

## Canadian University Music Review Revue de musique des universités canadiennes

Canadian University Music Review

# Anton Webern's *Six Pieces for Orchestra*: A Comparison of the Two Published Versions

Robert Falck

Number 13, 1993

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1014299ar>  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1014299ar>

[See table of contents](#)

### Publisher(s)

Canadian University Music Society / Société de musique des universités canadiennes

### ISSN

0710-0353 (print)  
2291-2436 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

### Cite this article

Falck, R. (1993). Anton Webern's *Six Pieces for Orchestra*: A Comparison of the Two Published Versions. *Canadian University Music Review / Revue de musique des universités canadiennes*, (13), 104–122. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1014299ar>

### Article abstract

There are two published versions of Anton Webern's *Six Pieces for Orchestra*, though the composer considered the 1928 revision to be the only valid one. The 1909 version was first performed in 1913, but in spite of at least two projected performances, the composer may never have heard the revision. Although the revision was not carried out for a specific performance, the ostensible motivation for it was to reduce the rather excessive orchestral demands of the first version, and thus make it more practical for performance. While many of the revisions do result from the reduced orchestration, there are many changes in dynamics, tempo, phrasing and instrumental emphasis which do not. In fact, the new score is a thorough rehearing of the pieces, and the revisions affect everything from their overall formal conception to often very subtle relationships among the elements of the individual movements. The revisions also reflect the changes both in Webern's personal style between 1909 and 1928, the year of the *Symphonie*, op. 21, but also the global change from the luxuriant and indulgent post-romantic style to the "lean, athletic" style of Neoclassicism.

---

# ANTON WEBERN'S *SIX PIECES FOR ORCHESTRA*: A COMPARISON OF THE TWO PUBLISHED VERSIONS

Robert Falck

---

The *Six Pieces*, now known as opus 6, were composed in 1909 and first published as opus 4 (henceforth 1909) at the composer's expense to commemorate their first performance in Vienna on 31 March 1913. A copy of this edition in the Moldenhauer Archive bears a handwritten dedication to the composer's father on the title page.<sup>1</sup> This score was taken over by Universal Edition in 1920 when Webern signed his first contract with them. In the same year the composer prepared an arrangement for a reduced ensemble which was performed under the composer's direction at a concert of the Society for Private Musical Performances on 23 January 1921.<sup>2</sup> The revised version, rechristened as op. 6 (henceforth 1928), was completed in September of 1928.<sup>3</sup> The performance of 1928, which was to have taken place in June of 1933 at the sixty-third *Tonkünstlerfest* of the *Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein* in Dortmund, would have been the first had it not been cancelled because of the interference of the new Nazi regime.<sup>4</sup>

- 1 The title page with the dedication "Meinem lieben Vater, Klagenfurt, 1913" is reproduced in Hans Moldenhauer and Demar Irvine, eds., *Anton von Webern: Perspectives* (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1966), 36. It was published as *6 Stücke für Orchester: Ursprüngliche Fassung*, Philharmonia no. 433 (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1961).
- 2 Nicholas A. Huber, "Zu Weberns Kammerorchesterbearbeitung seiner *Sechs Stücke für Orchester op. 6* für den 'Verein für musikalische Privataufführungen'," *Musik-Konzepte* 36 (1984), 65.
- 3 Published as UE 12415 (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1956). Hans Moldenhauer (*Anton Webern* [New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979], 709) lists its first performance as 27 January 1929 in Berlin, conducted by Hermann Scherchen. The concert, complete with date and program, is mentioned a year earlier by Scherchen in a letter dated 13 January 1928. See Hermann Scherchen, "... *alles hörbar machen*": *Briefe eines Dirigenten, 1920 bis 1939* (Berlin: Henschelverlag, 1976), 128. This dating is confirmed in a review by Adolf Weimann in *Die Musik* 20: 467. Scherchen's performance must have been of 1909, and not 1928, and Moldenhauer must be corrected accordingly.
- 4 See Moldenhauer, *Anton Webern*, 128 and note 14. A performance under the composer's direction on the BBC in 1935 is the next candidate for the first performance of 1928 (*ibid.*, 447). Webern wrote to Josef Humplik on 20 March 1935 that he was to conduct a concert in London on 25 April with the first performance of his "Bach-Fuge," two other (unnamed) works of his own and a classical symphony. See Josef Polnauer, ed., *Anton Webern: Briefe an Hildegard Jone und Josef Humplik* (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1959), 30. The concert is not listed or reviewed in *The*

It is noteworthy that Webern considered the 1928 version to be the “only valid one,”<sup>5</sup> while, on the contrary, the arrangement for string orchestra of the *Five Movements for String quartet*, op. 5, also made in 1928, was allowed to exist alongside the original as an equally valid realization of the piece. Whether we agree with Webern’s own assessment or not, it is clear that he meant the 1928 version to be an improvement of the original, and not merely an alternate version. For better or worse, 1928 is a very thorough rethinking (and rehearing) of the pieces, by which their “prosody” is both clarified and refined.<sup>6</sup> That this rethinking had begun before 1928 is suggested by the fact that “older performance scores” of 1909 already contain performance directions which point to the 1928 version without changing the instrumentation.<sup>7</sup> It is evident from the composer’s letters to Berg and Schoenberg, however, that most of the work of revision was done in the summer of 1928.

Many, though by no means a majority of the changes made in 1928 were a direct result of the reduction in the orchestral forces.<sup>8</sup> Instruments eliminated

---

*Musical Times*, which regularly reports on BBC programs, including others by Webern. Although the “Bach-Fuge” (Webern’s orchestration of the *Ricercar* from the *Musical Offering*) is included in an appendix that lists all first performances at BBC concerts from 1930 to 1980 (in Nicholas Kenyon, *The BBC Symphony Orchestra: The First Fifty Years 1930–1980* [London: British Broadcasting Corporation, 1981], 453), opus six is not so listed. The concert is not included in another appendix of concerts of new music, and there is likewise no mention of it in a chapter devoted to Edward Clark’s relationship with the BBC and his efforts there on behalf of the Viennese composers. That Webern could say in a letter of 1943: “How long have I been waiting for a performance of these pieces!!!” (Moldenhauer, *Anton Webern*, 551–52) seems to suggest that opus 6 was not included in the 1935 BBC concert, and that Webern never heard it performed.

