The Unknown Bruckner

This issue, following a very successful Bruckner Journal Readers’ Conference at Hertford College, Oxford, in April, continues to focus in part on the Fifth Symphony. Raymond Cox notes that the Fifth is being talked of and played more often than has previously been the case, and that perhaps it is a symphony especially suited to our times. The Sixth has often been referred to as the Cinderella of the symphonies, but it now receives fairly frequent performances. And there are even occasional performances of the First and Second to be heard. The choral works fare less well, only the Te Deum, a few of the motets and the Mass No. 2 being performed at all frequently. But when we consider the large number of smaller vocal works, for solo voice, mixed choir and male voice choir that Bruckner wrote, they are in most cases not to be heard at all in live performance, and in many cases not even available as a recorded performance. One searches hopefully through Hans Roelofs’ excellent vocal music discography, www.brucknerdiskografie.nl, but often as not the song with the interesting title you light upon turns out not to have been recorded. The accepted view is that they are not performed for ‘good’ reason, that, even though penned by a great composer, they are really not very good - but the ‘accepted view’ is often enough the blindness of received prejudice. So it is encouraging to discover in the concert-listings that Thomas Kerbl and his associated performers are giving a concert in Linz entitled ‘Bruckner - Vocal Works III’, (a sequel to the two previously recorded performances of male voice choir works, and choral and piano works on the Linz Brucknerhaus LIVA label). The list of works they are performing on 21st September (see listings page 41) suggests that a new recording is not far off through which we can acquaint ourselves with a good number of these ‘lesser works’ - and then judge for ourselves! For which opportunity we owe Thomas Kerbl and colleagues a debt of gratitude.

kw
Report on the Seventh Biennial Bruckner Journal Readers’ Conference

THE SEVENTH Bruckner Journal Readers’ Conference was held at Hertford College, Oxford on 15 to 16 April 2011. It was attended by about 40 people which is a record. The papers were presented in the Old Hall; refreshments served in the Old Library.

The Conference was opened by Ken Ward at 7 pm on Friday 15 April. After welcoming the participants, he introduced Raymond Cox who had undertaken to film the whole conference. Ken then introduced the first speaker, Malcolm Hatfield, who brought his expertise as a professional psychologist to his paper “Bruckner’s Personality: a non-pathological study”. Malcolm used the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and concluded that there was no evidence that Bruckner had a pathological condition. This was refreshing and thought-provoking in view of much earlier work that had at least drawn attention to Bruckner’s eccentricities. Malcolm also mentioned Stephen Johnson’s book “Bruckner Remembered” which was relevant to the next item in which Ken Ward displayed most of the English language books on Bruckner by Redlich, Doernberg (1960), Schönzele (1970), Watson (1975), Simpson (1967, rev. 1992), Howie (2 volumes: a documentary biography) and Horton. This was the prelude to Ken’s conversation with Dermot Gault about Dermot’s recent book “The New Bruckner”. Ken asked Dr Gault why his book was entitled “The New Bruckner”. The author replied that we now know more about Bruckner and his music as a result of the publication of virtually all versions of his works and the availability of recordings of most of them. Dr Gault sought a view of Bruckner that modified the one established by his friends and pupils as well as Haas, Cooke and Simpson and presented Bruckner as a far more confident, independent and decisive creative personality than alleged by others. Ken read out Dermot’s vivid description of part of Bruckner’s first Scherzo for the Fourth Symphony (of which a recording was played) and highly recommended Dr Gault’s book. This concluded this interesting and enjoyable preliminary evening.

Ken Ward opened the proceedings for Saturday 16 April at 9:45 am, noting greetings and best wishes sent to the conference from Ebbe Tørring and John Berky, and introducing Dr Paul Coones, who welcomed us all to the College and spoke about “Bruckner at Hertford College”. Dr Coones handed out a sheet containing a map of all of the exotic locations where the College choir had sung Bruckner’s motet “Locus iste”. On the reverse of this sheet was a helpful map of recommended eating places in Oxford. A second handout contained the first page of the score of the motet and one page from the Trio of Bruckner’s Eighth Symphony which is to be performed by the Hertford Bruckner Orchestra under Dr Coones on Saturday 3 March 2012.

Dr Crawford Howie then proceeded to chair the rest of the morning session and introduced Dr Andrea Harrandt, who inter alia has jointly edited the recently published volumes of Bruckner’s letters and is helping with the preparation of a new Bruckner lexicon. She talked about “Bruckner’s Vienna in the 1870s and 1880s – a Biographical and Historical Background”. This was a very interesting talk in which we learned a great deal about not only Bruckner’s activities but also other cultural activities and musical personalities, including Wagner, Meyerbeer, Liszt, Verdi and Brahms. It was surprising to learn that Brahms’s first two symphonies were not acclaimed at their first performances but that fact makes the incomprehension of most of Bruckner’s symphonies at their Viennese premieres more understandable.

The third speaker was Prof. Benjamin Korstvedt who talked about “Defining the ‘Problem’: the post-war reception of Bruckner editions in the English-speaking world”. Benjamin handed out an interesting sheet to support his talk which explored issues of race between the ‘original versions’ and views of Bruckner and editions that were published in the mid-twentieth century, most notably Gramophone reviews by Deryck Cooke. Ben’s talk generated a great deal of interest and questions. This was followed by the first break for coffee or tea.

After the break, Professor Brian Newbould spoke about “Chorale as Texture in Symphonic Music”. The term “chorale-like” was very clearly explained with numerous recorded examples including some piano and chamber music as well as orchestral music. This was rather like a musical quiz since many of the musical extracts were not identified before they were played. We heard four examples each of Bruckner and Brahms and one each of Mozart, Chopin, Saint-Saëns, Mendelssohn, Schumann, Liszt and Bartok. This was both stimulating and of wide musical interest.

The fifth speaker, Dr Frederick Stocken, spoke on the topic “Is Sechter ‘echter’? Considering Simon Sechter’s Fundamental-Bass Theory for analyzing Bruckner’s Music”. Frederick supported his talk with an admirable handout containing 9 contrapuntal exercises by Bruckner, an extract from the second movement of his Fifth Symphony, a Fundamental-bass analysis of one verse of his motet “Vexilla Regis” and an examination of the enharmonic pivot using an augmented sixth chord in bars 26-27 of the motet. (The talk concluded with a Sechterian analytical summary of the motet).

