Chapter Eight

German Humanism, Liberalism, and Elegy in Hanslick’s Writings on Brahms

Nicole Grimes

I could almost envy [Hanslick] his power of expressing himself, if not exhaustively, yet with an intuitive sympathy, which not only provides an outlet for his own feelings but helps others who have no command of words to express theirs.

—Elisabet von Herzogenberg to Brahms, January 3, 1882

Eduard Hanslick’s reviews of the works of Johannes Brahms span from 1862, when he announced “the appearance before the Viennese public of this blond, St. John visage of a composer,”¹ to the year of Hanslick’s death, 1904. Composer and critic struck up a close and lifelong friendship following their meeting in 1862, a friendship they shared with the Austrian surgeon and amateur musician Theodor Billroth—the three being on intimate du terms and forming the “closest musical threesome.”² Hanslick was the music correspondent for the Neue Freie Presse, Austria’s leading liberal daily newspaper.³ It was here that he published his abundant and multifarious writings on Brahms. Not only are Hanslick’s Brahms reviews musically perceptive and insightful, they can also be understood as a cultural commentary on the musical world of Vienna in the late nineteenth century, and they illuminate the cultural, religious, and political context in which Brahms’s works were composed and received.

Hanslick’s output on Brahms is vast and, therefore, I have chosen here to focus only on one aspect of this output: a selection of the reviews of Brahms’s choral and orchestral works composed between 1868 and 1883, an output that for reasons made clear below I refer to as Brahms’s “musical elegies.” This period coincided with the ascendancy of a modern form of liberalism in Vienna to which both Hanslick and Brahms subscribed. The works I will
explore in this essay are either settings of, or are closely related to the poetry of Goethe, Schiller, and Hölderlin. They are, therefore, inextricably linked to the turn-of-the-century New Humanism espoused by these poets. My discussion of Hanslick’s reading of these works is cognizant of his own humanist inclinations. My findings are informed by the recent work of Mark Burford, among others, who argues that Hanslick’s goal in his aesthetic treatise was not to “deny idealism, but rather to renegotiate a middle ground between idealism and materialism,” that is, to renegotiate the nexus between spirit and matter. Invoking the literature of what he refers to as “optimistic messianic humanism,” Burford both critiques Hanslick’s writings in the context of German idealism and outlines continuity in humanist writings from Ludwig Feuerbach through Ludwig Büchner to Hanslick. Building on the work of Mark Evan Bonds, Burford argues that Hanslick “took Hegel’s aesthetic and clung to the metaphysical premise of the ‘Idea’ or ‘Spirit’ in music, though in a newly interpreted sense.” Burford’s key insight is his claim that “in his attempt to characterize music’s essence, Hanslick did not so much reject musical metaphysics as, to a certain extent, reconceptualize it by arguing that the ideal content of music is a product of a human spirit, not a transcendent one.”

In this essay I will explore Hanslick’s reviews of Brahms’s “musical elegies” as outlined in table 8.1 in relation to the composer’s complex and multifaceted engagement with poetry and extramusical texts. I aim to show that Hanslick was in a unique position among Brahms’s critics—as one who was within his circle of confidants, and was therefore privy to the private musical meaning of many of his works, and as one who shared Brahms’s liberal outlook—to convey the rich and complex meaning of these works to his liberal readership. Moreover, I argue that these reviews form an integral part of the reception history of Brahms’s music that has been largely overlooked in the literature on Hanslick and Brahms in favor of a discussion of the 1854 monograph Vom Musikalisch-Schönen.

From German Humanism to Viennese Liberalism

The period 1867 to the mid-1890s witnessed the ascendancy of a modern form of liberalism in Vienna before it was quelled at the hands of the Christian Social demagogue Karl Lueger. Following the creation of the Dual Monarchy (Austria-Hungary) in 1867, Emperor Francis Joseph’s Constitutional Edict of 1869 granted a number of significant civic and social reforms, including the appointment of Austria’s first parliamentary cabinet or Bürgerministerium, and the availability of Austrian citizenship for the first time. Hereby all citizens were guaranteed equal legal rights, leading to a greater degree of ethnic tolerance (particularly for the Jewish communities); the displacement of Christianity (specifically: Catholicism) in favor of rationalism and science; and the primacy of German culture, which was celebrated further following Prussia’s victory
Table 8.1. Brahms’s musical elegies: timeline of compositions and reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Date of composition</th>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>Date of poem</th>
<th>Date of Hanslick’s review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schicksalslied, op. 54</td>
<td>1868–71</td>
<td>Hölderlin, “Hyperions Schicksalslied”</td>
<td>1797–98</td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alto Rhapsody, op. 53</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Goethe, “Harzreise im Winter”</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>1875 (reviewed with the German Requiem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Brahms, Symphony No. 1 in C minor, Op. 68 premiered on 4 November 1876]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragische Ouvertüre, op. 81</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nänie, op. 82</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Schiller, “Nänie”</td>
<td>1799</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesang der Parzen, op. 89</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>in Goethe, Iphigenie auf Tauris</td>
<td>1779–87</td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

over France in 1871. As Pieter Judson neatly encapsulates it, “this bill of rights allowed freedom of belief and public worship and granted to every citizen the same civil rights no matter what the individual’s religious beliefs.” The law also recognized the autonomy of individual religions to administer their own internal affairs and—in a clause pointed toward the hitherto privileged Catholic Church—stated that “no citizen who did not wish to could be compelled to take part in a public religious function.” In the thirty-five years that Brahms resided in Vienna (1862–97), this liberalism experienced a steady and dramatic decline before the city was engulfed in what Carl Schorske refers to as a “Christian Social tidal wave” in the 1890s that witnessed a rise in anti-Semitism and an alliance with the Catholic Church.

