning not the genesis but the actual achievement – the result of the process, not the process itself.” David Couzens Hoy, The Critical Circle (Berkeley: University of California, 1978), 26. The context here is obviously literary, but has application in other interpretive practices, including that of music.
am using poems of the American Walt Whitman.”

Several months later (07 May 1936), he wrote to Alexander Jemnitz, illuminating some of his intent for the work:

I am currently working on a cantata (for alto voice and large orchestra) (text freely adapted from Walt Whitman), in which I describe our life [Unser leben schildere]. The poems, which I have altered considerably, embrace our generally difficult, hopeless life, although no idea will be choked with death [doch wird keine Idee vom Tode erstickt]. I believe I have made in this work real progress in a music that concerns all humankind. I would like to submit this work for next year’s international music festival in Paris, even though only half of it is completed.

In late 1935, Hartmann had attracted to himself some unwanted attention from the Reichsmusikkammer, the Nazi Party organization that controlled musical life in Germany. Germany had seceded from the ISCM in early 1934 and had established another international contemporary music society under the leadership of RMK officials. Hartmann had not sought permission to attend the disavowed organization’s festival for the premiere of Miserae in September of 1935, most likely because he was sure he would not have received it. Insult was added further when, per Hartmann’s wishes, the hated Hermann Scherchen directed the premiere. Immediately after his return home Hartmann began receiving harassing letters from the RMK, cautioning him that in the future such trips abroad would require permission by the chamber, and demanding he comply with orders to complete his registration with the chamber with the submission of Aryan heritage questionnaires for himself and his wife. In January of 1936, Hartmann received final notice from the RMK, threatening to ban him from musical life in Germany. Although Hartmann never fully complied (RMK records dated July 1941 show he still has not supplied proof of his and his wife’s pedigree), the threat of discipline never materialized.

3 McCredie, Thematic Catalogue, 17.
4 Translation adapted from McCredie, Thematic Catalogue, 17; McCredie, Sein Leben und Werk, 57; Kater, Composers of the Nazi Era, 90.
It was in this atmosphere that Hartmann wrote his Whitman cantata as a symbolic gesture, a description of life in the mid-1930s as he saw it. Like *Miserae,* it would be cast in a large-scale genre, ensuring the widest audience possible for its message of misery. Such a dismal cultural statement as Hartmann described could hardly fail to be seen as a political statement, even if no specific parties or individuals were named. And like *Simplicius Simplicissimus,* the Whitman cantata would exploit a historic literary work as a contemporary cultural statement, leveraging the authority afforded the work by its historical separation to give its message a prophetic quality. When the work was submitted to competition in Autumn 1936, it bore the title *Unser Leben* and contained adapted translations of some of Whitman’s most miserable poems: “I sit and look out [upon all the sorrows of the world],” “When lilacs last in the dooryard bloom’d,” “Tears,” and “Pensive on her dead gazing.”

One of the contextual strands for Hartmann’s Whitman project is the politics of Walt Whitman reception in German-speaking countries, which tended to describe the American’s poetry in terms of modernist aesthetics and political progressivism and liberalism. Whitman’s reputation as the poet of the modern proletariat began in 1868, when Friedrich Freiligrath, revolutionary German poet and former friend of Karl Marx, published several of his own translations of Whitman poems along with an introductory essay that described Whitman’s common-man appeal. Several more extensive translations appeared in the years before and after the First World War, most of them produced by literary figures prominently allied to modernist aesthetics and politically liberal causes: many believed Whitman could point the way to a new

---

5 This history has recently been traced by Walter Grünzweig in the book *Constructing the German Walt Whitman* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1995), and in the essay entitled “Whitman in the German-Speaking Countries,” published in *Walt Whitman and the World,* ed. Gay Wilson Allen (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1995), 166-230.
anti-bourgeois German poetic, and others read into Whitman’s tragic war poems a pacifist manifesto.

The classic translation of Whitman’s texts, the version Hartmann used as the basis of his cantata, came in 1922 at the pen of Hans Reisiger. Reisiger’s commentary placed particular emphasis on the poet’s homoeroticism; such an emphasis had already been suggested near the turn of the century, when Whitman had been posthumously enlisted as a champion for the “emancipation of homosexuals.”6 Reisiger was close friends with Thomas Mann, with whom he shared a passion for Whitman’s style and, according to Grünzweig, the belief that the future success of German democracy relied on newer and expanded roles of sexuality and eroticism – according to Grünzweig, they believed these could "serve as a glue to keep democratic society from disintegrating."7 For them, Whitman pointed the way to such a utopia.