- 5 “... einzig gelten soll.” Rudolph Stefan, “Weberns Werke auf Deutschen Tonkünstlerfesten,” *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* 27 (1976): 121–27.
- 6 Moldenhauer’s reference (*Anton Webern*, 129) to Goethe’s comment that he often revised his poems to improve their “prosody,” which Webern had recently read, is probably taken from the letter to Berg quoted in the same paragraph, but this is not entirely clear. Webern evidently understood “prosody” to mean the clarification of relationships among the parts, large and small, of a composition. It includes, but is not limited to, phrasing and both rhythmic and melodic detail. I employ it here to indicate those changes, especially in orchestration and in tempo, that enhance relationships which may not be explicit in the notes alone.
- 7 Stephan (“Weberns Werke auf Deutschen Tonkünstlerfesten,” *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* 27 [1972]: 121–7) mentions these “ältere Aufführungspartituren” without identifying or locating them. The 1920 version represents an entirely different problem. It is an “arrangement” and not a fully realized version of these orchestral pieces. Since 1909 and 1928 are the only such realizations, this study concentrates on them exclusively.
- 8 A press release from Universal Edition stresses this feature of the revision exclusively: “A.W. hat die 6 Orchesterstücke einer Revision unterzogen und dabei die Orchesterbesetzung wesentlich reduziert, so da nunmehr auch kleinere Orchester das Werk aufführen können.” See Walter Kolneder, *Anton Webern, Österreichische Komponisten des XX. Jahrhunderts*, v. 19 (Vienna: Verlag Elisabeth Lafite, 1974), 54.

were: one of two piccolos, alto flute, both English horns, one of three B $\flat$  clarinets, the E $\flat$  clarinet and one of two bass clarinets, and two each of horns, trumpets and trombones in the wind section; one of two harps; one of three timpani and the *Rute* from the percussion section. This reduces both the number and variety of the percussion instruments in particular, reflecting the reduced, but still important, role played by the percussion in 1928. This in turn reflects the trend in all of Webern's instrumental music after the *Five Pieces for Orchestra*, op. 10, the last piece to employ a substantial battery of unpitched percussion instruments.

There are many orchestrational changes which are not dictated by the reduced ensemble. Some "fancy" string techniques, such as *col legno (weich gezogen)* (I/17; V/19), *mit dem Bogen geschlagen* (II/17ff.), are abandoned in 1928, and the role of the harp is curtailed well beyond what the elimination of one harp would demand. (In fact, two harps are absolutely essential only in VI/23–25, at the very end of the piece.) By far the largest number of changes in orchestration, even those which involve the replacement of instruments eliminated in 1928, are made in the interest of creating homogenous tone colours, as opposed to the mixed palette favoured in 1909. In many cases, such changes have real thematic significance and help to clarify both the form and the prosody of individual pieces.

The revision of tempo markings is a second major category, the effect of which is felt both on the small and on the large scale. Although they fall into the category of virtually inaudible revision, changes in tempo indications for the individual movements may be understood as a clarification of the composer's overall formal conception of the piece, but often they suggest that he was striving for a more unified, "classical" conception in 1928 (see figure 1).<sup>9</sup>

In a letter to Schoenberg prior to the 1913 première, Webern reveals that the music is about the death and burial of his mother in 1906.<sup>10</sup> The third and fourth movements are described as "central," and the first as Webern's anticipation of the event. In a programme note for the aborted 1933 performance of the revised score, the death of his mother is no longer mentioned, but the formal plan of the piece which is set forth still contains traces of the earlier conception. The first piece is "expectation of catastrophe," and the second "certainty of its fulfillment;" the third is the "most tender contrast" and an "introduction to the fourth, a funeral march." Five and six are "an epilogue: remembrance and resigna-

9 While a comparison of tempo markings in the two versions might suggest a slightly slower overall conception in 1928, the composer gives an estimated duration of 11–12 minutes in 1909, but *ca.* 10 minutes for 1928.

10 Moldenhauer, *Anton Webern*, 126.

11 Stefan, "Weberns Werke," 121–7, and Moldenhauer, *Anton Webern*, 128.

1909

I. Etwas bewegte (♩)

II. Bewegt (♩)

III. Zart bewegt (♩)

IV. Langsam (♩) *marcia funebre*

V. Sehr langsam (♩)

VI. Zart bewegt

1928

I. Langsam (♩ = ca. 50)

II. Bewegt (♩ = ca. 160)

III. Mässig (♩ = ca. 50)

IV. Sehr mässig (♩ = ca. 46)

V. Sehr langsam (♩ = ca. 40)

VI. Langsam (♩ = ca. 50)

Figure 1

tion.”<sup>12</sup> The whole scheme, then, is: I, II Expectation; III, IV Fulfillment; and V, VI Dénouement.

By applying the same adverb to each of the third/fourth (*mässig*) and fifth/sixth (*langsam*) movements, the composer made these pairings more explicit. Furthermore, by applying both the same adverb and metronome marking to the first and last movements, he seems to imply a classical symmetry not aimed at in 1909 and not apparent in either version. That the composer refers in the later programme note merely to a “catastrophe,” rather than to a personal tragedy, likewise tends toward the more objective and classical, which are the hallmarks of the composer’s later works. That he chose a larger metric unit as the “beat” in 1928 may also suggest a less intense conception.

In both versions the grouping of the pieces into pairs is emphasized by the placement of the word *ritardando*. Movements I, III and V end *ritardando*, *pianissimo*, thus blurring the boundary between them and the following movements, which in all versions begin at approximately the dynamic level where the previous movements had left off. Movements II and IV, on the other hand, each end “in tempo,” *fortissimo*. This creates a “hard edge” between these movements and what follows which is not noticeably affected by the revision.