Modern Viennese liberalism shared traits with European liberalism of the time, such as a belief in progress and the promotion of scientific methods, with Viennese liberalism appealing largely to the Bildungsbürgertum: the educated, culturally formed German and Jewish-German middle and upper middle classes. Brahms, Hanslick, Billroth, Max Kalbeck, Gustav Dömpke, and Ludwig Speidel were among the intellectual elite of Viennese liberalism, with Hanslick and Speidel being music and theater critics, respectively, for the Neue Freie Presse. Leon Botstein has asserted that “Brahms’s reputation among the Viennese in the 1880s was seen as linked to the older liberal elite,” and his music of this period “was part of an older conception of Bildung, in which
music, literature and painting were capable of cultivating a sensibility at odds with the vulgari
ties of modern mass intolerance and hatred.”

It was during this very period, between 1868 and 1883, that Brahms pro-
duced four one-movement works for choir and orchestra, *Alto Rhapsody*, op. 53; *Schicksalslied*, op. 54; *Nänie*, op. 82; and *Gesang der Parzen*, op. 89. These works are settings of texts by three of Germany’s most eminent poets from the turn of the nineteenth century: Johann Wolfgang Goethe (1749–1832), Friedrich von Schiller (1759–1805), and Johann Christian Friedrich Hölderlin (1770–1843); and the texts of three of the poems, opp. 54, 82, and 89, are based on legends of classical antiquity.

Brahms’s engagement with these poetic texts was, in turn, an engagement with the turn-of-the-century New Humanism of Humboldt, Goethe, Schiller, and their contemporaries. This “humanistic ‘new learning’” entailed “a ‘Renaissance’ or rebirth of Greco-Roman civilization and its associated values.”

These quintessentially German values are neatly encapsulated by J. A. Symonds for his English readership in the 1898 text *The Renaissance in Italy*, where he explains that “the essence of humanism consists in a new and vital perception of the dignity of man as a rational being apart from theological determinations and in the further perception that classic literature alone displayed human nature in the plenitude of intellectual and moral freedom.” Such a humanistic bent is also akin to the spirit and ethos of the classical German elegy as developed by Goethe, Schiller, and their contemporaries. Schiller is regarded as having provided the most sophisticated theory of the elegiac mode in *Über naïve und sentimentale Dichtung* (1795–96) in describing it as a “modern, sentimental state of mind inspired by the disjunction between imperfect reality and ideal, which embodies some sort of ‘moral harmony.’” This romantic sensibility epitomizes what Svetlana Boym categorizes as “reflective nostalgia”—a fascination with the present and a longing for another time or set of values—that becomes a “driving force for the human condition.” Brahms’s fixation on a poetic and poetical world that existed close to a century before he penned these works betrays signs of such a nostalgic element. On account of the ideological kinship between the classical German elegy and the Brahms works explored in this essay, I propose to call these works Brahms’s “musical elegies.”

The Hellenic ideal espoused by this “humanism” belonged to the future of “modern Germany [that these poets] were engaged in building.” The values of rationality and belief in human progress central to this endeavor focused on “the cultivation of the individual, a process seen as imperative if the society were to receive any collective benefits from its educational system.” The classicist Ludwig Curtius wrote of German humanism: “This ‘pure humanity’ was not a pale abstract theory, but a moral command, directed at each individual, for the reconstruction of his personal life.” This intense moralistic reflection espoused by these poets resonates with the values that were central to Viennese liberalism. For Brahms, for whom “cultural standards, love of learning
and humanism seemed unquestionably allied in [his] mind.”¹⁹ these texts by Goethe, Schiller, and Hölderlin surely gave powerful expression to his own liberal view of the world.

Common to Brahms’s “musical elegies” are endings that respond to their preceding texts, functioning either to extend the text or to reverse its meaning. Hanslick’s reviews recognize that these works are interrelated and that they bear comparison with Brahms’s German Requiem. According to Schiller’s dictum, “‘tender softness and melancholy’ . . . did not suffice if they failed to lead up to the energetic principle of Bildung, or spiritual harmony meant to transcend the poem’s despondency.”²⁰ This also held true for Hanslick, for whom it was not the poetry, but rather Brahms’s response to the poetry in his music that he considered to fulfill this energizing and spiritual role. Hanslick attributes numerous qualities to Brahms’s compositions that are in keeping with liberal values: the displacement of Christianity in favor of a secularized (usually, Greek) outlook on the world; an aspiration toward Bildung; a devotion to one’s task; strength; masculinity; an ethical character; and an indifference to external opinion.²¹ A reading of Hanslick’s reviews of these works uncovers a continuity between the humanist revival in German education from Goethe to Burckhardt, to the moral and ethical dimension these pieces share with the humanism of the idealist period (including the works of Beethoven), and finally to that of Viennese liberalism.²²

From Poetry’s Object of Sorrow to Music’s Object of Joy

Since the première of Brahms’s Schicksalslied, critical opinion has been divided on account of the orchestral postlude. His choice to end a choral work with a purely instrumental orchestral section perplexed critics as much then as it does now.²³ The work opens with a 28-measure orchestral introduction in E-flat major, with a performance direction of “Langsam und sehnsuchtsvoll” (slow and full of longing), an unusual tempo designation for Brahms. The postlude uses all of the same musical material as the introduction, but it is transposed down a minor third to C major, evoking the traditional musical topos for light and sunrise. The tempo designation is now “Adagio.”