For nearly every reason mentioned above Whitman ought to have completely rejected by the National Socialist regime. His emphasis on racial equality, expressive freedom, and pacifism made him antithetical to Nazi cultural policy. However, several poets favored by National Socialists continued to look to the American as a potential source of inspiration for a new German poetic. Whitman’s emphasis on blood and soil, the body beautiful, and even his view of women tended to appeal to the National Socialist aesthetic, and it was noted by at least one Nazi poet that Whitman’s use of the term “democratic” could easily be translated völkisch to correspond to Party aesthetics. In the end, according to Walter Grünzweig, "The Nazis thus preempted the possibility of a wide use of Whitman's poetry for the anti-Nazi struggle."8 While this may address some of the more general aspects of Whitman reception, Grünzweig's account

---

7 Grünzweig, “Whitman in the German-Speaking Countries,” 168.
8 Ibid.
may not apply specifically to a particular Nazi-controlled cultural center such as Munich in 1936. In spite of the muddled reputation during the Reich, the German reading of Whitman tended to emphasize the miseries and injustice of war, democratic freedom, the romance of the workingman, and other tenets close to the heart of socialism.\(^9\)

German composers also appeared to have been attracted to Whitman’s texts for primarily political reasons. It is clearly in this spirit that Hartmann chose the texts for his cantata. Indeed most settings were not *lieder* with piano accompaniment, with its limited chamber audience, but rather called for large orchestra, choir, or instrumental ensemble, requiring large stages and drawing large audiences, suggesting political. Hartmann was known to have programmed Hindemith’s chamber compositions in his *Juryfreien* concert series, and during this time he may become familiar with *Drei Hymnen von Walt Whitman* (1919) or *Eine lichte Mitternacht* (1929), the only Whitman works by Hindemith that predated his own.\(^10\) It is very likely that Scherchen was familiar with Delius’ *Im Meerestreiben* (1903),\(^11\) or with Othmar Schoeck’s *Trommelschläge* (1915),\(^12\) or even Franz Schreker’s *Vom ewigen Leben* (1924).\(^13\) All of these

\(^9\) Ibid., 160-168, 172-209.
\(^10\) Paul Hindemith wrote several Whitman works over his career: *Drei Hymnen von Walt Whitman* (1919) for solo baritone and piano and *Eine lichte Mitternacht* (1929) for acappella choir were chamber works which emphasized Whitman’s unique and expressive style and subject. (It is possible that Hartmann heard these works as part of his *Juryfreien* series, in which he was known to program Hindemith’s chamber works quite regularly.) *Nine English Songs* (1943) and *When Lilacs last in the Door-yard Bloom’d: A Requiem “For Those We Love”* (1946) were also political works in that they were demonstrations of solidarity with his new homeland, the United States, after fleeing National Socialism and immigrating there in 1942. It is significant that Hindemith prominently features the Jewish melody, *Gaza*, in his Whitman requiem.

\(^11\) In 1903, the German-born Englishman, Frederick Delius, set portions of “Sea Drift” to music, in a work that called for solo baritone, mixed choir, and large orchestra. While not considered a work by a German composer, it used a German translation of Whitman’s poems.

\(^12\) The first Whitman setting by a properly German composer was written in 1915 by the Swiss-born Othmar Schoeck: *Trommelschläge*, op. 2, for mixed choir and large orchestra, was to be his personal statement against the Great War that had engulfed Germany and all of Europe. Rather
scenarios, among others, at least suggest that the idea of a musical setting of Walt Whitman was part of the Zeitgeist in the musical community surrounding Hartmann in the 1920s and 30s. Not so unlike their literary counterparts, these composers emphasized Whitman’s horror of war and his themes of remembrance, grief, and death. While, it is unknown precisely how Hartmann came upon the idea for a Whitman cantata, it was almost certainly these same that motivated his choice.

In the early months of 1936, the title of the work appeared to be in flux. In letters from February and March, Hartmann calls the cantata by the title, *Lamento*, and beginning in April, Hartmann indicated that he had abandoned the simple title of *Kantate* for the more ambiguous and expressive *Symphonisches Fragment*. This change in title carries with it substantial formal implications, suggesting new and problematic conceptions of the work’s genre. It might be speculated that the decision to include several large instrumental sections may have been the catalyst for such a change. After Hartmann received word in January that his quartet had won

than simply make pacifist statements in the work – death saddens even the most war-minded individuals – Schoeck intended to violate the bourgeois sacredness of the concert hall and break aesthetic taboos with a distorted and uncomfortable musical idiom. Bitonality, harsh dissonance, and severe rhythmic irregularity (comparatively speaking) were not yet known in Zurich; the infamous *Rite of Spring* scandal had happened in Paris only two years before. The initial foray into Whitman settings was thus characterized by aesthetic modernism, political action, and anti-bourgeois sentiment. Schoeck’s later friendliness and subsequent popularity with the Reich would have eliminated any personal camaraderie between the two men.

13 In December 1912, Franz Schreker directed the Vienna Philharmonic Choir in a performance of Delius’ Whitman work, entitled *Im Meerestreiben*, and twelve years later, composed a Whitman work his own. Schreker composed his *Vom ewigen Leben* in 1924, taking the text from Reisiger’s translation of “Song of Myself” and “Calamus;” it was originally written for solo soprano and piano, but was reorchestrated in 1929 for soloist and large orchestra. Franz Schreker was a close friend of Arnold Schoenberg, and like Scherchen was widely traveled as a composer-conductor during the 1920s.

first prize in the Carillon contest, he may have decided to include a set of variations on the theme, it being taken from a now prize-winning composition.\textsuperscript{15}