Before lunch, there was a brief, unscheduled announcement by Professor William Carragan, speaking as a representative of the recently reactivated Bruckner Society of America. He conferred the Kilenyi ‘Medal of Honor’ on Ken Ward, Editor of The Bruckner Journal, and invited those who wished to inspect the medal to ask this latest recipient. This award was greeted with unanimous, enthusiastic applause and the overwhelmed recipient was almost lost for words. This was followed by the scheduled break for lunch.

After lunch, the afternoon session was chaired by Raymond Cox. William Carragan was the first speaker. Although his talk was scheduled as “The Finale of the Fifth – An Analysis and Tempo-Study”, William tried to cover the entire symphony. He treated us not only to an excellent presentation but also gave an admirable handout containing pages on the themes of all four movements, the First movement chorale, the Scherzo, the Finale and a colourful analysis of the Final fugue. Finally, two pages were devoted to “Bruckner’s Hymnal” (containing parts of the First Symphony’s
finale, the Third’s first movement (1873), adagio (transposed up a fifth) and finale (1873 and 1889), the Fourth’s Andante quasi allegretto (“Gebet”, bars 30-7 and 54-9), the Fifth (first movement and finale) and the Ninth (adagio “cross” motive and “Abschied vom Leben”, bars 76-83 and finale) plus Eighth mode intonation, Schumann’s Genoveva, act 1; Wagner’s Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg, act 1 and Die Walküre, act 3). Finally, Professor Carragan offered copies of his transcription of the Fifth Symphony for two pianos to the first four participants who would give him £10. The chairman suggested an early tea break to give the next speaker more time to overcome a technical problem.

After this break, Prof. Julian Horton gave an excellent presentation on “Counterpoint and Form in the Finale of the Fifth Symphony”. It was interesting to learn that Bruckner’s Finale was the first since that of Mozart’s “Jupiter” symphony to conflate Sonata and Fugue and also that Bruckner never tired of urging students to study Mozart’s work. Julian showed how a portion of Bruckner’s double fugue was built up. Finally, Julian stated that Bruckner’s Fifth and Brahms’s First can be seen as two solutions for the nineteenth century symphony in the light of Wagner’s Gesamtkunstwerk.

Prof. Paul Hawkshaw’s presentation on “Bruckner’s Use of Sonata-Form Terminology in the Sketches for the Finale of the Eighth Symphony” followed the previous talk immediately. Paul supported his talk with a very interesting handout consisting of Bruckner’s Autograph sketches for the Finale of his 8th symphony, his copy of of the *Cum Sancto Spiritu* of Josef Eybler’s Messe Sankt Leopold plus Sonata Form Terminology from Kitzler-Studienbuch applied to the Finale of the Eighth Symphony and Bruckner’s own terminology in sketches for the Eighth. On the basis of his work with these sources, Paul examined how Bruckner’s early training at St Florian and with Kitzler provided some of the structures and compositional techniques he was to continue using throughout his career. It was also interesting to learn that Bruckner sometimes consulted other classical models such as Mozart’s Requiem, Beethoven’s “Eroica” and Cherubini’s Mass in C.

The chairman decided that there was time for a short break before the final paper. Prof. Eric Lai’s talk was entitled “Toward a Theory of Coherence: Compositional use of the Turn in Bruckner’s Symphonies”. The speaker supported his talk with an excellent handout which covered Bruckner’s use of several compositional ingredients including the turn. This was an interesting conclusion to the presentation of so many fine papers in this conference.

AFTER a sufficient break for dinner, the finale of the conference was provided by a stunning performance of William Carragan’s transcription of Bruckner’s Fifth Symphony for two pianos, performed by Dr Crawford Howie and Professor Carragan in the atmospheric surroundings of Hertford College Chapel. For me, this performance was the highlight of the conference as well as an ideal conclusion since two papers were entirely concerned with the Fifth Symphony and it was mentioned in several of the other papers. As if the performance of this demanding work were not enough, we were treated to a repeat of the Coda of the Finale as an encore.

Congratulations to everyone involved in the organisation and presentation of this Seventh Bruckner Journal Readers’ Conference, particularly the two performers. The Conference achieved a very impressive level for the next conference to aim for.

*Alan Freestone*
Concert Reviews

SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA SYDNEY OPERA HOUSE 7 AUGUST 2010

Wagner - Lohengrin, Prelude to Act 3
Szymanowski - Violin Concerto (Baiba Skride vn)
Bruckner - Symphony No.7

Sydney Symphony Orchestra / Simone Young

THE CONCERT began with the prelude to Act III from Wagner’s *Lohengrin*, whose title role is the original knight in shining armour. Simone Young conducted it with sweep and energy: it served to open the eyes of the audience to wonder at what was to come. Baiba Skride, a violinist born in Riga and now resident in the UK, gave a flawless performance of Szymanowski’s first violin concerto, with double stopping to die for and a sound so powerful that it carried effortlessly over the huge orchestra demanded by the composer.

After the interval Simone Young came in and waited for silence to begin Bruckner’s *7th Symphony*. Her charisma was so luminous that she almost succeeded, even with Sydney’s audience – the air was electric. But then one of the cellists needed to adjust her instrument, and someone, inevitably, coughed…out of which the music, coming like Beethoven’s *9th* out of nowhere, began. She took the opening so expansively that I thought we’d be still sitting there (perfectly happily) at midnight. But I soon realised that she was performing this work like Barenboim conducts Wagner – with enormous and almost constant variation of tempo. In performances of Bruckner this is much more surprising than with Wagner who as a conductor took tempo flexibility to new extremes, whereas Bruckner’s music is often deemed to rely on steady tempos to allow its enormous architecture to work. I found Young’s approach irresistibly compelling. From the very beginning she shaped the music with a sense of line so intense that at no time were those moments, so frequent in Bruckner, where a long cadential passage signals perhaps too clearly the end of a section, allowed to interrupt the flow.

And what sounds she got from this orchestra! The SSO is a wonderful orchestra, but does not always sound like the Vienna Philharmonic as it did last night. The strings, especially when they played alone, were vibrant to the point of ecstasy. The brass were strong without being overbearing. And the Wagner tubas in the slow movement – has anyone any idea how hard it is to play those instruments? But they played with perfect blend, and produced a sound somehow infinitely more sorrowful than even horns might manage. And when this majestic elegy for Wagner closed, and the Wagner tubas played together with the horns, the chording was sublime.