This work is a setting of Hölderlin’s poem of the same title, which ends in hopelessness, with suffering humanity being hurled into an abyss of uncertainty. The majority of critics at the time of the work’s first performances saw an “imaginary continuation of the contents of the poem” in this final, instrumental movement and sensed the effect of comfort and reconciliation.²⁴ Several critics, however, understood the Nachspiel to be at odds with Hölderlin’s poetic message. Some understood the music to have conquered or subjugated the words of the poem, while others lamented the fact that composers of the day ventured near texts of such high poetic quality.²⁵
Unlike those who see the postlude in Brahms's setting of Hölderlin's "Schicksalslied" as being either in congruence with or in contradiction to the poem, Hanslick is concerned with the expressive potential of pure instrumental music, which he understands here to express that which cannot be seized in words. He outlines the stark contrast between Brahms's setting of the first two strophes, an Adagio in E-flat major describing "the blessed peace of the Olympic gods who 'breathe aloft in the light of immortality,'" and the setting of the third, an Allegro in C minor that "describes the pitiful lot of mankind who are 'given no place to rest.'" For Hanslick, the manner in which Brahms deals with Hölderlin's stark contrast between imperfect reality and the ideal is of secondary importance. Indeed, he considers Brahms to be "unswayed by the ideas of the great and immortal," implying, rather, that it is mortals with whom he is concerned. Brahms's postlude of purely instrumental music reveals to his audience the "whole transfiguring power of music." He considers this postlude to go beyond—and to fulfill—the expressive potential announced by the poem, yet never within its reach. It is worth quoting Hanslick at length here:

In this hopelessness the poet finishes—but not so the composer. It is an extremely beautiful poetic turn, which reveals to us the whole transfiguring power of music. Brahms returns, after the final words sung by the choir, to the solemn, slow movement of the opening, and dissolves the confused hardship of human life in a long orchestral postlude, in blessed peace. In a touching and generally accessible way, Brahms conveys this train of thought via pure instrumental music, without the addition of a single word. The instrumental music here replenishes and complements the poem, and it articulates that which can no longer be expressed in words: a remarkable counterpart to the reverse procedure in Beethoven's Symphony No. 9. Brahms's Schicksalslied reminds us in style and mood of an after effect of his admirable German Requiem, the same Christian outlook, but Greek in form.

Writing more recently, Michael Musgrave has also likened the general sentiment expressed in the German Requiem—"comfort, hope, reassurance, and reward for personal effort"—to Brahms's settings of the legends of classical antiquity, including Schicksalslied, Nänie, and Gesang der Parzen. Hanslick commended the "Christian outlook" in Brahms's German Requiem in 1875, a work which is "stripped of every confessional dress, every sacred convenience" on account of Brahms choosing German biblical words in place of the Latin ritual text. Daniel Beller-McKenna has argued that "by emphasizing Brahms's adherence to purely musical laws and effects, Hanslick sought to decontextualize (or at best recontextualize) op. 45," so that "in Hanslick's view, the piece functions less like sacred music and more like absolute music." I dispute Beller-McKenna's assertion by arguing that Hanslick recontextualized the piece to function not as sacred music, but as a source of comfort for a secularized society. It would
have been no coincidence that Hanslick singled out the fifth movement—the soprano aria “Ihr habt nun Traurigkeit”—as a means to illustrate the expressive potential of this requiem. Whereas those who are bereaved would not “remain dry-eyed through the overwhelming, touching sounds of the soprano’s aria,” he wrote, they would “experience how transfiguring and strengthening the purest comfort is that flows from this music.”

Michael Musgrave has observed that the fifth and sixth movements of the Requiem “offer the most striking examples of [biblical] meanings changed through selection.” He recognizes in this fifth movement “a personal hymn to consolation and comfort which removes the words from a Christian context, the voice of a God figure, or of Christ.”

It is noteworthy that it is Brahms’s music—in the context of its relationship to the text—that Hanslick recognizes as the “purest comfort.” For Hanslick, for those who “now have sorrow,” it is Brahms’s music (the product of a human spirit and not the utterance of a sacred one) that will provide comfort. Likewise, in Schicksalslied, it is “pure instrumental music, without the addition of a single word” that brings “blessed peace,” yet this too is dependent on the text, in that it “replenishes and complements the poem.”

It was not only Schicksalslied and the German Requiem that Hanslick considered to be closely related: he considered these both to be companion pieces to the Alto Rhapsody, op. 53. In this work, Brahms provides contrasting musical material for each of the three strophes (5–7) of Goethe’s poem “Harzreise im Winter” that are concerned with the portrait of a lonely, misanthropic young man. For Hanslick, “the poem becomes truly musical initially with the closing strophe, which brings comfort and reconciliation,” the point in the work where the music modulates to the parallel major (Adagio 4/4), where the four-part male-voice choir joins in with the contralto in a hymn to the “Father of Love.” Hanslick identifies a “peculiar, ethical character which is impressed on us so completely and utterly in Brahms’s music” that arises in the Rhapsody “in gentle tendentious strength.” It is on account of this “ethical character” that Hanslick considers Brahms’s music to be “so closely related to Beethoven’s music.”