The title Symphonic Fragment, which this composition carried for two decades of existence and several years in performance, is rather problematic. Within German musical discourse, this term Fragment may refer to works uncompleted by a composer, as in the case of Schubert’s several abandoned symphonic fragments/sketches (D.615, D.708a, and D.936A); pieces culled from larger works, as in Richard Strauss’ symphonic fragment from Josephslegende (1947); or works that in their final version are incomplete or fragmentary as an essential aspect of their aesthetic, as in Mikhail Gnesin’s 1908 “symphonic fragment” entitled Iz Shelly (From Shelley).\textsuperscript{16} In this last sense it appears then that symphonisches Fragment may be thought of as an unofficial genre, an offshoot of the symphonic tradition that makes no attempt to live up to all related expectations. A related term in English musical terminology might be the symphonic sketch, as in Prokofiev’s Autumnal (1908). Later examples of the term being used as a distinct genre include [Walter Steffens’ 1962 Symphonisches Fragment, a setting of texts by Nelly Sachs WEB?]; Hans-Jügen von Bose’s 1980 Symphonisches Fragment, a setting of texts by Freidrich Hölderlin; and Horst Lohse’s 1982 symphonic fragment in memory of Albert Camus, entitled Sisyphos. Clearly, further scholarship on this concept is needed.

Hartmann’s five-movement, seven-section Symphonisches Fragment was not fragmentary or diminutive in the number of its movements, as in the case of Schubert’s two-

\textsuperscript{15} According to records at the Bavarian State Library, a sketch labeled Werk für Orchester was found within an autograph score of the first string quartet, and therefore likely dated around 1935 (Mus. Mss. 12952). The sketch is said to correspond to measures 1-4 and 15-18 of the first variation, and suggests that Hartmann’s concept for a set of orchestral variations on this theme actually predates his ideas for a Whitman cantata.

movement “Unfinished” or Bruckner’s three-movement Ninth; this term better applies to several of Hartmann’s other works and not to the format of his Whitman setting. Neither was the work fragmentary in the sense of being culled from other larger works. It seems unlikely to be a Neo-Romantic appeal to the Schlegelian unvollendet aesthetic, as might be seen in Robert Schumann’s lieder and “character pieces.”

Most enlightening in this regard may be Adorno’s observations regarding the openness and disunity of modern form. While Adorno is not known to have been an influence on Hartmann, Adorno’s critical work on the modernist aesthetic is descriptive of the zeitgeist within which and from which the young composer worked. According to Adorno, modern music – that is, the musical philosophy of Schoenberg and his ilk, among whom we may count Hartmann – contradicts the bourgeois ideals of unbroken unity, disturbs traditional notions of the polished and closed work. The politicized nature of Adorno criticism is of note here, and is suggestive of the manner in which Hartmann himself blended his politics philosophies and his aesthetic style. In the spirit of die Neue Musik, Hartmann was avoiding the suggestion that his symphonic work was an appeal to that bourgeois and passé genre of the symphony, and he was operating in a fragmentary modernist aesthetic that was particularly characteristic of the artistic philosophies of his time.

The title does appear to make an appeal to the symphonic tradition, especially to that represented by Mahler’s vocal symphonies and orchestrated lieder, and following the more chamber-oriented musical tastes of the 1920s, the title choice may have been an exercise in

---

17 “Since the beginning of the bourgeois era, all great music has founded its sufficiency in the illusion that it has achieved an unbroken unity and justified through its own individuation the conventional universal legality to which it is subject. This is contradicted by modern music. The criticism directed towards decorative elements, towards convention, and towards abstract universality of musical language are all of one mind.” Theodor Adorno, Philosophy of Modern Music, trans. Anne G. Mitchell and Wesley V. Blomster (New York: Seabury Press, 1973), 39.
caution, taking care to avoid making claims for the work as a symphony out of either modesty or an attempt to avoid a recently less popular genre. We see this in Hartmann’s oeuvre throughout the Nazi era, suggesting that the term symphony/symphonic with titles, subtitles, and expressive qualifiers was an essential part of the composer’s expressive style during this time: Symphonie “L’Œuvre” (1937/8), Symphonie für Streichorchester und eine Sopranstimme (1938), Symphonische Ouvertüre: “China kämpft” (1942/3), Symphonische Hymnen (1941/2), Symphonische Suite “Vita Nova” (1943), Symphonie “Klagegesang” (1944). Most of these were rewritten into numbered symphonies following the war.

In October 1936, Hartmann appealed to ISCM juror, Slavko Osterc, for the Symphonic Fragment’s acceptance at the 1937 festival: “I certainly hope that there will be an opportunity to present my symphonic piece in Paris. I will remain obliged to you, with greatest appreciation, if you are able to successfully secure a performance.”

Scherchen also lobbied Osterc, his fellow juror, on Hartmann’s behalf: “Good friend, you must do everything possible to get Hartmann’s work accepted. He has taken a major and novel step forward.” In spite of these appeals, the selection committee rejected the work in December on account of its excessive length and unreasonable difficulty.