\* \* \*

In the following discussions of individual movements, I will comment only on those revisions which make us hear and understand the music differently, or

<sup>12</sup> It is noteworthy that while IV is still called a “funeral march” in the composer’s 1933 program note, the words are no longer found in the 1928 score.

which clarify an idea which was present in both versions. In particular, changes of instrumentation and of tempo relationships within, or which articulate subsections of, a movement, fall into this category. Both the “prosody” and the formal design of individual movements may be affected by these changes as well as by changes in dynamics, which is just another dimension of orchestration, and thus of tone colour. Many of the revisions discussed below are so small as to seem inconsequential, and some are, indeed, literally inaudible. However, any changes made to pieces which are as brief and fragile as these will have a measurable effect, and some suggest quite profound rethinking and rehearing of the music.

Movement I is not much affected by the reduced ensemble, as it does not use the full complement of instruments available in either score. The tendency of 1928 to be more precise in the way it indicates tempi, and changes of tempo, is fully evident, however. There are comparatively few changes of tempo or character indicated in this piece, but the final *ritard* begins one bar later in 1928 (m. 18 and m. 17 respectively). In 1909 *etwas drängend* (m. 9) and *Wieder ruhiger* (m. 11) are found, but both were eliminated in 1928. While this is one of the few instances in which 1928 has fewer tempo indications than 1909, the kind of change is still characteristic. Thus *drängend* becoming *ruhiger*, coinciding with the dénouement of the piece, are eliminated in favour of letting the thicker texture and increased range alone convey the message of urgency in 1928. In any case, the change from an eighth-note to a quarter-note beat tells us that the urgency of 1909 has been toned down somewhat throughout.

Although there are some changes in the inner voices of mm. 4 to 8 (harp/viola/violin II) which reflect a rehearing of the relationship between principal and secondary voices, none were necessitated by the reduced instrumentation of 1928. The English horn part in mm. 9–13 in 1909 did have to be replaced, and a number of instruments in the appropriate range were available, including one of the clarinets or trumpets. While the line is analogous motivically to both elements of the clarinet-trumpet duet of mm. 3–7, it “takes up” the range of the clarinet from m. 7. In the new texture of m. 7/2 onward, however, the “Hauptstimme” in the woodwinds has shifted upward, and so the choice of trumpets for the countermelody in 1928 is perfectly comprehensible, as the trumpets now take up the role played by the single trumpet in mm. 3–7. The quadruple woodwinds (flutes, oboes) and quadruple trumpets of mm. 9<sup>ff</sup>. in 1928 represent an intensification of every aspect of the duet of mm. 3–7, and the choice of trumpets for the “Nebenstimme” in 1928 underlines the parallel between these two passages.

Another change in orchestration not dictated by economy comes in the aftermath of the flute-oboe melody of mm. 7–10. In 1909, it is the oboes which sustain the high B<sub>1</sub> from mm. 10–14, while in 1928, this role is given to the flutes.



**Example 1:** Movement II, mm. 22–23.

This is no doubt partly based on practical considerations: it is clearly easier for the flutes to sustain this note and make a long, gradual *decrescendo* than it is for the oboes, even though in 1909 the composer attempts to achieve this by having one oboe drop out in m. 12. Another effect, however, is to deemphasize the double reed instruments generally in 1928, leaving flute, clarinet, trumpet and horn as the principal wind soloists. Thus the opening exchange among flute/trumpet, flute/horn and clarinet/trumpet in mm. 1–4 is reproduced in mm. 12–19 in 1928. Another minor change in the last part of the piece again effects the colour of the string sound. The pizzicato chord in violas and cellos in m. 17 of 1928 is *collegno* and *weich gezogen* in 1909. This is an indulgence, a sound heard only once more (V/9) in 1909, and not at all in 1928. Webern eliminated it in favour of a “normal” pizzicato in 1928, because its more incisive sound is a better match for the celesta/harp chord in mm. 15–16. Another change in this measure has something like the same effect. The horn articulates the B $\flat$  for the last time in m. 17, but only in 1928 is the note stopped. Whereas the note is articulated together with the string chord in 1909, it sets in one-third of a beat earlier in 1928. The generally softer contour of the whole measure in 1909 is further emphasized by the fact that the *ritardando* begins here, rather than a measure later as in 1928. Webern evidently wished to maintain a sharp-edged contour longer in 1928, allowing the relaxation to set in only after the melodic and contrapuntal “action” of the piece is effectively over.

Movement II is longer and more complex in every way, and its revisions are correspondingly both more numerous and more significant. Both versions are marked *Bewegt*, but 1928 defines this as  $\text{♩} = 160$ , the only movement in the revision which takes the eighth-note as the beat. Measures 1–13 have no changes in tempo in 1909, while 1928 has no fewer than six. From mm. 14–21, the two scores largely agree on the placement of the *ritardando* and *accelerando*, and both establish a new tempo at m. 22. In 1909 this is simply *Schnell*, while 1928 has *Rasch* with a new metronome marking of  $\text{♩} = 80$ . There are no further changes in tempo in 1909, while 1928 alternates *Rasch* with *mässiger* ( $\text{♩} = 160$ ;

$\text{♩} = 80$ ), first by the measure and then, approximately, by the half-measure. This produces a very subtle proportional relationship between these measure, and an equally subtle difference over 1909, since the *mässig* measures will be equal to one and one-half of the *Rasch* measures. The way in which these measures are related to one another in 1909 and 1928 is shown in example 1.

The difficulties facing the composer as he revised this movement in 1928 are apparent right from the first measure. The bass clarinet solo which opens the movement was meant to sound an octave higher in 1909, as a note to the score explicitly warns “ohne Oktav-Transposition.”<sup>13</sup> This is perfectly possible, but creates a different hierarchy between melody and accompaniment, and a new connection between it and the trombone melody which follows. Changes to the accompanying voices in this initial episode are not required to accommodate the loss of the second harp, and the total sound of the passage is not much affected by them. They do, however, clarify and strengthen the role of the bassoon in the texture at the expense of the harp, and the connection to the following trombone melody is likewise clarified. Since the bassoons are *tacet* after the second measure in both versions, and the bass clarinet is limited to a supporting role in 1909 and eliminated altogether in 1928, the strengthening of the bassoon part in mm. 1–2 of 1928 gives these measures a clearer instrumental profile.