There are a number of ways of reading Hanslick’s frequent references to Beethoven’s “ethical character” and his association of this quality with Brahms’s works. Marcia Citron observes that before German unification in 1871, Beethoven was held up as a masculine German icon, with his strong, heroic style being used to represent Germanic ideals. She cites “the triumphalism of the ‘Eroica’ symphony, the Brüderlichkeit in the last movement of the Ninth Symphony or the conquering of ‘fate’ associated with the Fifth Symphony,” all of which she sees as being related to the “concept of Bildung central to German Romanticism: a melding of education, socialization and struggle as one became a fully formed individual.”

Brahms and Beethoven certainly had in common a broad intellectual curiosity, paramount in which was an interest in philosophical issues. Both read
widely, and both kept a log of proverbs and philosophical sayings that were significant to them.\textsuperscript{39} Whereas Beethoven and Brahms each nominally subscribed to a religious faith (Catholicism in Beethoven’s case, Lutheranism in Brahms’s), neither was a regular churchgoer. Hanslick himself acknowledged this as early as 1861 in his review of the \textit{Missa Solemnis}: “Beethoven was never especially attached to the articles of the Catholic faith . . . his belief had rather the character of a liberal (free), law-abiding theosophy.”\textsuperscript{40} As with Brahms, Beethoven’s image of God, as Barry Cooper has observed, “was not based solely on traditional Christian teaching but was drawn from a wide variety of influences including Classical antiquity and oriental religions.”\textsuperscript{41} The work that epitomizes this approach in Beethoven’s music is the Ninth Symphony. In order to embrace the message of this work one need not profess allegiance to one true faith or nation. Rather, the nonspecific religiosity of Schiller’s poem is enhanced by Beethoven’s music, which, as David B. Levy reminds us, “embraces the ‘millions’ of the world without the slightest hint of exclusivity.”\textsuperscript{42}

It is this lack of exclusivity, this absence of discrimination between religious faiths or between the secular and sacred, that Hanslick recognizes as the ethical (one might say humanist) character in Brahms’s “musical elegies.” Such an approach to these works, moreover, corroborates Mark Burford’s argument that Hanslick recognized the ideal content of music, “both music’s metaphysical essence and materiality” being “inextricably linked to human intellectual activity.”\textsuperscript{43}

Brahms’s \textit{Nänie}, completed in August 1881, is dedicated to the memory of his friend, the artist Anselm Feuerbach. Feuerbach died in Venice on January 4, 1880. \textit{Nänie} is a setting of Schiller’s poem “Auch das Schöne muß sterben!,” a lament on the transience of life. Hanslick observes that it is less their shared “love of music that connected Feuerbach and Brahms in friendship and affinity than their similar outlooks on art.”\textsuperscript{44} He considered them to share an “impe- turable orientation toward the great, the exalted, and the ideal”—characteristics that for both artists lead to “sharp severity and seclusion.”\textsuperscript{45} Hanslick enlists the words of Feuerbach in relation to the latter’s painting \textit{Poetry} to illustrate this affinity between artist and composer: “It is no painting dictated by fashion; it is severe and unadorned. I expect no understanding of it, but I can do nothing else. And whoever takes the trouble to consider it for a long time becomes somewhat overcome, as though the picture were not a picture of our time.”\textsuperscript{46} These words allude to artistic ideals that Brahms and Feuerbach shared, characteristics that lend themselves to artistic creative excellence and integrity—an aspiration toward truth in their respective art forms that was not dependent on superficial or coloristic means and was indifferent to external opinion.\textsuperscript{47}

Like most other commentators who have written on this work, both contemporaneously and more recently, Hanslick notes that Brahms reverts to the penultimate line of Schiller’s poem for his ending, rather than finishing the work less optimistically, as Schiller does. “It is appropriate that Brahms does not end with the phrase ‘for the ordinary goes down unsung into Orcus,’” he
writes, “but rather closes with the previous verse, ‘Even to be an elegy in the mouth of the beloved is glorious!’” For Hanslick, the return of the opening musical material, again in D major (I), “rounds off the work harmoniously.” The meaning of Nänie for Hanslick, in keeping with the collective tone of Brahms’s “musical elegies,” is that despite the inevitability of the transience of beauty and perfection, the aesthetic triumphs over death in the memory of beauty.

Gesang der Parzen, after a poem from one of Goethe’s classical dramas Iphigenie auf Tauris, was completed in 1882. Brahms’s setting is the Song of the Fates that Iphigenie sings in act 4 in her attempt to come to terms with the conflicting demands of “the eternally unspoilt peace of the gods, in comparison with the constant fight of the stressful existence of poor humans.” Not only is Brahms’s composition at odds with Goethe’s play, his music has been largely understood as being at odds with the very section of text he chose to set. The poem is concerned with the hopelessness of man in the face of the gods. The text opens with the lines “In fear of the Gods shall ye dwell, sons of men,” as the gods hold dominion over mankind in their eternal hands. It further warns mankind that despite being exalted by the gods, they live in constant peril of being plunged, abused, and shamed into the nocturnal depths. And while mankind remains bound in darkness in the hope of justice being served, the gods turn their blessed eyes away from an entire—one beloved—race of people.

It is Brahms’s musical language in the fifth strophe that has elicited most comment in relation to the incongruity between poetry and music. The verse reads: “The rulers turn their eyes away from entire races of people, and they shun in grandchildren the once-beloved, silently speaking features of our ancestors.” Brahms introduces the parallel D major tonality to the work for the first time at this peak of ruthlessness, albeit with subtle minor mode tilts to ward off any false sense of security in the major. Gustav Ophüls reports Brahms’s comment that “I often hear people philosophizing about the fifth strophe of the Parzenlied. I think that, at the mere entry of the major key, the unsuspecting listener’s heart must soften and his eyes become wet, only then does the whole misery of mankind take hold of him.”