Michael Kater has suggested that these backstage appeals, Hartmann’s frequent lack of concern for length requirements or playability, and his inability to meet deadlines all tend to point to a self-centeredness, a narcissism, and a “sloppiness and sloth that

---

manifested arrogance.”21 No matter what may be attributed to such character flaws, with this major compositional motivation and opportunity for premiere now lost, the work disappeared into the composer’s files, likely among the scores enduring Allied bombardment buried in a sealed case in the mountains near Munich.22

In May of 1948, Hartmann’s *Symphonisches Fragment* finally received its premiere performance on Radio Frankfurt’s third annual “New Music Week,” a seven-day series of performances that included works by Hindemith, Stravinsky, Schoenberg, Honegger, Zillig, Copland, and other contemporaries. Hartmann had given the work a new subtitle, *Versuch eines Requiems* (“Attempt at a Requiem”), and though he never clarified his reasons for the title change, it certainly reflects post-war sensibilities: rather than emphasizing the personal misery of dissenting Germans, the new title memorializes the greater victims of the Reich – the approximately 6 million Jews and 5 million others murdered under the Nazi regime.

The requiem was an obvious and quite popular form to use in response to war, carrying the weight of tradition and history with the poignancy of a contemporary comment. Themes of remembrance and mourning of the dead make it a potentially powerful post-war, even perhaps anti-war, statement. Hartmann’s title change came two years after Hindemith had premiered his own *Requiem for those we love*, also a setting of Whitman’s “When Lilacs last in the dooryard bloom’d;”23

---

21 Kater, *Composers of the Nazi Era*, 97.
23 Joseph Haas, Hartmann’s composition instructor from the Munich academy, also composed his post-war *Totenmesse* in 1945. Other post-war and anti-war requiems include Michel Fould’s *World Requiem* (1921, following the first World War), Michael Tippett’s *A Child of Our Time* (1941), Yury Levitin’s *Requiem for the Memory of Fallen Heroes* (1946), and perhaps most famously, Benjamin Britten’s *Sinfonia da Requiem* and *War Requiem* (1961).
But in what way is it only an attempt at a requiem? It is not likely in the same pseudo-modest manner suggested by *Symphonisches Fragment*, since Hartmann has not tried to imitate or borrow from the church music tradition in the sense of quotation of musical material, liturgical content, or even the structural forms, and therefore he does not appear to be apologizing for a Requiem that does not pass traditional muster. However, in a fashion similar to the *Profane Messe* and the Becher/Marx *Kantate*, he has taken Whitman’s texts, which are considered by so many to be rather common in their appeal, and elevated their “seriousness” to the level of religious liturgy, perhaps even to that of a sacred scripture. It is, in essence, Hartmann’s “profane requiem,” a statement of sadness and mourning with the expressive weight of a liturgical service. As seen in his other profane works, Hartmann was consistent in denying himself the comfort and sense of completion that religious expression offers. It is for this reason he can only “attempt” a requiem: the “attempt” term does not suggest interruption or incompletion, but rather an appeal to the “fragment” aesthetic that had motivated the symphony’s previous title, *Symphonisches Fragment*.

While several contemporary critics praised Hartmann’s colorful instrumental effects, they felt his style was too derivative of the Expressionists. One critic, Hugo Puettter, also disapproved of the *Symphonisches Fragment*’s awkward structural design, writing in the journal *Melos* of its “formlessness” and “lack of solid construction,” and in the journal *Musica*, that “a lack of structural stability was not to be overlooked.” It is not known if any revisions were made to the

25 “Hartmanns Werk erreichte durch seine eigenwilligkehren, noch vom Expressionismus zehrenden Klangfarben zum Teil verblüffend packende Wirkungen, wenn in dieser
score immediately prior to its 1948 premiere, but these comments are strikingly similar to the formal critiques of the ISCM jurors a decade earlier, and thus seem to support the theory that large-scale improvements were yet to be made. The dozen or so manuscripts in the Nachlaß Hartmann at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek show that a majority of the changes made before the final print in 1956 were in the ends and beginnings of the movements, around the “structural seams” as it were.

Hartmann had entered into an exclusive publishing contract with Süddeutscher Musikverlag in 1947, which bound him to publish only with that company until 1954. Müller published Symphonisches Fragment in 1950, but for reasons currently unknown, the published version of Symphonisches Fragment, along with several other works, was withdrawn almost immediately and never released into the market.26 A series of revisions had already produced symphonies 2 through 4 in 1948-49, and for several years Hartmann’s oeuvre was without an official first symphony. In 1950, Hartmann even negotiated with Müller for the republication of his 1935 symphonic poem, Miserae, as his first numbered symphony. However, in 1954, Hartmann was released from his contract with Müller and signed an agreement with the Schott family publishers. The following year, Schott published the Symphonisches Fragment as Hartmann’s Symphony no 1, Versuch eines Requiems, bringing the genesis story of the first symphony to a close.


26 The author has made attempts to find this score among the stacks of the Library of Congress, the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, other international libraries registered with WorldCat, and even the Willy Mueller publisher’s archive that was assumed by Baerenreiter in the 1980s.
Hartmann’s First Symphony is not like other symphonies. Though it is certainly a multi-movement work for large orchestra, it resists formal comparison to the symphonies of Haydn, Mozart, early Beethoven, or even Brahms; none of its movements suggest traditional symphonic forms of sonata, minuet (or scherzo) and trio, or rondo. Only the middle movement theme and variations may be said to invoke a traditional symphonic form. Such resistance to formal tradition is stronger even than that found in Mahler, whose *Das Lied von der Erde* serves as the most obvious model for Hartmann. His musical language, though highly emotive, is strongly anti-sentimental, avoiding sumptuous melody and orchestration in favor of clarity and incisiveness, further distancing himself from his Classical and Romantic forerunners. The comparison of Hartmann’s First Symphony to the symphonic tradition, as natural as it may seem from the unambiguous title of “Symphony no. 1,” ultimately fails to address the questions raised movement-by-movement description in Chapter One, and is thus unable to deal with the work’s most salient content.