Following the introductory measures 1–5, the movement is a series of episodes which pit woodwinds against strings, with the latter initially in the accompanying role. (See mm. 6–8, 11–12, 13–14, 17, and 19–21.) In each of these episodes, the winds carry the melody and are accompanied or answered by chords of varying density in the strings. As well, the roles of the two groups of instruments in each episode is further underlined by some kind of threefold division of the beat in the winds, against two or four in the strings, a relationship which is reversed in the exchange in mm. 13–14. The melodic voice begins in simple octaves (m. 6), becomes the reiteration of a chromatic dyad (mm. 11–12), an enigmatic three-voice complex (m. 13) and finally a melody in three-voice harmony (mm. 17, and 19–21). The accompanying chords are in six voices (mm. 6, 14, 17–21) or four voices (mm. 10–11). The tight exchanges between chords and unpitched percussion in mm. 22–27 combine winds and strings, while preserving the three-against-two rhythm in successive statements of pitched and unpitched instruments. What happens is clearest if we examine more closely the role of the string section. At m. 6, the string chords are played tremolo, muted and

13 The rest of the bass clarinet part in this movement is notated in the already somewhat archaic bass clef, as if to underline clearly this difference. Bass clef is employed otherwise, with the exception of IV/12, V/10 and VI/11, where comparison with 1928 shows that the treble clef as usual indicates a pitch a major ninth higher than sounding. In 1928, treble clef is employed throughout.



*am Steg*. In 1909, these are doubled by the six horns, eliminated in 1928 to make the texture more transparent and also to focus more clearly the role played by the string section in the movement. In mm. 11–12, the four-voice chords are played pizzicato beginning *pp* (1928) or *ppp* (1909), and make a *crescendo*. While the upper range of the chords is not increased, the “melody” in the trumpets is reduced to a pair of pitches lying below the upper note of the string chords. In addition, the extreme bass register is eliminated and the chords are more sharply articulated. Measure 14 is a response to the winds in m. 13 rather than an accompaniment, but the full string section, minus contrabass, plays *arco* in a pitch range which closes the gap between wind and string statements. At m. 17, the melody in the woodwinds has regained the highest position in the texture, while the strings, now *fortissimo* from the start, return to a lower pitch level. In 1909, these chords are *col legno* and, again, doubled by the horns, both refinements eliminated in 1928 for reasons of both textural and thematic clarity. When winds and strings come together at *Schnell* (1909) or *Rasch* (1928) in m. 22, the strings play pizzicato, *ff* or *fff*, and in the highest register. The unpitched percussion response by *Rute* and bass drum in 1908, tam-tam and bass drum in 1928, is an echo of this moment of musical stasis, which in each score sounds three, two and one times successively as the eleven-tone complexes of winds and strings finally choke them off.

It is not difficult to interpret this succession of events in light of Webern’s programme note for the 1933 performance. It is the growing “certainty of [the “catastrophe’s] fulfillment” that is depicted in this progression from the relatively relaxed atmosphere of m. 6 to the veritable hysteria of the final measures. The “echo” in 1909 is the combination bass drum/*Rute*, which cannot help but recall the Scherzo of Mahler’s *Symphony no. 2*, along with the “danse macabre” atmosphere of that movement.<sup>14</sup> In 1928, the *Rute* is abandoned, and the same duet is played by bass drum/tam-tam at a slightly slower tempo (Ex.1). Webern thus abandons the reference to Mahler, and instead anticipates the characteristic bass drum/tam-tam tone colour of movement IV, which is, of course, the “catastrophe,” now even more clearly foreshadowed by movement II. The tempo marking *mässig* not only anticipates the marking for the next movement, but also that for movement IV: *Sehr mässig*. (There seems to be no other explanation for such a marking for a movement with tempo of  $\text{♩} = 46$ , while the first and last movements’ *Langsam* is  $\text{♩} = 50$ .)

The pitches of the chords in mm. 22–27 add up to eleven in both versions (E is missing), but some significant redistribution was undertaken in 1928. The

14 It is heard twice as an accompaniment (in 3/8) to the concluding phrase of the movement’s main theme (mm. 66ff and 167ff).



**Example 2:** Movement II, m. 22.

wind chord accounts for all eleven notes in both orchestral scores, and in both the woodwinds play the top five notes (piccolo, oboes, clarinets), and the brass the lower six (trumpets, horns, trombones). In 1928, the string chords double the lowest four notes of the woodwinds (violins 1 and 2), and the six notes of the brass (violas, celli 1 and 2). In 1909, however, the chord played by the violas and celli does not duplicate the pitches of the brass instruments, but plays a six-note chord whose two lowest pitches duplicate the top two of the violins' chord (D–F). This latent D-minor/major chord, which anticipates the D-major/minor third of the timpani's entrance in the fourth movement, and the D-minor ostinato of the fifth movement (1909, mm. 17–21; 1928, mm. 19–21), is an esoteric detail which is abandoned in 1928. The simple doubling of the brass parts results in something like a tone cluster in the violas and cellos. (Example 2 shows the string chords from both versions.)

Movement III is the shortest of the cycle, and few changes were necessitated by the reduced instrumental resources in 1928. As in movement I, a characteristic tempo marking is replaced by a sober single word and a concrete metronome marking. 1928 typically contains more tempo modifications, notably a *ritardando* in m. 2 and m. 4, though 1909 demands a new tempo – *etwas schneller* – (mm. 5 and 9). While the final *ritardando* was delayed by a full measure in the revision of movement I, it sets in at the same place in both versions of movement III. Both in detail and in the overall conception, this movement is the least affected by the revision. It is similar in this respect to movement I, and both, significantly, are less complex than their much-revised “pairs,” movements II and IV.