The scherzo produced some surprises. I’d never thought to connect the Vienna of Bruckner with that of Lehar, but Young conducted the dance-like bits of the scherzo just like that. And that alternated with slightly demonic passages where she seemed to be like an Alberich feverishly exhorting his Nibelungs to forge gold. In the finale she refused to allow any sense of longeur – whenever the brass seemed to hold the tempo back the strings would pick up the tempo, ever more impatiently, pressing on to the coda with unstoppable energy.

Simone Young is one of the few really great conductors I have ever heard live. And, pace the late Charles Mackerras, and even Stuart Challender, I will go so far as to say that she is the greatest conductor Australia has yet produced. Antony Walker is on the horizon – may we treat him well.

Nicholas Routley
Having performed the Eighth Symphony with the ASO six years ago and with the BBC Scottish Symphony Orchestra in the UK more recently, Runnicles revealed himself as one who has an intimate knowledge of the work. He knew exactly what he wanted, and was able to communicate that clearly to the ensemble. The musicians were dedicated and focused in their playing; the strings were rich and resonant, and the woodwinds were balanced and accurate in intonation. The star of the evening, however, was the brass section, which, from the beginning to the end, showcased its ensemble spirit as well as soloistic virtuosity. The timbral variety, rhythmic precision, and sense of depth that emanated from these players attest to their high level of musicianship and technical ability. I was especially impressed by the group’s dynamic range—just when I thought it had reached its limit (loud or soft), I would later be surprised and proved wrong. In fact, not until the Coda of the Finale did I realize the full potential of the ASO brass. To some extent, this outcome was due to the unusual seating arrangement for the section, which spread evenly across the stage from one side to the other, allowing the sounds to blend more evenly and naturally within an extended space. Sitting in one of the best areas of the hall, I was able to savor not only the richness and power of the brass, but also the subtleties of instrumental color and orchestral texture that the entire ensemble provided.

Having heard many different recordings of the Eighth Symphony, I could not resist comparing this live performance (which was my first) with what I was already familiar with. With Furtwängler’s romantic style of extreme tempo fluctuations on one end and Celibidache’s monumental, meditative approach on the other end of the spectrum, Runnicles’ tempo seems to fall within the middle, moderate range, producing a very “secure” performance whereby the music flowed steadily but uneventfully. My praise of the performance in the previous paragraph notwithstanding, it is precisely this overkill of tempo inactivity that I consider a major flaw in Runnicles’ reading. It is particularly evident in the Steigerung passages. Although each passage was meticulously prepared to generate a seamless crescendo within an extended time span, there was not enough acceleration to support the drive to the climax. This is especially true of mm. 211-226 of the Adagio, where the constant repetition of the turn figure that first appears in m. 215 demands a gradual increase of not only dynamics (as indicated by the poco a poco cresc. in m. 219) but also tempo. This did not happen in the performance. The section sounded stagnant - the sense of progression, expectation, and arrival one expects from this kind of passages was thwarted by a lack of momentum. Moreover, most of them were handled with a one-size-fits-all manner. As a result, after hearing these intensifications several times, the excitement died off as the treatment of the music became so predictable. It is my opinion that each Steigerung should be approached differently according to its musical and formal role. Treating them alike does not do justice to the organic potential of the music.

In spite of this weakness, there were some sections that were done beautifully under Runnicles’ leadership. They include the “Annunciation of Death” of the opening movement, the idyllic Trio of the second movement, the brief but nostalgic final appearance of the B theme toward the end of the Adagio, and the peroration at the conclusion of the Symphony. In particular, Runnicles’ ability to create one overarching climax for each movement is to be commended. In addition, the third movement, despite my comment in the previous paragraph, stood out as my favorite. Here, I could hear the maestro relishing every note that came out of the orchestra, combining and shaping them into a living stream of sonic presence. In fact, Runnicles has called this movement “a personal utterance” and recognizes its spiritual quality: “There’s a glimpse of the other side in this music, a portal. One is left with a glimpse of something that doesn’t quite exist in this world, then the portal closes.” To me, the Adagio is the spiritual and emotional climax of the entire symphony, and I am thankful that I had the opportunity to encounter a live performance of such beautiful music. The Eighth Symphony, like other compositions by Bruckner, will continue to inspire me and offer solace to many in a world of chaos and disharmony.

Eric Lai

1 See Atlanta Symphony Orchestra program, January 2011, 27, and reviews of the BBCSSO performances by Ken Ward and Stephen Pearsall appear in The Bruckner Journal 14/1 (March 2010), 9-10.
2 Ken Ward also observed a similar seating in the brass section in his review of the BBCSSO Glasgow concert (The Bruckner Journal 14/1 (March 2010), 10).
Sweeping, so I am grateful to Maestro Orozco-Estrada for my first live Bruckner First Symphony experience. The Bristol, Middlesbrough, Southend, and Llandudno - having to settle for Brahms' 2nd symphony or Beethoven's as 'the Miracle of Vienna'. Only in Bradford and Warwick did they play Bruckner’s First, other places on the tour - Vienna-trained, Colombian Andrés Orozco-Estrada has been chief conductor since 2009. Apparently a coup.

Bruckner was preceded by Beethoven's Emperor Concerto in a combative performance - soloist Natasha Paremski of years ago he stood in at short notice and gave a performance of Bruckner's Fourth so good he was described by some as 'the Miracle of Vienna’. Only in Bradford and Warwick did they play Bruckner’s First, other places on the tour - Bristol, Middlesbrough, Southend, and Llandudno - having to settle for Brahms’ 2nd symphony or Beethoven’s Seventh. So I am grateful to Maestro Orozco-Estrada for my first live Bruckner First Symphony experience. The Bruckner was preceded by Beethoven’s Emperor Concerto in a combative performance - soloist Natasha Paremski delighting the near-capacity Bradford audience. To most, though perhaps I am being presumptuous, the music of the second half would have been completely new, so it’s a credit to the Yorkshire audience for parting with their cash and listening so attentively.

Orozco-Estrada brought out well the Tannhäuser-like passages in the first movement, while the lyrical theme was gently and beautifully enunciated, reflecting perhaps Bruckner’s struggle between what an audience of 1866 expected and what was going on in his head. The big romantic theme and climax in the second movement, an almost Tchaikovskian moment, was played with heart and passion. By the third movement the distinct Bruckner style had re-emerged, blunt, uncompromising, here intense but not brash, though if it had been the latter I wouldn’t have complained. Then, with the opening of the finale, the gauntlet was thrown down: I was startled and that added to the enjoyment, this new musical language in full flow, and this fine orchestra totally convincing. I have a feeling we will hear a lot more about Andrés Orozco-Estrada and that is good news for Bruckner enthusiasts everywhere.