In his 1883 review of Gesang der Parzen, Hanslick notes the incongruity of Brahms’s musical language in the fifth strophe with the remainder of the piece. To him, “this reconciling, almost transfiguring conclusion is not explainable from the poem itself—it is not necessarily a result of it.” The fact that “the gods turned their blessed eyes away from the innocent grandchild of the unfortunate, once-beloved ancestor” in the poem does not signify a softening for Hanslick, “but rather indicates the pitiless persistence of their cruel senses.” Hanslick takes a similar approach here to that taken in his review of Schicksalslied. He avoids making a value judgment on the text, or indeed, taking a position on whether Brahms has been faithful to it or not in his musical setting. Rather Hanslick’s emphasis is on the significance of the
text as a stimulus for Brahms’s musical needs. Brahms, in Hanslick’s view, is neither refuting nor reversing the harshness of the heavenly decree of the gods as expressed in Goethe’s poem. For Hanslick, “Brahms’s penetrating interpretation” privileges the human position. For humans who, along with Iphigenie, face the conflicting demands of heavenly decree and worldly practicality, there is beauty and comfort to be found in this practicality, in the human endeavor of art and, more specifically, in Brahms’s composition.

Brahms’s demand in Parzenlied—as the piece is often called—as seen through the lens of Hanslick’s criticism, seems to be that if there must be destitution, there must also be hope and reconciliation. “Just as Rubens or Rembrandt often need a bright color and, without the compulsion of the subject, use it for individual portions of a painting with a dark background,” Hanslick writes, “so, we think, Brahms the musician deemed a more reconciled ending to be essential to this chorus and therefore arranged it so touchingly and beautifully.” In Hanslick’s opinion, Goethe’s “gloomy tones of lament,” and the “penetrating cry” of the poem, when taken in isolation, “bring us hopelessly down to earth.” But when coupled with Brahms’s “beautiful sound,” it “rises against this hopelessness.” Hanslick, in a manner that recalls the turn-of-the-century humanism of Goethe and Schiller, considers Gesang der Parzen “highly important in its perfect union of the severity and simplicity of classical antiquity, with the liveliest, most moving expression of feelings.”

The Weltanschauung that Hanslick espouses in these works is one that juxtaposes harshness and sorrow with comfort and transfiguration. His reviews draw attention to these qualities in a manner that offers consolation for a secularized public by distancing the work from religious dogma. Hanslick discerned similar qualities in Brahms’s orchestral works, specifically the Tragische Ouvertüre. It is to this work that we now turn.

From the Sacred to the Secular: Distancing Dogma?

Brahms gave no clues as to the origin of the suggestive title Tragische Ouvertüre, op. 81, and left no record of having a specific tragedy in mind. Moreover, he did not even hint that the tragedy was of the literary kind. Several commentators have put forward suggested readings of the overture, from Kalbeck’s proposal that its origins are in Goethe’s Faust to Tovey’s comparison with Shakespeare’s Hamlet. In the absence of clues to the poetic idea embodied in the work, or how the work embodies the notion of tragedy, Hanslick offers his own suggestion for the significance of the title in his 1880 review. Noting that the overture “deals with independent musical thoughts, themes, from which the composer organically develops the whole, with his characteristic, rigorous logic,” Hanslick accurately records that Brahms has no specific tragedy (Trauerspiel) in mind for
his overture, "rather a general 'Actus Tragicus' (just as J. S. Bach’s inscription reads)." He ventures that "if we had to call on a tragedy to be introduced by Brahms’s overture, we would probably call on Hamlet."

Hanslick’s use of the term Trauerspiel in relation to the overture is noteworthy. Brahms himself had toyed with the idea of giving the work the title "Trauerspiel-Ouvertüre." Walter Benjamin perceives the seventeenth-century Trauerspiel as being central to baroque allegorical thought, on account of its "antithetical music-allegorical elements." In John Deathridge’s 1996 discussion of Wagner’s Tristan und Isolde (composed 1857–59), he argues that Isolde’s Liebestod is reminiscent of a Trauerspiel owing to its "chorale-like beginning" and "hymn-like gestures." Here Deathridge draws attention to Benjamin’s description of the baroque tragedy (Trauerspiel) as "showing an antinomic relation between Lutheranism and the everyday, . . . a process that actively resists the sense of disenchantment brought about by rigorous, anti-Transcendentalist Lutheran dogma." Deathridge reminds us that Trauerspiel was linked to Lutheranism, but could also be understood as resisting its dogma. Hanslick’s liberal Viennese readership in 1880 would most likely have been aware of such associations. Lest the term Trauerspiel alone fail to conjure up such images, Hanslick employs further references to Lutheranism.