Movement IV is the longest of the set and was revised most extensively in 1928. Because this movement makes the most extensive and consistent use of the available wind and percussion instruments of the 1909 version, a great many of the changes compensate for the reduced orchestration. The 1928 version is actually one measure shorter, one result of a rethinking of the initial nineteen- (1909), or eighteen-measure (1928) episode.

The effects of the reduced wind section are felt immediately in the initial set of three chords in mm. 9–10 (=8–9). In 1909, these are each represented by a

The image displays two musical staves, labeled 1928 and 1909, with measures numbered 1 through 18 for the top staff and 1 through 19 for the bottom staff. The top staff (1928) shows measures 1-5 and 14-18, with a vertical line separating the two groups. The bottom staff (1909) shows measures 15-19. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and beams, with some measures containing multiple notes. A bracket connects the first measure of the 1928 staff to the first measure of the 1909 staff, indicating a comparison or relationship between the two versions.

**Example 3:** Movement IV, mm. 1–5, 14–18 (1909); mm. 15–19 (1928).

single tone colour: four flutes, six horns (=five different pitches) and the first chord repeated by four trumpets. The first chord is mixed among flutes and clarinets in 1928, and in the second, the middle tone of the chord (A $\flat$ ) is sacrificed so that the chord could still be played unmixed by the four horns. (The first chord is a rare example of an unmixed tone colour in 1909 which is replaced by a mixed one in 1928.)

It was, however, the elimination of two of the three timpani in 1928 that prompted the most far-reaching revision of this opening passage. The measure in which they enter, playing a soft sustained chord F $\sharp$ , D, F, (*mit Dämpfung*) is the one eliminated in 1928 (“between” mm. 7 and 8 of the revised score. The pitches which they play, echoed in 1909 by bass clarinets and clarinet (m. 12), are taken over by bassoons and bass clarinet in 1928 already in m. 10, in a rhythm which is a compromise between that of the winds and of the corresponding timpani part in m. 11 of 1909. There are likewise a number of seemingly minor changes in the rhythms played by the tam-tam and low bells. One result of these changes is an approximate retrograde in the outer four and one-half measures of the passage. This is a very trivial kind of rhythmic retrograde, and is exact only in the bell part. While there is a general similarity between the beginning and the end of the passage in 1909, as contrasted with the uniformity of the middle part, there is no hint of a palindrome. That Webern should have tinkered with this passage to produce such a result in the year of the *Symphonie*, op. 21 is surely significant. That he did so only in 1928, and not in 1909 should be a caution to those enthusiasts who wish to find hints of the serial manner in the early works. Example 3 shows the literal mirror of bell part in 1928 (reading forward from 1–5 and backwards from 18–14), the approximate mirror when both parts are considered, and the absence of such a scheme in 1909.

The diagram illustrates the musical notation for Movement IV, comparing the 1909 and 1928 versions. The 1909 version (top) shows measures 26-41, with sections 'End of B', 'Coda of B', and 'C'. The 1928 version (bottom) shows measures 25-40, with sections 'End of B', 'Coda of B', and 'Link to C'. Both versions show a timpani part (T-t) and a guitar part (Gl). The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and beams, indicating the rhythmic structure of the piece.

**Example 4:** Movement IV, mm. 26–41 (1909); mm. 25–40 (1928).

The section which follows (mm. 19–26 in 1909, mm. 20–27 in 1928) is largely unchanged except for the substitution of clarinet for alto flute. The tam-tam/bell duet returns before the end of the section (mm. 25–26 in 1909, mm. 26–27 in 1928), and continues to the end of the piece. Here, too, some minor changes have been made. The arch shape of the first section is not the intent of either version here, but the internal articulation is altered in the revision. Both begin more or less the same way, building again to a uniform rhythm. When the section articulated by the trombone chords and bass drum ends (m. 30), 1909 reaches this uniform rhythm (m. 30/3) and continues to the end. In the revision, this rhythm is already reached in the middle of m. 27 (=28 in 1909). In the three measures from 29–31, the rhythm is reversed in the tam-tam part, and is restored from m. 32 to the end. This clarifies the end of the “B” section (at m. 26), the coda to that section (mm. 27–8), the linking passage to the “C” section (mm. 29–31), and the “C” section itself (mm. 32–40). This is not accomplished as clearly, or as subtly, in 1909, and though the results of the 1928 revision are all but inaudible, it was evidently important enough that the composer took some pains over the revision (see example 4).

The revision of the timpani part influenced the concept and sound of the whole piece, not just that of the initial episode. The timpani play a thematic role in 1909, both at the beginning of the piece and from m. 33 to the end, but they are reserved for the last four measures in the revision, with one minor exception. It is evident that Webern wanted to eliminate the timpani entirely prior to the four climactic measures, and he tried to compensate in each case for the missing pitch. For

instance, the F played at the end of m. 35 in 1909 is replaced in 1928 by the horns, which enter with that pitch at the end of m. 34. The C played off the third beat of m. 36 is accommodated in 1928 by rewriting the second trombone part in m. 35. In m. 32, however, there is no convenient way to replace the timpani's F (1909, m. 33). It would have been incongruous to add horns to complete this chord, as was done two measures later, so he was left with the choice of introducing the timpani "prematurely," or leaving this note out of the chord. When we recall that he chose the latter solution in mm. 8–9 (horns), we must ask why he did not do the same thing here. The answer seems to be that, while the chord in mm. 8–9 occurs only there, this six-note chord occurs three times in mm. 33–36 (32–35 in 1928), and that its identity evidently outweighed the composer's wish to save the timpani's entrance.

The *ritardando* which begins three measures before the end is delayed by a measure and a half in 1928, and in both versions the last two measures have *Tempo 1* and *crescendo*. The cymbal roll begins in the middle of the third measure before the end in 1909, and, in 1928, in the penultimate measure, in rhythmic unison with the snare drum and the remaining timpani. The repeated chord of the third measure before the end is redistributed somewhat to compensate for the loss of two horns, two trumpets and two timpani, and the rhythm of the latter is changed. The timpani plays in rhythmic unison with the winds in 1928, but it is ever so slightly independent in 1909. Whereas the sound of the three timpani dominate the last two measures in 1909, in 1928 the single remaining drum is virtually swallowed up by the unpitched instruments which enter simultaneously with it in the penultimate measure.