Stephen Pearsall

LONDON
BARRICAN CONCERT HALL

Messiaen - Et exspecto resurrectionem mortuorum
Bruckner – Symphony No. 9

London Symphony Orchestra / Sir Simon Rattle

Three enormous ear-splitting tam-tams were employed in Messiaen’s Et Exspecto Resurrectionem Mortuorum, the largest being truly gigantic, maybe 10ft (3m.) in diameter. When we reassembled after the interval to hear the LSO perform Bruckner’s 9th symphony, this massive tam-tam was still centre-stage, at the back lowering over the orchestra. For a moment I was worried that we were about to witness an intervention into Bruckner’s score far exceeding anything Ferdinand Löwe perpetrated in the first printed edition, but the massive instrument remained silent throughout and stood like some monumental glistening sculpture adding an unusual visual dimension to Bruckner’s mighty final symphonic endeavour. Ranged in front of it was a line of 8 double basses facing us, four trombones and the bass tuba completing the row. In front of them were two rows of horns/Wagner tubas, woodwind, with trumpets and timps to the right; in the foreground first violins, a large wedge of cellos, then violas, and second violins on the right. It was a layout that led to great clarity of line and counterpoint, and enabled key moments such as the quiet trumpet and drum repeated-note comments in the opening pages to be played perfectly together, and interplay between firsts and seconds to be fully appreciated.

The tremolando at the start was suitably hushed and expectant, and the horn-infested opening arose atmospherically out of the mists. Simon Rattle decided that an accelerando was necessary up to the tutti statement of the octave-drop main theme, as opposed to the ‘ritenuto’ Bruckner calls for, but the ensemble here went somewhat awry and the tutti itself seemed underpowered. You couldn’t wish for any greater clarity in the denser textures of the lyrical second subject, and the third group was presented with deliberate precision and vigour. So far, so good - but nothing quite to write home about. But come the second part of the movement, things changed - perhaps this was a deliberate interpretative decision: to present the exposition with some restraint and then to show the expressive potential of the material in the ‘expanded counterstatement’ of the second half. Particularly shattering was the march-like crescendo after the repeated re-statement of the octave drop main theme, leading to one final collapse before the second subject steals in, played here with immense beauty and expressiveness. This was magnificently handled, as was the movement’s coda, its dazzling heaven-storming fanfares both visceral and transcendental.
By contrast, the Scherzo and Trio were somewhat stolid. It was as if Rattle wished to present great architectural blocks, rather as had been so powerfully displayed in the Messiaen beforehand, and there was little of the demonic about the Scherzo, nor anything spectral about the Trio. The music seemed to serve its purpose as a formal element, an intermezzo, but not much more. But certainly, there was a great clarity of sound, and voices heard that are sometimes not apparent.

The opening phrase of the Adagio was extraordinary: there was a failure of articulation and ensemble, a series of glissandi scooping up and sliding down the phrase to quite ghostly effect, greater security then being supplied by wonderfully forward Wagner tubas, and the horns ushering in the rise to the Parsifal-like ethereal violin and woodwind cadence. I’m sure it was unintentional, because when the moment is repeated later in the movement (bar 77) it was done with perfect ensemble, and articulated without any compromising of that leaping ninth, but in the event it was quite as heart-wrenching as it was unsettling. At the fortissimo where trumpet exclamations shout above the horns powering up and down that ninth, Rattle held his arms out wide and the hall was filled with a blaze of glorious sound - unforgettable - and then the descending chorale, Bruckner’s ‘farewell to life’, seemed to express not only deep, deep sadness, but also pride, as though recognising that something wonderful had been achieved here, the tiny fragmented viola comments particularly telling. There was further great beauty in the second subject, and later on the inexorable rise to the movement’s dissonant climax accomplished without any extraneous histrionics or exaggeration. After the silence the movement starts up again, almost where it began, bar 9, unchanged by the traumatic enormity that has just occurred, signifying perhaps that there is work still to be done that awaits resolution in the Finale. Meanwhile, the tension winds down to that long-held horn, Wagner tuba, and trombone chord, here very beautifully rendered indeed. As interpreted by Rattle, the closing pages seemed not entirely valedictory, the repeated descending motive on the violins more a legato mp song of calm assurance than a hushed, disembodied pp lament.

At times this had the makings of a great performance, often with a greater sense of flexibility and spontaneity than is sometimes the case in performances directed by Simon Rattle, but maybe it still needs a little more time to mature. It will be very interesting indeed to see what Rattle and the Berlin Philharmonic make of the symphony with completed finale when they perform it in February 2012.

Ken Ward

LONDON – BARBICAN CENTRE 7 MARCH 2011

Bruckner – String Quintet.

Heath Quartet – Oliver Heath, Cerys Jones, Gary Pomeroy, Christopher Murray, with Adam Newman

The Heath Quartet and Adam Newman treated us to a truly enchanting performance of Bruckner’s Quintet. Perhaps right at the beginning Oliver Heath’s phrasing of the opening theme came over as just a bit too ingratiatingly expressive but, once they settled in, the performance took flight and became one of the best it has been my privilege to attend: it was played with such intelligence and commitment! The opening movement’s three theme groups were each wonderfully characterised, and then the five-way conversation that takes place in the development, the movement’s opening phrase passed in various guises from instrument to instrument, was accomplished with true communication between the players, each seeming to respond and take wing from the previous player’s contribution. It was absolutely delightful.

The Scherzo’s dancing figures were brightly inflected and totally absorbing, especially that weird and ghostly passage where the second viola meanders beneath pizzicato violins; the Trio beautifully airy, an enchanting contrast. The performance of the Adagio that followed was full of profound emotion, very slow but in fact perfectly paced and controlled: it is hard to imagine how it could be better presented. The bizarre motivic fragments, contrasts and drama of the finale were tackled head-on, without compromise or embarrassment, but there was never any sense that the structural progress of the work was undermined – and this sense of formal coherence and direction was apparent in all the movements – so that when the final fff tonic burst upon us it seemed both arbitrary and inevitable at the same time: a wonderful conclusion to a fantastic performance!