Hanslick’s allusion to Actus Tragicus can be read in a number of ways. The very mention of Bach—the composer revered as a German cultural icon in the nineteenth century—draws attention to the historical lineage of Brahms’s music. By referring to a Bach cantata, Hanslick evokes the image of Brahms as a North-German Lutheran. Actus Tragicus (BWV 106) was one of the better-known Bach cantatas during the nineteenth century, having appeared in A. B. Marx’s 1830 edition of the cantatas, and having received frequent performances. In this work, Bach sets texts chosen from the Old Testament, the New Testament, and Martin Luther’s chorale “Mit Fried und Freud’ ich fahr dahin.” Eric Chafe points out that the Actus Tragicus differs from its sister genre, the biblical historia, in having a more meditative and less purely narrative emphasis. He argues that BWV 106 goes much further than “the confrontation of Old and New Testament texts or of Law and Gospel,” and explores both the “doctrinal element” and the “personal, individual and subjective side of faith.” The subject of meditation in this cantata, he states, “is the understanding of death according to the stages of salvation history.” These stages encompass “the history of Israel to the coming of Christ, his death on the cross, and the era of the Christian church.” He also suggests that the sequence can be read “as an internal progression from fear of death and acceptance of its inevitability to faith in Christ and in the promise of the Gospel, and, finally, to the willingness of the believer to die in Christ and his church.” In other words, the theme of Actus Tragicus, a work steeped in Christian dogma and Lutheran theology, can be understood as the inevitability of death, or, as Beller-McKenna understands it, as “a sequence of ideas that progress towards an acceptance of death.”
Whereas Hanslick evokes Lutheran dogma in his review of the *Tragische Ouvertüre*, op. 81, he also distances his review from such dogma, not only by referring to BWV 106, but also in his reference to *Hamlet*. A sequence of ideas that progress toward an acceptance of death is a good description of what happens in *Hamlet*, in particular in the air of resignation we find in the last act. We witness the character’s progression from a state of depression in act 1, to that of an exemplary Shakespearean villain, with an over-reliance on reason and a strong belief in a free will, in act 2. By the last scene, Hamlet seems to have become indifferent to death, neither desiring it nor fearing it: “We defy augury. There is special providence in the fall of a sparrow. If it be now, ’tis not to come; if it be not to come, it will be now; if it be not now, yet it will come—the readiness is all. Since no man of aught he leaves knows, what is’t to leave betimes?” This is indicative of a state of stoical detachment. Moreover, despite the fact that Hamlet has now come to put his trust in providence, it seems his attitude toward death is not that of a devout Christian. Hamlet shows no particular concern to repent of his sins, for example, as a devout Christian should in the same circumstances.

Of course there is no way of knowing for certain why Hanslick (or indeed, later Tovey) considered *Hamlet* to be a poetic counterpart to the *Tragische Ouvertüre*. Nevertheless, the references to BWV 106 and *Hamlet* taken together illuminate one another, juxtaposing a sequence of ideas steeped in Christian dogma and Lutheran theology and progressing toward an acceptance of death, with a secular counterpart. This reading is in keeping with Hanslick’s description of the work as being “filled throughout with a pathetic seriousness that sometimes touches the severe, but never the horribly distorting ‘tragic.’” If we are to understand the work in terms of Brahms’s musical thoughts and themes, as Hanslick suggests we ought, there is a direct musical analogy in the inability of the theme to articulate the tonic. As James Webster observes, the struggle brought about by this tragic element is evident throughout the overture, but reaches a powerful culmination in the coda. Webster speaks of a “last defiant gesture” (mn. 379) as the coda moves toward its relentless close. It is in the passage that follows that the work takes on all of the struggles that have gone before, and thrashes them out in a formidable finale. The work ends with a stoical acceptance of its fate; to invoke Shakespeare: “the readiness is all.” Hanslick’s reading, therefore, can be interpreted not as suggesting a program for the work, but as providing the reader with a number of ways of understanding the work spiritually. His proposal of literary adjuncts for the work is entirely compatible with this understanding of the work’s “characteristic, rigorous logic.” I would argue that Hanslick sees Brahms universalizing the spiritual message that he considers the work to embody.

Evidence of Brahms’s critics interpreting such universal or humanitarian messages in any of Brahms’s works other than the *German Requiem* is scant. Yet as Margaret Notley aptly notes, “beginning with Kalbeck, who referred to the composer as a ‘heretic,’ Brahms’s biographers have usually regarded him
as having been an unobservant Christian in his adult years, to have become a liberal like Hanslick in this respect.⁷⁹ Notley further argues that among Hanslick’s liberal propensities was a tendency to be an unobservant Christian, to view Biblical stories as valuable lessons in moral conduct, regardless of the specific faith of the reader. It is in this context that Hanslick recalls his childhood relationship to religion: “The essence and foundation of religion should be only ethics; all faiths with the same moral principles were of equal worth. We became acquainted with the Biblical stories only from their amiable, tenderhearted, and poetic side, with the ‘miracle’ only as allegories.”⁸⁰

The *Tragische Ouvertüre* was composed in the summer of 1880. On a number of occasions during this period, Brahms expressed his dissatisfaction with his lot as a composer of spiritual music, and explicitly stated his wish to find heathen texts to set. Thus his letter of July 14, 1880, to Elisabet von Herzogenberg: “I am quite willing to write motets, or anything for chorus (I am heartily sick of everything else!); but won’t you try and find me some words? One can’t have them made to order unless one begins before good reading has spoilt one. They are not heathen enough for me in the Bible. I have bought the Koran but can find nothing there either.”⁸¹ In August 1882 Brahms laments to Herzogenberg, “Shall I never shake off the theologian!”⁸² Most likely referring to *Gesang der Parzen*, he writes: “I have just finished [a psalm] which is actually heathenish enough to please me and to have made my music better than usual I hope.”⁸³ Kalbeck adds a footnote to his edition of the correspondence at this point to contextualize Brahms’s comment: “He had always taken pleasure in hunting up ‘godless’ texts in the Bible. Nothing made him angrier than to be taken for an orthodox Church composer on account of his sacred compositions.”⁸⁴ Along the same lines, Beller-McKenna understands the observation made by Clara Schumann that “Brahms was no churchgoer, yet he was of a deeply religious nature” to indicate Brahms’s “private versus public relationship to religion.”⁸⁵