Movement V is marked *Sehr langsam* in both versions, but the eighth-beat of 1909 is replaced by a quarter-beat in 1928, which likewise bears a metronome marking. There is no *ritardando* at m. 7 in 1909, and the next two measures are *Etwas fliessender* rather than *tempo*. The *ritardando* from mm. 9/2–10 begins only in m. 10 in 1928. *Wieder sehr langsam* is restored at m. 11 in 1909, and the *ritardando* in m. 12 and that in m. 14 are missing in the earlier version. Whether by accident or design, the composer has produced a slower tempo at the change from 3/4 to 6/8 in 1909. 1928 has ♩. = ♩ and *tempo*, whereas 1909 has ♩ = ♩, which produces a slower tempo at the level of quarter note/dotted quarter note. This is "corrected" in 1928 by a metric proportion which makes the larger beat the same. Both maintain the same tempo for the chosen integer valor, but the 1909 version is actually slightly slower. The double bar between mm. 16–17 in 1909 is articulated by a *ritardando/tempo* pairing in 1928, as is the new episode which begins in m. 19. Another *ritardando* beginning at the middle of m. 20 in 1928 leads to *noch langsamer* (♩ = ca. 60) in 1928. The final ritard in 1928 begins a measure later in 1928. Each version slows down in stages, but in 1909 there are

essentially only two such stages, each of which ends with a *ritardando*. 1928 is more complex, with *ritardando* marked at no fewer than eight subsections. In other words, the revision reflects an agitation with gradually calms toward the resignation of the last movement, whereas 1909 is more mechanical, less psychologically “realistic.”

This is the only piece which uses all six trombones in 1909, and the rescoring of their four chords is the least of the orchestrational changes made in 1928. The replacement of the sixth trombone by tuba and, especially, the second and fourth by two horns in mm. 2–3 and 6–8 produced another change of scoring in 1928. The woodwinds-plus-horns accompaniment of the first trombone’s second phrase in m. 4 has been recast for woodwinds alone in 1928. Webern evidently wished to make these chords completely different in colour from the trombone chords in mm. 2–3. The bass drum roll of m. 8 in 1909 is moved back to mm. 6–7 in 1928, where it is in rhythmic unison with the second set of trombone chords, just as the cymbal roll in the previous measure had accompanied the low string chords. This is a final echo of the trombone/bass drum colour of movement IV (mm. 19ff) and, possibly, of a similar moment, though without trombones, in movement III, m. 4. As yet another echo of movement IV in this “remembrance” movement, Webern adds a single timpani rolling a low G beginning at *noch langsamer* in m. 21 and continuing to the end. This “echo” is made more unmistakable by the fact that only there and in the final measures of movement IV does the timpani play a roll.

Measure 11 has been completely reheard. The harmonic high E in the cellos becomes a solo cello *modo ordinario* accompanied by a stroke in unison on the celesta. The flute’s F remains, but the unison note in the harp has been changed to a harmonic. The total effect of these changes is to make the two notes more nearly equal in weight, better reflecting their nearly equal melodic status. In 1909, the cello note seems more like part of the background, and the progression E, F, F# (horn, m. 12) is not as clear. The celesta E at the end of m. 12 is present in both versions, but in 1909 it has to compete with two low notes in the harp. The 1928 version eliminates these harp notes, leaving the celesta to mark the beginning and end of this brief, but quite special moment.

The decision to cut off the cellos and contrabasses at the end of m. 12 rather than letting them, and the D/F in the harp, carry over into m. 13 creates a cleaner break between sections in 1928. In the episode from mm. 13–16, the English horn had to be replaced by oboe, and the part given to the flute alone in mm. 15–16 is divided between flute and horn in 1928. This latter change seems whimsical and inconsequential, but its effect is that this exchange reproduces that between these two instruments in mm. 11–12, while reversing the elements of that exchange. In other words, the single note in the flute followed by the horn’s three-

The image displays a musical score for Example 5, Movement V, comparing two versions of measures 11-12 and 15-16. The score is organized into two systems, labeled 1909 and 1928. System 1909 features parts for Flute, Horn, Harp, Violoncello, Celeste, and Contrabass. System 1928 features parts for Flute, Horn, Harp, Violoncello (solo), Celeste, Viola, and Violoncello/Contrabass. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings.

**Example 5:** Movement V, mm. 11–12 and 15–16.

note melody in mm. 11–12 becomes an almost identical four-note flute melody, followed by the single horn note in mm. 15–16 (example 5). Measure 15 is further cleaned up by eliminating both the horn and harp parts in favour of a monochrome chord on violas and cellos.

The new episode beginning at m. 17 has been changed in several ways. First, the winds have been eliminated from the chord which begins with a low C in the contrabass. Secondly, the harp's second, and more explicit anticipation of the ostinato D/F, which begins in earnest in m. 19, has been eliminated. Webern evidently wished to emphasize some long-range connection with this motive in 1909, but abandoned it in favour of greater clarity and transparency in 1928.<sup>15</sup>

15 Although it was first performed in 1911, it is impossible to miss the resemblance of this passage to the *Abschied* movement of Mahler's *Das Lied von der Erde*, especially as it fits the "program" of Webern's work so very well. Could it be that the composer changed his original 1909 concept sometime between 1911 and the first performance of "opus 4" in 1913, and that 1928 represents a return to the concept of 1909? The D–F ostinato can also be heard as a reminiscence of Schoenberg's op. 11, no. 2, completed six months before the composition of Webern's *Six Pieces*, which bears an "official" dedication to Schoenberg. Webern evidently admired op. 11, no. 2, and chose it to "dedicate" the piano which he bought in Berlin in 1911 (Moldenhauer, *Anton Webern*, 150).