Ken Ward
LONDON DUKE’S HALL, ROYAL ACADEMY OF MUSIC 25 MARCH 2011

Bruckner – Symphony No. 6
Academy Concert Orchestra / Sir Colin Davis

As they get older, the better their Bruckner: there has been a glorious tradition of ageing Bruckner conductors giving of their best in their eighth and ninth decades. It, of course, not a necessary nor indeed always a sufficient qualification for directing a great Bruckner performance, but there is something awe-inspiring about witnessing the frail old man, mounting the podium with difficulty, increasingly solitary by virtue of longevity, with trembling hands unleashing music of such massive power and soul-searching humanity. It is as though there finally comes a time when the performer realises that this music requires no special advocacy in the way of dramatic or expressive exaggeration, that that sort of anxiety with its concomitant distortion of the score can be left behind, and in its place rises a calm, magisterial overview that allows the music untrammelled eloquence.

Sir Colin Davis made his way to the podium somewhat unsteadily. He managed to remain standing throughout the first movement exposition, but thereafter sat down on a high conductor’s chair, and remained seated thereafter, except for two fortissimo tuttis in the finale that brought him briefly to his feet. But the performance he facilitated from the wonderful student orchestra at the Royal Academy was anything but frail. From the very outset, the perfect unanimity of the strings’ annunciation of the duplet/triplet rhythm had an excited urgency and precision that is rarely heard even from fully professional orchestras. Presumably this was the result of considerable rehearsal and clarity of direction from the conductor. Similarly, the main theme presented by the basses and cellos was crisp and purposeful, and already one had the feeling that something quite special lay ahead.

Pointless to attempt to list all the wonderful felicities of this performance, but the rhapsodic playing of the strings, not silky-smooth but forthright, gutsy and clear, and indeed of the whole orchestra in the various Gesangsperioden, was so immensely beautiful that it became difficult to maintain one’s composure and keep tears from the eyes. (Even greater self-restraint was required when the man beside me, as the quiet duet of horn and oboe heralded the wondrous excursion through the keys in the first movement’s magical coda, reached into his rustling bag, withdrew a plastic bottle of water, twisted off the cap and proceeded to gulp, as though we were earthbound in some arid desert rather than rising on wings of joy through one of music’s most fertile and verdant landscapes.)

The Adagio entered with a weight of grief in the strings and desolate sadness in the keening oboe melody that seemed able to encompass both Bruckner’s own personal tragedies of rejection and isolation, but also the sorrows and sufferings that afflict all mankind - the contemporary disasters in Japan and north Africa that were much on our minds at this time included. The turn to E major for the second subject brought consolation through a warm joy that grew in passion and desperation, subsiding in the calm finality of the softly-phrased funeral march third theme. The Scherzo is marked, ‘Nicht schnell’ (Not fast), and not fast it was: it had a sort of dogged determination; the Trio was similarly measured, with quizzical pizzicatos and glorious romantic horn calls replying. And how deceptively simple and straightforward the Finale seemed - and how effective. It was conducted with a clear steady beat, not inflexible but the underlying pulse firm and purposeful, and the movement worked its way through its intriguing array of thematic motives, and ultimately turned the corner to the tonic major with joy and finality. I thought it was one of the best Sixth’s it’s been my privilege to attend. Ken Ward

MANCHESTER BRIDGEWATER HALL 31 MARCH 2011

Bach - Suite No. 2
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5

Hallé Orchestra / Markus Stenz

It was nearly four years since Bruckner appeared on a Hallé programme so full marks to Markus Stenz, the Hallé’s principal guest conductor, for including the Fifth and participating in an illuminating pre-concert talk with Stephen Johnson. This began with a bonus item as we were joined by four young trombone players from Chetham Music School who played for us an arrangement of the motet, Christus Factus Est.

Towards the end of the talk I was amused by the suggestion that a heavily disguised Anton would furiously visit Lutheran services just to hear the chorales. If true, thank heavens he did. Markus remarked that this music allowed conductors to stamp their own personality on it, and he made much of using the silences, which in the event, tended to give the first movement especially, a stop start feel. So this was not the great long march, but rather a more episodic journey, often searingly beautiful, for instance the abrupt interjections of the clarinet, played here stunningly by Lynsey Marsh and enhanced by the magnificent Bridgewater Hall acoustic. In fact, the tone and articulation of this orchestra was an absolute pleasure - all that practising for this moment with frequent performances of Brahms symphonies certainly paying off handsomely.

Variable tempi in the adagio gave the effect of drama rather than gravitas, while the scherzo was light and fast, never outstaying it’s welcome: if we were on a trek it was an enjoyable one, with dance-like entertainment relieving any fatigue. A long pause before the finale and we were off again, another chance to hear that clarinet motif as it kicked off the string section in a vigorous statement of the theme. I thought the performance really took off at this point, it was foot tapping stuff and this long and varied journey ended, as it should, in triumph. Stephen Pearsall
NEW & REISSUED RECORDINGS March to June 2011
Compiled by Howard Jones

A slimmer listing than the bumper one in the previous issue. Janowski’s OSR cycle of the symphonies continues with symphony No. 7 and Simone Young’s Hamburg PO cycle with No. 1. Cambréling’s series with the SWRSO adds No. 3 and Sony Classical offer the Bavarian State Orchestra under Nagano in Nos. 7 & 8. CPO release volume 1 of a projected cycle with the Basle SO under Venzago in Nos. 4 & 7. A cluster of DVDs and/or Blu-rays of Nos. 7, 8 & 9 (including a 1991 rehearsal of No. 9 from Celibidache) completes the listing. (The empty brackets signify dates and timings not known at the time of going to press)