Hartmann’s First Symphony is a narrative. The Whitman texts are an early clue, of course, as well as the presence of the singer. The titles of the outer movements invoke the literary conventions of the *Introduction* and *Epilogue*, which by emphasizing the symphony’s beginning and ending makes it teleological, a story arc concentrated into the intervening movements. The recitatives of the outer movements, the aria-like *lieder* of the second and fourth,
and the intermezzo quality of the instrumental middle movement\(^1\) invoke the dramatic conventions of opera. Various subtitles, such as \textit{Attempt at a Requiem}, \textit{Misery}, and \textit{Tears}, are nearly programmatic in their suggestion of death and mourning.

It is also important to understand that this story does not fully reside in the Whitman texts, which remain largely ambiguous and disconnected from each other. They are as much (or more so, as I shall demonstrate) for the setting of mood as they are for the telling of the story. The arc of the five movements is essentially musical, and the voice and its text are participants in the collaboration. It is perhaps in this sense that it is a symphony and not an orchestrated song cycle, which might be thought to render the performing forces as singer and accompaniment.

The preceding chapters have built the historical case describing the work’s genesis as a particularly meaningful act for its composer, and how that meaning evolved over two decades. This chapter explores the way in which the work might be understood as meaningful to the performer and listener. Since we have already looked at the symphony chronologically in the Chapter One of this thesis, this discussion will begin by identifying those most moments (thus, hermeneutic cues) where discontinuity within the symphony’s story arc begs for explanation. These potentially meaning-laden events serve as landmarks within the narrative landscape, and are necessarily preliminary to understanding the symphony’s story. These were alluded to in Chapter One: the mere presence of the voice in symphony, the untexted instrumental variations in the middle movement, and the switch to \textit{Sprechgesang} in the opening of the last movement.

It is perhaps most helpful to restate one of our expressive questions from Chapter One: who is this singer in Hartmann’s symphony? Is the alto voice a personification of Walt Whitman,

\(^1\) The variations movement was labeled \textit{Zwischenspiel} as late as the 1950 Willy Müller print. Karl Amadeus Hartmann, ”[Sinfonie Nr. 1 (Neufassung; Autograph A)], Mus. Mss. 12953,” [ca. 1957], AMs (microfilm), p. [i], Hartmann Nachlaß, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich.
or the composer? A possible answer to this question is suggested in the *Sprechgesang* switch in the last movement, which may be heard as a lyrical stepping out of voice. The text during this switch describes hearing the voice of *die Allmutter* (“the Mother of All” in Whitman’s original) as she gazes over the torn bodies of the dead, those who perished in “the misery.” When the musical setting and the unusual text are taken together, it appears the alto has begun to play a second role in the scenario, to speak in a second voice, that of a narrator. This character-role effect may be compared to the *Sprechgesang* of “The Speaker” in Schoenberg’s *Gurrelieder* (1901/11), or to the speaking role of the Major-domo in Richard Strauss’ *Ariadne auf Naxos* (1912), or perhaps even of the devil-incarnate Samiel in the Wolf’s Glen scene in Weber’s *Der Freischütz* (1821).\(^2\) A similar role may be found in the *Sprecher* from Hartmann’s opera of 1934, *Simplicius Simplicissimus*, who serves as the libretto’s narrator.

If the *Sprechgesang* signals the entrance of a new character, then the lyrical singing voice heard since the beginning of the Symphony may be interpreted as having been that of the *Allmutter* character. It is this character who is the ‘lyric I’ from movement 1, “I sit and look out;” and from movement 2, “I mourn’d, and yet shall mourn.” In movement 4, it is she who describes her horrifying vision of the ghost, and in movement 5, she is the fully revealed and named character with the ‘Request’ from the movement’s title: “I charge you [O my earth] not to lose my sons, my daughters.” So with this new consideration – that the symphony is a dramatic monologue by a personified *Allmutter* – it is not the texted movements that provide the greatest moment of departure and mystery, but the untexted, deceptively absolute middle movement, *Thema mit vier Variationen*. How does a movement like this fit into the *Allmutter* monologue?

\(^2\) Hartmann spoke of being particularly impressed by this scene upon hearing it for the first time as a 10 year old. Karl Amadeus Hartmann, “Autobiographische Skizze,” 9-11.
The texts that frame the middle movement suggest an answer to this question. The subtitle, *Introduktion: Elend* (‘Introduction: Misery’), and the textual content of the first movement sets a tone for the rest of the symphony: “I sit and look out” upon sorrow, shame, tyranny, martyrs, prisoners, “slights and degradations cast by arrogant persons,” “meanness and agony without end.” The themes of injustice, oppression, and death are established early, and as an introduction, the movement establishes an interpretive framework for the rest of the symphony.