The final change in this episode is the replacement of the trombone at the end of m. 18 with tuba, probably a practical consideration to ensure clean articulation of discrete pitches rather than the almost inevitable too-expressive glissando which the trombone would produce, especially if played *äusserst gebunden* as marked in 1909.

Clarity, transparency and consistency of tone colour dictated revisions to mm. 19–21. The chord which initiates this episode is given to celesta and triangle alone in 1928, rather than the more complex, but less incisive and unified sound of these together with harp and *col legno* strings, *weich gezogen*. The metallic sound established by triangle and celesta is continued by eliminating the trumpet part which doubled the Glockenspiel on the ensuing melody in mm. 19–21 in 1909. The accompanying ostinato is reduced to harp, celesta and two trumpets, muted in 1928, eliminating the doubling trumpet and cello parts of 1909. The latter underlines the D–F motive even more strongly in the earlier version by presenting it in augmentation.

The final episode (mm. 21–26) returns to the idea of m. 17: a sustained chord anticipated by a pedal note. This note is played by contrabassoon, horn and contrabasses in 1909, but alternates between contrabass (m. 17) and contrabassoon (m. 21) in 1928, a change which again promotes the more distinctive tone colours of the revision as opposed to the mixed tone colours favoured in 1909. The solo violin part of mm. 21*ff* recalls that given to the whole violin 1 section in mm. 17–18, but in 1909 it is doubled by celesta, evidently to establish a clear connection to the sound of the previous episode. In 1928, contrast is the aim: the metallic, sharp-edged sound of mm. 19–21 is succeeded by the lush, richer sound of mm. 21*ff*. The low G in the harp, horn and bass clarinet is replaced in 1928 by a single timpani roll for reasons already discussed. The melodic “action” of the piece ends in m. 24, where the violin comes to rest on A, and the trumpet re-introduces the C which had been the resting place of the trombone melody in mm. 1–8. the re-articulations of both the high A (celesta, m. 25) and the low B-flat (solo contrabass, contrabassoon, harp, m. 25) are both eliminated, so that the *ritardando* which begins in m. 25 of 1928 is “marked” only by the trumpet’s reiteration of the C (mm. 25 and 26) and of the accompanying trombone chord (m. 25).

As in movement IV, the revision of the final movement eliminated a whole measure. The reasons for the change are not as complex in this case and are unrelated to the reduced orchestral resources available in 1928. The measure eliminated is m. 3, a change which curtails the harp part and shortens the trilled string chord by one measure. The string chord, though muted in both versions, is nevertheless substantially altered in 1928. It is, first of all, a rare instance of *sul ponticello* in 1928 which was not specified in 1909. Secondly, Webern’s



original concept of four solo cellos trilling minor thirds, arranged symmetrically around a central perfect fourth, is destroyed by transposing the next lowest note up an octave in 1928. In 1909, the English horn melody, the cello chord and the harp all occupied discrete ranges, a concept which is compromised by the upward transposition into the range of the English horn/oboe of the second cello's C#. This change, together with the rescoring of the chord for the full violin, viola and cello sections, renders the overall sound more homogeneous, and further clarifies the roles of melody, countermelody and accompaniment. One further change in this brief episode is that the third note of the English horn melody is changed from B to B $\flat$  on the oboe in the revision. As both pitches are present in the (trilled!) string chords, no help may be sought there. The revision does reflect the composer's mature "second thought", and the major/minor third figure of the second beat seems more characteristic of this phase of the composer's stylistic development. As well, the 1909 version produces a complete descending augmented triad (E $\flat$ , B, G), a *fin de siècle* cliché which Webern and others were just outgrowing in 1909, and which does not occur elsewhere in opus 6.

Some characteristic tempo changes are made in 1928 as well. Atypically, *ritardandos* begin earlier and last longer in 1928, but 1909 becomes progressively slower in its basic tempo. Thus the tempo at m. 6 in 1909 is *etwas ruhiger*, and, following a phrase-ending *ritardando*, the music is *noch ruhiger* in m. 10. A three-measure *ritardando* leads to *langsam* in m. 19, and this remains in force until a general *ritardando* in the final three measures. 1928 always returns to *tempo* at the corresponding places (mm. 5, 10, 18), but the *ritardandos* which precede them are longer. There is likewise one disagreement about where an episode begins. The new *noch ruhiger* tempo at m. 10 in 1909 is one and one-half-measures earlier than the corresponding place in m. 10 of 1928. The latter sets the beginning of the new episode at the onset of the triplet chords in horns and clarinets, with the first clarinet melody overlapping and joining the two episodes. The original phrasing equated the beginning of the episode with the clarinet music in m. 10, and the end of the previous episode in trumpet and strings is the "overlap." It is difficult to choose between these two interpretations, though allowing the *ritardando* to continue through m. 10 in 1928 merely prolongs slightly the first note of the clarinet's melody, and the *a tempo* seems to make more sense when associated with the new idea represented by the triplet chords.

Some further alterations to the "prosody" of the initial episode are noteworthy. In m. 6 of 1909 the solo viola/bassoon duet begins *pianissimo*, swelling to *piano* in the next measure. In 1928, both instruments begin *forte*, and are *piano* in the next measure without a *decrescendo*. The episode which begins at m. 6 (1909, m. 7) is a disguised reprise of the first measure, in which the viola varies the

oboe's phrase, and the C#/D in the bassoon takes up the trilled C#/D of the first violins. In 1909, this reprise is even more carefully hidden by connecting it more closely to the previous measure. The low G in the bass clarinet sets in a sixteenth-note before the barline in 1909, creating yet another element of continuity between these two measures. As well, the connection of the bassoon's C#/D to the cello's trilled C#/D an octave lower is less obvious. The chromatic progression from bassoon (C#/D) to horn (D#/E) to trumpet (E♭/E/F) is then taken up by the clarinet (E♭/F) an octave higher in mm. 9–10 (=1909, mm. 10–11). This takes up the final note of the viola solo from m. 8, and a static version of the oboe melody from m. 1. The outcome of the revision (example 6) is to isolate m. 5/6, which can be heard neither as a continuation of mm. 1–4 or as an upbeat to the episode which begins at m. 6. (The example eliminates the string parts of mm. 9–11/8–10.)