CDs and DOWNLOADS
* = first issue

SYMPHONIES

No 0  *Blunier/Beethoven Orch., Bonn (with Orchestral Pieces) (25-27/05/2010) MDG 9371673-6 (50:11 & 08:05)
No.1(Linz v.)  *Young/Hamburg PO ( ) OEHMS CLASSICS SACD OC 633 (49:08)
No.3(1873 v.)  *Bloomstedt/Leipzig Gewandhaus Orch. ( ) Querstand SACD VKJK 1017 (57:25)
No.3  *Cambreling/SWRSO (Freiburg, 09/11/2010) GLOR CLASSICS GC 10391 (57:25)
Nos.4 & 7  *Venzago/Basle SO (2010) CPO 777615 2 CDs, Vol. 1 of a projected cycle.
No.5  Furtwängler/Berlin PO (25 to 28/10/1942) TESTAMENT SBT 1466 (69:00) First release from the original master-tapes.
No.6  *Inbal/Tokyo SO (Tokyo, 30/11/2010) EXTON EXCL-00064 (53:42)
No.6  *Zagrosek/ Berlin Konzerthausorchester (7-9/03/2008) ALTUS CD ALT-205 (58:34)
No.7  *Janowski/Orch. Suisse Romande (10/2010) PENTATONE CLASSICS SACD PTC 5186370 (65:59)
No.7  *Nagano/Bavarian State Orch. ( ) SONY CLASSICAL 88697909452 ( )
No.7  Skrowaczewski/Nippon Yomiuri SO (16/10/2010) DENON SACD COGQ-50 (65:47)
No.8  *Nagano/Bavarian State Orch. ( ) SONY CLASSICAL 88697909472 ( )
No.9  *Herbig/Philh. Taiwan Nat. SO (19 to 20/12/2009) NSO Live CD(54:26)
No.9  *Svetlanov/Swedish RSO (Stockholm, 06/03/1999) WEITBLICK SSS 0121 (66:30)

INSTRUMENTAL

String Quintet  Raphael Ensemble (Bristol, 24 to 26/10/1993) HYPERION CDH 55372 (with Intermezzo) (11:25 + 7:44 + 14:00 + 8:46, + 3:56)

CHORAL

Motets/Totenlieder/Aequali  *Ferguson/St Mary’s Cathedral Choir, Edinburgh, RSAMD Brass (Edinburgh, 31/05 to 04/06/2010) DELPHIAN RECORDS DCD 24071 (62:10)

DVD & BLURAY

Sym. No.7  Munch/Boston SO (1958) ICA CLASSICS DVD ICAD 520.8 (with Haydn Sym. #98)
Sym. No.7  Ozawa/Saito Kinen Orch. (10 to 14/09/2003) NHK DVD & BLURAY
Sym. No.8 (1887 v.)  *Welser-Möst/Cleveland Orch.(Cleveland, 08/2010) ARTHAUS MUSIK DVD 101581 (89:00)
Sym. No.9 (Rehearsal)  *Celibidache/Munich PO (1991) ARTHAUS DVD 101555 (58:00)
Sym. No.9  Wand/NDRSO (Lubeck, 08/07/2001) with Schubert Sym. No.8, ARTHAUS DVD 107223

“When Mario Venzago embarks on a large project, one can be sure that something extraordinary will come out of it. This was the case with his Schumann Project, and it is now again the case when he takes a radical new view of the complete Bruckner symphonies. These recordings will show that Bruckner did not write the same symphony nine times (as is often claimed), but that each has its own distinctive message, for which the composer consistently invented new musical principles and a changed tonal palette. It was therefore my wish to assign each symphony to a specific orchestra of differing size, culture and tradition. As with all interpretations, this project is just a one-off snapshot of ‘The other Bruckner’. These performances emphasize the particular characteristics of each symphony, but the following criteria apply to them all: a consistently slimmer sound, in the tradition of Schubert (as opposed to anything massive and pathetic), and music-making rich in rubato, free from the constraint by bar-lines, and the working out of sacred, ritual moments.’ Be assured, this is an listening-adventure that awaits you here! The Basel Symphony Orchestra opens the cycle.” (Publicity, trans. kw)
IT IS ALWAYS a pleasure to review a new book on Bruckner, particularly one written by a scholar from the English-speaking world. Dermot Gault’s *The New Bruckner* has the distinction of being the first book in English to provide a thorough and balanced account of the various changes made in the different versions of the symphonies and larger choral works, the raison d’être for these changes and the nature and extent of the input of Bruckner’s young friends.

In his introductory chapter, Gault takes the disastrous performance of Bruckner’s Third Symphony in December 1877 as his starting-point, describing this work as one that “encapsulates many of the issues that continue to surround Bruckner” and identifying these specifically as “the vexed question of his numerous revisions, and the degree to which they were motivated by adverse reception; the extent to which his former students participated in both the revisions and in the first published editions; Bruckner’s relationships with Wagner and the Wagnerian faction in Vienna; the complex cultural and political cross-currents of the time; and the presence or absence of extra-musical elements in the music itself” – issues that Gault will explore more systematically in the course of the book. Not only in his own lifetime and shortly after his death do we encounter the input, well-meaning at best, over-intrusive at worst, of Bruckner’s friends and pupils, but we also have to reckon with the reminiscences of former pupils, some trustworthy, others less so. Hence we have had to tolerate until relatively recently the long-lasting and deeply ingrained perception of Bruckner as an eccentric composer who lacked the ability to give coherent shape to his undeniably original inventions. It is to Gault’s immense credit that, in Chapters 2-10 of the book, he creates a clear path through the dense and confusing thicket of information, not to mention a great deal of misinformation, as he discusses the first printed editions, the “revisionism” of both the Haas and Nowak scores and the “New Bruckner perspective” demonstrated in recent Bruckner studies as original versions of the symphonies or movements from the symphonies have come to light.

After providing a brief survey of Bruckner’s early life and works (up to 1863) in the introductory chapter and before continuing with more detailed account of the Masses and early symphonies in Chapter 3, Gault identifies elements of “tradition and innovation” in Chapter 2, in particular Bruckner’s individual treatment of received forms such as sonata form and his idiomatic use of rhythmical and thematic elements, as well as recurring stylistic features and some programmatic ingredients. In describing “the legacy of the classics”, he mentions works that Bruckner clearly knew and assimilated in the process of forming a style of his own – Mozart’s *Requiem*, Beethoven’s Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Eighth and Ninth Symphonies, the *Missa Solemnis* and the late string quartets including the *Grosse Fuge*, and the works of Schubert that he studied at St. Florian and heard later in Linz and Vienna (the “Unfinished” and “Great” C-major symphonies, as well as several of the songs and piano sonatas). It is good to be reminded that, for the most part, Wagner’s influence was “manifest only in certain generalized aspects of Bruckner’s music”. Gault ends the chapter with a brief, albeit succinct, account of some inconsistencies in Bruckner’s tempo markings, still something of a minefield in Bruckner studies, and an equally brief but no less valuable insight into important “manuscript issues” that an editor has to deal with when attempting, for instance, to discern the relationship between the manuscript sources, the *Stichvorlage* and the first published editions of the composer’s works.