The poetic speaker in the second movement, *Frühling* (‘Spring’), marks the return of spring by the blooming of the lilacs, and this event prompts the sad memory of someone lost, in turn symbolized by the star that has set below the horizon. The words that close Hartmann’s second movement – “And thoughts of death, which is so close to us.” – are not Whitman’s: Hartmann admittedly altered the original poetry to make them less specifically referential to the slain American president. His version maintains the original poem’s use of the returning lilac blossoms as the catalyst for thoughts of misery and death, only now they are thoughts about a death that is less specific.

The setting of the final words of the second movement is made even more poignant by its musical setting: the melody for the words *Flieder blühend* through the end of the poem quotes in paraphrase the Jewish folksong entitled *Elijahu hanavi* (“Elijah the Prophet”). The original words to this folksong refer to an important doctrine in Judaic eschatology: the future coming of the prophet Elijah as the harbinger of the Messiah, whose kingdom will usher in an age of peace and divine justice. Heister has noted that this messianic kingdom stands in stark contrast to the

---

unjustly oppressive Third Reich. Hartmann’s conscious assimilation of these musical figures and devices was an aesthetic choice that, according to Heister, signified a universal “solidarity with those persecuted by the Nazi regime.”

The folksong is also paraphrased in the second movement of Hartmann’s First Symphony, the musical setting for spring’s miserable ‘trinity.’ Comparing the X’s in both Examples 2.2 and 4.1 reveals the similarities between the original melody and the one that appears in the Symphony. Hartmann’s paraphrase is a good bit more reduced and elemental than the paraphrases he employs in the First String Quartet and Simplicius, but the basic structural outline of the melody is clearly present. (See “Chapter Two: Precedents” for a short discussion of this melody in the context of these other works.)

Example 4.1
“Elijahu hanavi” in Sym. no. 1, mvt. II, mm. 52-62

Hartmann SYMPHONY NO. 1
© 1957 Schott Music, GmbH & Co. KG, Mainz
© renewed
All Rights Reserved
Used by permission of European American Music Distributors LLC,
U.S. and Canadian agent for Schott Music, Mainz

5 Heister, “Elend und Befreiung,” 278.
6 As far as I can tell, this is the first scholarly paper to identify the use of this melody in this composition. All discussions of Hartmann’s quotation of Elijahu hanavi to date have limited their observations to the first string quartet and the opera, Simplicius.
The fourth movement, which immediately follows the variations, is a setting of Whitman’s *Tears*; the poem’s tearful beginning and ending, both with the three-fold repetition of the title word, *Tränen*, surrounds the terrifying apparition of a ghostly figure. The final movement closes the symphony with the titular request by the *Allmutter* for the earth to receive her dead and to exhale them out “years hence, centuries hence,” in what amounts to a requiem-like yet irreligious prayer for the peaceful rest and future resurrection of the dead. It is, therefore, in a narrative space between ‘thoughts of death’ and ‘tears’ that the theme and variations movement occurs.

Considering the political meaningfulness of the large-scale setting, the shift from large orchestra to string quartet (plus bass) in the middle movement is, therefore, also a particular meaningful one: it marks a motion inward, creating an affect of intimacy and privacy, an intensely personalized gesture. The Hartmann contemporary, Hans Werner Henze, has described chamber music as having a tone of confidentiality and an ability to deal with unspeakable things, a music better able to represent thoughtfulness and introspection than that which tends to ring loudly in concert halls and theaters.7

This theme (see Example 1.3) is one of particular significance for Hartmann, appearing in one form or another in all of his extant works from the Nazi period. Heister has emphasized the intensely personal importance of this theme by suggested that the theme is Hartmann’s own

---

‘lyric I’ with which he writes himself into his compositions,\(^8\) and following this lead Rüdiger Behschnitt has usefully labeled it as the ‘Hartmann theme.’\(^9\) It is no great stretch to hear a set of musical variations as the unique and personal voice of the composer. By using such a personalized musical gesture for the theme of the movement, Hartmann has in effect placed himself into the symphony’s narrative. And as we have seen, the *Sprechgesang* of movement five may be thought of as the voice of someone else besides the singer, and the same may be said of the middle movement. The musical interjection that is the third movement is so nearly like that of the Narrator in movement five that we may actually be able to identify Hartmann himself speaking in the *Sprechgesang* of movement five.

In contrast to the marginally tonal melodies of the vocal settings, the theme of the middle movement resists tonal allusion; its melodic motion emphasizes non-tonal intervals (seconds, sevenths, and ninths), and successive leaps that trace non-tonal triads (diminished and augmented).\(^{10}\) As McCredie explains: “His music, while rarely employing dodecaphonic rows as such, nevertheless reveals a persistent usage of a number of intervallic combinations or constellations frequently favoured by dodecaphonists.”\(^{11}\)

The Hartmann theme has also been referred to as the “Jewish theme” by scholars such as Distefano, McCredie, and Heister,\(^{12}\) though no one has demonstrated that it comes from any specific Jewish synagogal or folk melody, as is the case with “Elijah the Prophet.” Heister has described the theme as ‘Jewish’ not “with regards to [specific] pitch or rhythm patterns,” but

\(^{8}\) Heister, “Elend und Befreiung,” 283.

\(^{9}\) Behschnitt, “‘Wahrheit, die Freude bereitet und mit Trauer verbunden ist’,” p. 108.