The episode which begins in m. 10 (=11) is again altered in sound, and in this case an obvious connection to the first episode is obscured. Not only is the triplet chord which accompanies the clarinet melody now staccato rather than legato, but the harp has been eliminated, its part being taken by the fourth horn in the revision. The music is an obvious repetition and continuation, an octave higher, of the harp music in mm. 1–5. In 1909, the harp plays almost continuously, being absent only from mm. 6–10. In 1928, it plays only at the beginning and the end. It is the only instrument which is present in both the initial and final episodes, and thus is an element of return and closure, even more obviously reinforced by the low E which is prominent in both places. Perhaps the elimination of one measure of harp solo in m. 3 or 4 is simply one more symptom of the harp's reduced, but more clearly focused, role in the piece.

Some changes in the final episode are likewise noteworthy. The violin/trumpet exchange recalls that of mm. 8–10 (=9–11), and this connection is reinforced by the rescoring of the accompanying chord for solo strings alone, as in mm. 9–10 of 1928. The flutes which are part of this chord in 1909 had not been heard previously in this movement, and are eliminated in favour of the more homogeneous and formally significant sound of the strings. The violin's melody is likewise another reminiscence of the oboe/English horn melody of mm. 1/ff, and the E/F in the trumpet echoes the harp part of the initial episode. The celesta takes over the notes of the second harp in 1928, and also switches to the lower octave a beat sooner, strengthening the cadential effect of the octave leap by making it correspond to a strong beat. Something like the same effect is accomplished in 1909 by introducing the second harp into the celesta chord on the last eighth note of m. 23. If Webern's performance directions are followed faithfully, the ending will be less incisive in 1928, as the *ritardando* must be continuous throughout the final episode (from m. 19). In 1909, the final three measures are set apart by a cadential *ritardando*, a very different effect. Whereas

Example 6: Movement VI, mm. 6–11 (1909); mm. 5–10 (1928).

Webern favoured somewhat more incisive and sharp-edged ending for other movements in the revision, especially the even numbered ones, he evidently wished to treat the final piece differently. To make the special placement of this piece even clearer, Webern includes the deep bells as a final reminiscence of the funeral march, here *pianissimo* and *kaum hörbar* (1909)/*vernehmbar* (1928).

\* \* \*

Webern's decision to revise his *Six Pieces* was not a response to a direct commission from his publisher, or because of the immediate prospect of a performance, but seems to have been the result of a purely musical stimulus. Perhaps that stimulus was the completion of the *Symphony*, op. 21, which was delivered to Universal Edition together with it in September of 1928.<sup>16</sup> It is also a manifestation of a typically Viennese preoccupation with *Bandeln*, which Theodore Adorno characterized as follows in a 1960 radio talk on *Wien*:

What is meant is any activity which passes the time, wastes time ... but it also requires an endearing mania for detail. ... The insatiable, and loving care which the Viennese school devoted to the polishing of their musical scores, as if they were finishing and polishing furniture, is the most endearing heritage of the 'Bandler'.<sup>17</sup>

16 Moldenhauer, *Anton Webern*, 128.

17 "Gemeint sind Beschäftigungen, mit denen man seine Zeit hinbringt, sie verplempert ... es bedarf aber auch der liebevollen Manie für kleine Dinge ... Die unersättliche, liebevolle Sorge der Wiener Schule ums Ausfeilen der Notentexte, als gälte es, Möbel zu polieren, zu reinigen, zu glätten, ist die zarteste Erbschaft des Bandelns." Theodore W. Adorno, "Wien," *Musikalische Schriften I–III, Gesammelte Schriften Bd.16* (Frankfurt-am-Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1978), 441–42.

Surely Webern is the composer for whom the term is the most appropriate, and the two versions of the *Six Pieces for Orchestra* the best demonstration of the *Bandler* at work. It would, however, be wrong to dismiss the revisions as nothing more than polish applied to the surface of the music, especially if we take seriously the role of orchestration as an independent compositional variant in his music. Webern's own judgement that the revision looked like an "old Haydn score"<sup>18</sup> is perhaps the key to understanding what he thought he had accomplished. He evidently wished to associate himself more closely with the classical Viennese tradition in 1928, and the virtually simultaneous completion of this score and the *Symphony*, op. 21 are equally striking indications of this classicizing trend. The economy and restraint aimed for in the revision is certainly part of what "classical" would have meant to the composer, but the refinement and integrity implied by the comparison to Haydn are equally so. This *Bandeln*, then, is both a quaint reminder of a "nicht voll industrialisierte Produktionsweise,"<sup>19</sup> and a striking manifestation of a musical thinking which is anti-romantic, or anti-*Secessionist*, in a way that both reflects the neo-classical style of the 1920s and points to the more objective, almost scientific attitude to musical composition that characterizes all of the works from op. 21 onward.

### Abstract

There are two published versions of Anton Webern's *Six Pieces for Orchestra*, though the composer considered the 1928 revision to be the only valid one. The 1909 version was first performed in 1913, but in spite of at least two projected performances, the composer may never have heard the revision. Although the revision was not carried out for a specific performance, the ostensible motivation for it was to reduce the rather excessive orchestral demands of the first version, and thus make it more practical for performance. While many of the revisions do result from the reduced orchestration, there are many changes in dynamics, tempo, phrasing and instrumental emphasis which do not. In fact, the new score is a thorough rehearing of the pieces, and the revisions affect everything from their overall formal conception to often very subtle relationships among the elements of the individual movements. The revisions also reflect the changes both in Webern's personal style between 1909 and 1928, the year of the *Symphonie*, op. 21, but also the global change from the luxuriant and indulgent post-romantic style to the "lean, athletic" style of Neoclassicism.

18 Moldenhauer, *Anton Webern*, 128.

19 Adorno, "Wien," 441.