In Chapter 3 Gault turns his attention to the major works written in the 1860s, namely the Symphonies in F minor (*Studien symphonie*), no.1 in C minor and D minor (*Die Nullte*), as well as the three Masses – in D minor, E minor and F minor. He also mentions the earlier versions of the Adagio and Scherzo of the C minor Symphony, eventually rejected by Bruckner in his desire to refine the work and to move away
from too much reliance on Classical models, and an intriguing sketch for a Symphony in B flat (October 1869) which contains metrical numbers that were to be a prominent feature of the symphonies from no.2 onwards. All these works demonstrate the gradual but inexorable progress towards the mature Bruckner symphony, and Gault rightly highlights the tension in the mature Mass settings between “doing justice to the ethical and spiritual stature of the text” and finding a symphonic mould that would incorporate this. Yes, he and, in a different way, Franz Liszt, had probably “taken the genre as far as he (they) could”, but I suspect that, given the opportunity and the right circumstances, the mature Bruckner may have tried again. It was some time before Bruckner the symphonist could entirely shake off the influence of Bruckner the church music composer. The spirit of the F minor Mass certainly hovers over the D minor (Die Nullte) symphony - a Janus-faced work, looking back to Beethoven and Schubert, but also forward to his Second and Third Symphonies.

Chapter 4 – “The Emergence of the ‘Bruckner Symphony’” – encompasses the period from Autumn 1871 (the beginning of work on the Second Symphony) to May 1876 (the completion of the first draft of the Fifth Symphony) and includes details of all the significant events pertaining to his work on Symphonies 2-5 during this time, notably the changes Bruckner made to the Second both before and after the Novitäts-Probe by Dessoff and the Vienna Philharmonic in September 1872 and the first public performance of the work by Bruckner and the Philharmonic in October 1873; the intense labour on the Third between October 1872 and the end of December 1873, including Bruckner’s visit to Bayreuth in September 1873 when Wagner was asked to become the dedicatee of either this new symphony or the earlier Second, and subsequent alterations to the symphony, including the composition of the “intermediate” version of the Adagio in 1876, that would eventually lead to the 1877 version; the beginning of the no less remarkably chequered history of the Fourth in January 1874 with its problematic Finale and the extra dimension of Bruckner’s own programmatic references to the symphony in his letters; and, finally, the epic Symphony no.5, begun one year later in January 1875 and, given the composer’s circumstances at the time, a triumph of will over adversity – Gault’s remarks on the new structural tightness of the work, especially in the first movement where there is an overlap between, indeed a merging together of, recapitulation and development, and the importance of tonal centres a third apart (B flat, G flat, D / E double flat) and prominence of the Neapolitan C flat in the musical argument are particularly apposite.

Bruckner’s work on Symphonies 2-5 was followed almost immediately by four or five years of “consolidation and revision” and in Chapter 5, Gault takes us meticulously through these changes, many of which were concerned with achieving a higher degree of metrical regularity. He makes a careful distinction between the compositions completed or begun before Bruckner’s move to Vienna in 1868 (Symphony no.1 and the three Masses) in which he was “prepared to tolerate a certain amount of metrical irregularity” and the four symphonies already discussed in Chapter 4, namely Symphonies 2-5, in which Bruckner was more rigorous in his revision process. Symphony no.2 was subjected to several changes not only before and immediately after the second performance of the work in February 1876 but also in 1877. There were several stages in the revision (metrical, textural, textual and structural) of Symphony no.3, culminating in the “1877 version”, the premiere of which took place in Vienna in December of that year, and Gault wisely counsels his readers to study the detailed list of Bruckner’s small-scale alterations (pp.73-87) with the help of published scores rather than simply read them through. Even a cursory glance, however, is enough to convince us of the extent of the changes, particularly in the outer movements, and to give us a glimpse into the composer’s workshop, much as we may regret the loss of so much material. Bruckner’s changes to the Fifth, which were effected between 16 May 1877 – exactly a year after the completion of the first draft of the work – and the beginning of January 1878, preceded the major alterations he made to the Fourth, and Gault is correct in pointing out that they are often regarded as “late composition rather than as revision”, the extent of the revision notwithstanding. Of the four symphonies, the Fourth was the one that experienced the most changes during its 1878-81 revision process, including the composition of a new Scherzo in October 1878, a completely rewritten (August / September 1878) and then entirely new Finale (November 1879 – June 1880), extensive structural alterations in the first, second and rewritten fourth movements and thinning out of orchestral textures. Once again we are indebted to Gault for his clear and methodical description and appraisal of Bruckner’s changes.

The four works discussed in Chapter 6 – the String Quintet, Symphonies 6 and 7 and the Te Deum and in Gault’s words, “four masterpieces that he never afterwards felt the need to revise” – demonstrate in different ways Bruckner’s increasingly adventurous approach to structural considerations. In the String Quintet, composed between December 1878 and July 1879, this is particularly apparent in the outer movements, while in the Te Deum, begun in sketch form in May 1881 but set aside for more than two years and not completed until March 1884, it is the inspired matching of the musical material to the religious
words that makes the greatest impression. Gault argues persuasively that lessons learned in the writing of the Quintet enabled Bruckner to give his orchestral textures a “new singing warmth and inner life” in the Sixth, its lovely slow movement in particular. Shortly after completing the Sixth (in September 1881), Bruckner began work on his Seventh, completing it in September 1883. It is well known that Richard Wagner’s death in February 1883 had a profound effect on the composer and he later claimed that he had been inspired to write the slow movement as a tribute to the “immortal Master of all Masters” (although, the initial dates on the manuscript do not corroborate this). Be that as it may, the movement bears an emotional weight that is not present in Bruckner’s earlier symphonic slow movements. Gault refers to this “reassignment of roles that runs counter to the Finale-orientation of the Fifth Symphony and the revised Fourth” – and in the Seventh Bruckner also constructs a Finale that, in its thematic relationship to the opening movement, provides a satisfying summation to the work as a whole.