\(^{10}\) As with most non-tonal music, notated pitches are assumed to be enharmonically equivalent pitch classes.

\(^{11}\) McCredie, *Thematic Catalogue*, 176.

instead evoking Jewish folksong “in gesture, tone, and recitational quality….” This essentialized label ought to be questioned; such labels were common in the Wagnerian-Germanic discourse of the late Romanticism and the rabid nationalism of the early twentieth century. This discourse may ultimately be seen as leading to and supporting Nazi aesthetic policy, in which all ‘good’ music, generally that which utilized tonality and traditional forms, was considered essentially German and ‘life-affirming,’ as opposed to that which was ‘degenerate,’ ‘Bolshevist,’ and ‘Jewish.’ An example of such rhetoric is the following quote by Hans Severus Ziegler, Generalintendant of the Weimar Theater, taken from his opening address at an infamous exhibition called ‘Degenerate Music,’ which he organized in 1938:

Atonality is the result of the destruction of tonality and hence represents degeneracy and artistic Bolshevism. Moreover, since atonality forms the basis for the harmonic system of the Jew Arnold Schoenberg, it has to be specified as a product of Jewish thought.14

Kater further explains:

... Contemporary music was not permitted to be atonal, especially of the twelve-tone variety personified by Schoenberg, as the Nazi music exhibition in Düsseldorf demonstrated a year later. Both modern, abstract (as in much Expressionist) art, and modern, atonal music were ultimately condemned as Jewish.”15 [emphasis mine]

While defining a ‘Jewish’ style today is problematic and inadvisable, it may still be reasonable to suggest that, at the time the symphony was composed, these aesthetic choices were regularly and publicly identified as ‘Jewish,’ and that a work embracing them may be interpreted as an identification with the plight of that people group.

In spite of the symphony’s resistance to tonality, the half-step figure in the Hartmann theme is identified as der Klage-Topos by Heister, and as der Klage-Chiffre by Brehler.16 In

14 As quoted in Kater, Twisted Muse, 78.
15 Kater, The Twisted Muse, 178.
16 Heister, “Elend und Befreiung,” 284; Brehler, 130.
Deryck Cooke’s *The Language of Music*, he states that “the chief and almost only expressive function” of such a half-step figure is to give the effect of a burst of anguish: “one can hardly find a page of ‘grief’ music by any tonal composer of any period without encountering it several times.” Cooke traces the figure’s now well-known association with sighing and mourning from Arnold de Lantins and Josquin in the fifteenth century to Bartok, Stravinsky, and Schoenberg in the twentieth. There is a potential pitfall in such an analysis: in music so beholden to the Second Viennese school, with its resistance to tonal allusion, one might find hundreds of prominently placed half-steps, and it would be inappropriate to make each one carry interpretive weight. However, the prevalent emphasis on death and sorrow in the title and texts, as well as Hartmann’s affinity for all three of these latter twentieth century composers, makes the connection to the historic ‘sighing’ gesture yet another layer in a work thick with signification.

Finally we turn to the interpretation of the formal processes of the middle movements. Two concepts characterize the discursive rhetoric surrounding the formal process of musical ‘variation’. *Repetition* refers to the recursive presentation of a given musical idea, and the notion that some aspects of that idea remain constant. In formal variations, the theme consists of a complex of elements, including bass line, chords, phrase structure, melody, rhythm, meter, tempo, mode, texture, instrumentation, and dynamics. Any of these may serve as the site of the theme’s essential identity and the strategies of constancy employed are often used to label the different types of variation procedure: ground bass or basso ostinato, constant-harmony, and formal-outline are examples of such labels. The constancy of the theme throughout the variations may be understood as the ongoing presence of an entity, either narrative or ‘purely’ musical.

---

However, similarity is not the most important aspect of musical variation; in Leonard Meyer’s discussion of conformant relationship in music, he explains that the main function of repetition is to emphasize difference.\textsuperscript{18} Modification, then, refers to the fact that repetition is not exact, but that some elements of the musical idea are altered. If the theme may be interpreted as a representation of an entity, variation is the process that changes it or its environment. It is this principle of modification that may lend teleology to a set of formal variations; a set often contains a buildup-climax-denouement structure or culminates in a climactic final variation. The strategies of change, therefore, may engage any one or multiple thematic elements that are not deemed constant, and these strategies may change with each variation.

In the ‘fantasy’ or free variation technique, as in Hartmann’s symphony, the variations retain small-scale constructive elements in the theme, especially rhythmic and melodic motives; the result is often in effect less recursive, more teleological. When further combined with continuous development, where each successive variation is based on the immediately preceding variation and not directly on the theme, the later variations are potentially unrecognizable – the essential thematic identity may be so obscured as to be lost in the process. Meyer explains that this variation type, which became common in the post-Beethovenian late-nineteenth century, emphasized process rather than form, and the result tended to mask the existence of repetition.\textsuperscript{19} In such a case, the connection of a later variation to the original theme may be better characterized as an assumption, a belief in an essential resilience. There may also be a potent awareness of agency, that the obscurity has come as the result of overdetermination by an active force, either real, as a result of performer or composer virtuosity, or imagined, as a result of a

\textsuperscript{18} Leonard Meyer, Explaining Music: Essays and Explorations (Berkeley: University of California, 1973), 52.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., 52.
character or event in a narrative.\textsuperscript{20} In this way, the theme of Hartmann’s variations may be seen as a musical representation of a protagonist, a personal gesture of identification with the Jewish people, which plays out in stages of increased oppression, misery, and violence, and finally death and mourning.