Whereas it is likely that what I suggest as Hanslick’s reading of the *Tragische Ouvertüre* was not indicated by Brahms himself, I propose that Hanslick was open to viewing the work in this manner due to his awareness of both Brahms’s position on matters of faith, and the liberal Weltanschauung that he shared with him. Hanslick distances dogma from the fundamental message he understands the work to convey and ascribes to this overture a secular view of man’s ultimate fate. Given the evidence for Brahms’s search for heathen texts and his attitude toward religion, it is likely that this subject may have been discussed with other members of his intimate circle of friends. Notwithstanding the absence of documentary evidence that such a conversation took place (and bearing in mind that absence of evidence is not evidence of absence), Hanslick’s discussion of the *Tragische Ouvertüre* presents the listener with alternative ways of understanding the work’s spiritual message—one bound to its religious context, the other not. Such a reading is consonant with the spirit of Brahms’s musical elegies,
Hanslick’s View of Brahms: A Reconsideration

The Weltanschauung that Hanslick distils from Brahms’s music is consonant with Schiller’s formulation in Über naïve und sentimentale Dichtung, in which he juxtaposes an object of sadness and an object of joy. Hanslick’s discussion of these works in this context provides evidence of how a member of Brahms’s intimate circle of friends responded to such deeply felt and spiritual works. For that reason they form an integral part of the reception history of Brahms’s music. This is all the more important because compared with Brahms’s instrumental music, the Alto Rhapsody, Schicksalslied, Nánie, and Gesang der Parzen have been given scant attention in scholarly writings. Yet they are—as Michael Musgrave attests—among Brahms’s most moving and characteristic works.

In the literature concerning Hanslick and Brahms, Hanslick has frequently been accused of seeing a confirmation of his own aesthetic theory in Brahms’s works, and of exploiting this confirmation for his own formalist ends. Constantin Floros, for instance, makes two principal claims regarding Hanslick’s image of Brahms: the first is that Hanslick saw in Brahms’s works “models of the ‘pure, absolute music’ he tirelessly promoted,” asserting that Hanslick recognized in these works “a posterior and unexpected confirmation of the aesthetic theory” he proposed in 1854. The second—an extension of the first—is that Hanslick’s “doctrine of Brahms as a prototype of the ‘absolute’ musician does not do justice to his music. For it simply ignores the considerable share of the poetic and autobiographic in the work of this great composer. In this respect, Hanslick’s Brahms interpretations have done great harm and have obstructed the view for a truly differentiated investigation.”

Hanslick used the term “pure, absolute music” only once in Vom Musikalisch-Schönen, and never in his writings on Brahms. The single instance in the monograph occurs in chapter 2, titled “The Representation of Feeling Is Not the Content of Music.” Here Hanslick has “deliberately chosen instrumental music” for his examples. He maintains that “whatever can be asserted of instrumental music holds good for all music.” In other words, whether or not a piece of music has a poetic heading, a literary adjunct, or a prescriptive program, the music must remain intelligible in its own right, and not depend on its extramusical adjunct for its comprehensibility: “If some general definition of music be sought, something by which to characterize its essence and nature, to establish its boundaries and purpose, we are entitled to confine ourselves to instrumental music. Of what instrumental music cannot do it ought never be said that music can do it, because only instrumental music is music purely and absolutely.” Burford understands Hanslick to articulate the link he perceives
between essence and individuation clearly in this passage. “Both the Romantic and idealist views of art,” he argues, “tended to embrace the notion of a species-essence—the ‘poetic’ and ‘Spirit’ respectively—whereas Hanslick argued for music’s individual essence (‘musically beautiful,’ the ‘specifically musical,’ etc.).” Hanslick’s opposition is not to vocal music, program music, or music with any kind of autobiographical or literary allusion, as Floros falsely asserts. Rather it is to music that seeks to be understood in terms of its extramusical content, and not its musical content—that is its tones, latent within which are the ideal content or spiritual substance (geistiger Gehalt), and thereby music’s metaphysical status. To this end Hanslick writes, “Where it is a matter of the ‘content’ [Inhalt] of music, we must reject even pieces with specific titles or programs. Union with poetry” he claims, without denouncing such a union, “extends the power of music, but not its boundaries.” In other words, we must reject works that have their specific title or program as the content, or spiritual substance, of the piece.

A 1997 essay by Hans Joachim Hinrichsen, “‘Auch das Schöne muß sterben’ oder Die Vermittlung von biographischer und ästhetischer Subjektivität im Musikalisch-Schönen. Brahms, Hanslick und Schillers Nänie” is noteworthy, because Hinrichsen is one of the few commentators who seek to recover Hanslick and his “much abused little book” from the formalist arena to which they have been assigned. However, at the same time he reinforces the view of Hanslick as the formalist champion of Brahms the “absolute” by focusing only on Vom Musikalisch-Schönen and not considering Hanslick’s critical writings on Nänie and a number of other pertinent works.

Hinrichsen attributes the formalist reception of Vom Musikalisch-Schönen to a lack of clarity in Hanslick’s explication of his concept of “form imbued with meaning” evident in all ten editions, and not to a formalist agenda in the book itself. He considers Hanslick’s “famous formulation of ‘tönend bewegte Formen’ as the only content of music”—the most oft-quoted excerpt from his book, usually cited out of context—to have been “intended as a paradox and received as a tautology.” Hinrichsen notes that “form in Hanslick’s aesthetics is ‘not merely acoustic beauty,’ but a carrier and representative medium of the ‘spiritual content.’” For Hinrichsen, the difficulty in understanding Hanslick’s aesthetic ideals is that whereas Hanslick made it easy for his detractors to reduce his aesthetic theory to a “formalistic exterior,” he did not make it easy for his readers to distinguish between “autonomy and objectivity.”

Hinrichsen then considers Brahms’s compositional process in relation to Hanslick’s aesthetic arguments. He makes the case that Brahms’s Tragische Ouvertüre and Akademische Festouvertüre should not be understood as a pair, as the two often are. Rather, he proposes that the Tragische Ouvertüre and Nänie are a pair because one perceives in both works together the “peculiar ambivalence, above all the radicalism, in Schiller’s view of lost beauty,” which Hinrichsen identifies as “mourning and tragedy on the one hand, comfort and
transfiguration on the other.”\textsuperscript{100} He considers this to be a “characteristically Brahmsian mode of ‘speaking’ or ‘expressing’ in music.”\textsuperscript{101} Such a reading of opp. 81 and 82 is certainly insightful, taking into consideration not only Brahms’s but also Schiller’s artistic tendencies.

However, Hinrichsen asserts that Hanslick would not have been amenable to viewing the \textit{Tragische Ouvertüre} and \textit{Nänie} as a pair. These works would actually be separated in principle, he suggests, in the aesthetics of Hanslick due to their \textit{Gattungszugehörigkeit} (the one being considered pure absolute music, the other vocal music).\textsuperscript{102} Yet, what is remarkable about Hinrichsen’s own reading of these works is how closely aligned it is with Hanslick’s view of op. 81 and op. 82 and of Brahms’s “musical elegies” considered above. Whereas Hanslick does not go so far as to view these two works as a pair, he identifies strongly with what Hinrichsen deems to be a “Brahmsian mode of ‘speaking’ or ‘thinking’ in music.”\textsuperscript{103} The writings of both authors are comparable in that each distills from Brahms’s music the notion of mourning and tragedy on the one hand, comfort and transfiguration on the other.

Noticeable by its absence in Hinrichsen’s article is any discussion of Hanslick’s critical writings, despite the fact that Hanslick reviewed all of the works to which Hinrichsen refers. In making a case for his own aesthetic reading of Brahms’s works, Hinrichsen argues that “the musical poetics and aesthetics of a composer who only expresses himself in a taciturn manner—like Johannes Brahms—are to be deduced predominantly from the compositions themselves.”\textsuperscript{104} Yet he disregards Hanslick’s reviews of these very works. Hanslick is represented once again only by the polemical monograph of his youth, with the critical writings of his maturity being overlooked. This leads Hinrichsen to such claims as, “Only in the instrumental music, as is well known, does Hanslick see music completely fulfilling the term as pure, absolute music; general conclusions about the poetic and compositional concept that are drawn from a piece of vocal music would be, accordingly, of limited stylistic range.”\textsuperscript{105}

The weakness in Hinrichsen’s argument becomes more apparent when he broadens the discussion to include \textit{Schicksalslied}. He suggests that the orchestral postlude in this work can be understood as being contrary to Hanslick’s notion of pure instrumental music as espoused in \textit{Vom Musikalisch-Schönen}.\textsuperscript{106} As we saw above, however, the spiritual substance of the orchestral postlude in \textit{Schicksalslied}, as Hanslick understands it, is inextricably bound up with—and would not have been conceived were it not for—Hölderlin’s poetic text. Hanslick explicitly refers to this postlude as “pure instrumental music.”\textsuperscript{107} His argument is that Brahms’s postlude expresses that which cannot be expressed in words, that which is, arguably, more definite than words, and can in this sense be seen to exemplify what John Daverio refers to as the “leap over the abyss separating the manifest content of a poetic text and its spirit or aesthetic quality.”\textsuperscript{108}
Brahms’s liberalism and humanism are abundantly evident in a number of his works that question the nature of human existence, and are preoccupied with death, fate, suffering, and the human condition. His “musical elegies,” being the deeply spiritual works that they are, perhaps reveal this to us more powerfully than any of his other works. Here Brahms provides a source of comfort and glimpses of transient beauty for his fellow human beings. Such music resonates with audiences and performers, regardless of their faiths or beliefs. I argue that Hanslick was acutely aware of this aspect of Brahms’s artistic persona and that he sought to convey this in his rich and multifaceted, if at times complex, reviews of Brahms’s works. To mistake Hanslick’s appreciation of Brahms’s “thinking in tones” for a dismissal of anything that lies outside of these tones, and for a disregard for the poetic and autobiographic in the work of this great composer, amounts to a distortion and misrepresentation of Hanslick’s writings. Notwithstanding some evidence in the Brahms Briefwechsel that points to a liberal and humanist approach to Brahms’s works, and given the fact that Brahms is renowned for his reticence in his letters and correspondence, Hanslick’s critical writings are key in documenting this aspect of the critical reception of Brahms’s œuvre. Elisabet von Herzogenberg, one of Brahms’s closest friends, and one whose advice Brahms eagerly and regularly sought on his compositions, was well placed, therefore, to appreciate the value in Hanslick’s writings on Brahms, as she did in 1882 in the quotation given as the epigraph for this essay.
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