It is the Allmutter who presides over this “attempt at a requiem,” as both mourner and celebrant. The dead are hers, according to the Narrator in movement five, and it is she who laments their death. The symphony is her secular liturgy, and central to her ritual is an instrumental pageant, a musical reenactment of her loved ones’ death. She has replaced the Triune Godhead with a trinity of her own, one that only brings sadness and sorrow. It is not to God she addresses her request for eternal rest and resurrection, but to the earth.

The Allmutter scenario, though compelling from the weight of evidence, is not necessary in order to appreciate the miserable and mournful quality of the work, much less the political implications of such an emotional tone in the face of the blood-and-soil optimism of the propagandized Nazi culture in the early 1930s. It is certainly possible to appreciate the work as a singular entity, laden with meaning only in the most abstract, musical sense. However, it seems clear that this was not the opinion of the composer, given the extensive use of expressive textual markers, nor would it have been the opinion of the Nazi cultural officials, from whom Hartmann felt it necessary to hide the work.

\textsuperscript{20} Richard Strauss’ \textit{Don Quixote} is a famous example of theme and variations as a narrative device: the theme serves as a musical representation of the title character, Don Quixote, and the constancy of the theme from variation to variation represents his ongoing presence in the story. Each variation serves as a different chapter in the tale, representing both the changing of scenes and the changing personality of the character.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

Karl Amadeus Hartmann’s life changed with the fall of National Socialism in 1945. He founded a series of concerts called *Musica Viva* designed to reintroduce the Munich public to the modern music that had been banned for the last decade. Because his reputation had remained unsullied both by National Socialism and by German Communism, the American authorities gladly gave him their support. It was as if he was resuming the *Juryfreien* concert series from twenty years before, though now on a grand scale. The music of Mahler, Schönberg, Berg, Webern, Stravinsky, Bartók, and Hindemith were once again heard in the city of Munich, having been banned since 1933.

Hartmann’s increased exposure as a concert organizer benefited his composing career as well, bringing him commissions, prizes, and fellowships from all over the world. Sensing the need to make his compositions more universal in message and therefore able to speak to other times and other places, he began revising nearly all his large-scale works from the Nazi years. Only about eight works were original post-war compositions. When Hartmann passed away in 1963, he had contributed eight symphonies, two string quartets, several concerti, and a handful of choral and chamber works.

In any scholarly effort to treat a single composition, there is a tendency to represent historical details as a series of events that inexorably led to the work’s creation, as if it were the culmination of all that came before it. In some cases this might be a fairly valid argument. However, historically speaking, Hartmann’s First Symphony is merely one point in the
composer’s personal trajectory, and is not necessarily representative of his “best work,” whatever that might mean. In depth academic study should be done on many of more of Hartmann’s works, especially on those even more frequently performed than Symphony no. 1, such as *Miserae*, *Concerto funebre*, or *Simplicius*. This is to speak nothing of those that are very rarely performed, like Hartmann’s post-war compositions that deserve careful treatment. With the passing of Andrew McCredie in 2006, the field of Hartmann research is in especially great need of thoughtful scholarship.

There is one fascinating research project missing from this thesis. From all available evidence, there appear to be at least three different completed versions of the First Symphony. There is the first version, *Symphonisches Fragment*, which was completed, submitted to the ISCM festival jury, and rejected by the same in 1936.¹ The second version is the 1950 Willy Müller imprint, most of which may be found as the basis for the autographs of the final version, the 1956 Schott imprint that is available commercially and in most university libraries. A detailed comparative analysis of these three versions could more thoroughly map the work’s evolution and track in more detail the composer’s own changing opinion of the work. Particularly interesting would be to find out what happened to the two instrumental sections present in the 1936 version,² but not found in either later ones. It seems clear that the third movement theme and variations is the remnant of the *Orchestervorspiel (Variationen)* from movement four of the original version. However, it is not clear what became of the *Orchesternachspiel (Impression)* of the original second movement, and the *Tanzlied* of the original middle movement.

¹ According to the Thematic Catalogue, a copy was “in the keeping of Karl Heinz Ruppel,” who passed away in 1980. McCredie, *Thematic Catalogue*, 47.
² This is according to the previously mentioned letter between Hartmann and Osterc. Cvetko, “Aus H. Scherchens und K. A. Hartmanns Korrespondenz,” 74.
Finally, there are a significant number of manuscript resources in the Hartmann collection at the *Bayerische Staatsbibliothek* that are not accounted for in the 1982 Thematic Catalogue, having been acquired in the nearly three decades since the research for that publication was completed. It is essential to the future of Hartmann scholarship that these recent acquisitions be reckoned with, that full account be taken of what they tell us about Hartmann’s compositional efforts. The overall story of his life is unlikely to change greatly. However, as Michael Kater has recently demonstrated, some aspects of Hartmann’s life remain a mystery. As musicians program and record Hartmann’s music more frequently, scholars should and likely will cast an increasingly probing and critical eye on the man, his music, and complex culture in which they appeared.
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