In Chapter 7, we encounter “Bruckner and his disciples”, and Gault, while taking into account Cyrill Hynais, Ferdinand Löwe, Max von Oberleithner, Friedrich Eckstein, Friedrich Klose and Carl Hruby, is concerned largely with the influence of the Schalk brothers, Josef and Franz, with whom Bruckner was involved for nearly twenty years, but whose role in the dissemination of the composer’s works became increasingly significant during the final decade of his life. Although Josef was resident in Vienna, Bruckner had a closer and more trusting relationship with the younger Franz, who left the capital in 1881 to make his way as a violinist and then conductor in various provincial towns and cities before eventually returning to Vienna to become conductor at the Hofoper four years after Bruckner’s death. Of the main sources of information about the Bruckner-Schalk relationship, Thomas Leibnitz’s *Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner* is undoubtedly the most revealing, and Gault understandably makes thorough, albeit selective, use of this book to describe the nature and extent of the brothers’ input, identifying “conspicuous public failures of Bruckner’s music” – not only the 1877 performance of the Third but the performance of the Fourth conducted by Felix Mottl in Karlsruhe in December 1881 – as a spur to ensure greater promotion of Bruckner’s music. This promotion was twofold. First, Josef Schalk in particular was largely responsible for mounting piano performances of his works as part of the activities of the Vienna branch of the *Akademische Wagnerverein*. Second, both brothers gradually became more and more involved in the preparation of Bruckner’s works for publication. At first this involvement was innocuous. Gault reminds us, for instance, that several minor details added by Josef Schalk at the printing stage of the Gutmann first edition of the score of the Seventh (December 1885) were almost certainly endorsed by Bruckner and that there is sufficient evidence that the 1888 version of the Fourth, later rejected by Haas, Nowak and others on the grounds of lack of authenticity but now accepted into the canon of the *Bruckner Gesamtausgabe* in Benjamin Korstvedt’s edition (2004), was also approved by the composer who was clearly involved in the revision right up to the final stages. The same is true of the 1889 version of the Third Symphony, as it is clear that Bruckner accepted some of Franz Schalk’s suggested “improvements” to the Finale (detailed by Gault on pp.133-4), but rejected others. Although, as Gault points out, Bruckner “did show some uncertainty during the revision process”, there seems to be no doubt that he was eventually satisfied with all the changes he made himself and those of Franz that he endorsed. However, in spite of Josef’s undertaking that he would not make any further alterations to the score prior to printing (in November 1890), it is abundantly clear that he did so, and this more “interventionist” input of the Schalks and others at the printing stage gradually became more prevalent during the 1890s, taking the form of over-editing (the First, Second, Third and Sixth Symphonies and the D minor Mass) or further revision, including some rewriting (the Fifth and Ninth Symphonies and the F minor Mass). Gault’s words of reproof are very much to the point here – “It is not enough to point out that Bruckner was alive and well when most of these editions appeared, and infer his approval. When confronted with such widespread and consistent deviations from the autograph sources, we need specific endorsement...” To take just one example – the publication of the F minor Mass (Doblinger, 1894/95?) following the concert performance of the work conducted by Josef Schalk in March 1893: although Bruckner made his own revisions after the performance, it was Schalk who was responsible for the score, and Gault aptly quotes Paul Hawkshaw’s indictment of this first print which includes “hundreds of spurious performance directions and articulations as well as a massive reorchestration”. Bruckner was understandably furious when he received the proofs in April 1894 and was probably not well enough at this stage to take the matter further, but we can surely assume that no endorsement was forthcoming.

Chapter 8 is devoted entirely to the Eighth Symphony, from its inception in sketch form in the summer of 1884 through to the preparation for the first publication of the score of the work in 1892, and comprises an assessment of Bruckner’s response to Hermann Levi’s criticism of the first version, a detailed comparison of the 1887 and 1890 versions (including the two different Trios and three different *Adagio* movements), an evaluation of the contributions made by both Franz and Josef Schalk, and a discussion of
Bruckner’s references to the programme of the work in a letter to Felix Weingartner in March 1891 and in statements later recalled by August Stradal and Friedrich Eckstein. Paul Hawkshaw, who is currently engaged in the herculean task of providing a Revisionsbericht of the Eighth for the Bruckner Gesamtausgabe, surprised us at our recent Bruckner Journal conference in Oxford by revealing that the early history of the first version of the symphony is particularly complex; there is an enormous amount of source material, much more than exists between the first and second versions. It would also appear that Bruckner took on board a few but by no means all of Levi’s comments when he began to revise the symphony in October 1887, not completing the second version until March 1890. Gault is particularly generous with his music examples as he shows how Bruckner made use of essentially the same material in the three Adagio movements in the painstaking process of carefully refining and re-fashioning it. This pruning procedure was not confined to the Adagio, of course, and those who prefer the first version of the symphony will lament the fact that Bruckner discarded so much fine material in revising the work. But this was his own decision, and there is no evidence to suggest that he was manipulated or unduly influenced by either Josef or Franz Schalk. On the other hand, Josef’s involvement in the first edition (published March 1892) is undeniable.

Bruckner’s work on the Ninth Symphony throughout the last decade of his life was undoubtedly hampered by the ongoing process of revision to earlier compositions – not only those discussed by Gault in Chapters 7 and 8, but also Symphony no.1, a closer examination of which begins Chapter 9. Once again there is no evidence that either of the Schalks interfered in any way with the revision of this work which occupied Bruckner for 13 months (from March 1890 to April 1891) and entailed a few major alterations but, in the main, a considerable number of smaller changes (in orchestration, dynamics and articulation). Considering that Bruckner’s health was gradually declining by this stage, we may regret that he spent so much time revising the First when he could have expended all of his flagging energy on completing the Ninth. “There is no point now in asking if we would rather have a completed Finale of the Ninth, when it is not a choice we are able to make”, argues Gault. But I think that we must ask the question of those whose skill, ingenuity and understanding of Bruckner’s musical style have led them to make their own completions of the Ninth: “Given the choice, would you not have preferred a completion from Bruckner’s own hand?” As Gault acknowledges, Bruckner’s “harmonic language and formal sense” in the Ninth reaches a new level, with dissonance playing a vital role at key points in the opening movement, the Adagio and what survives of the Finale. There was no interference by the Schalk brothers in this work, but their intervention in the Fifth between 1892 and 1896 (Franz’s preparation of an altered score for a performance conducted by him in Graz in April 1894 and the eventual appearance of the first edition in 1896) is a sad story of deception and subterfuge.

A particularly valuable aspect of the book is that Gault, in his final chapter (“Anomalies of History”), traces the troubled history of Bruckner reception from his death in 1896 up to the present day, taking in those first published editions that appeared posthumously, the backlash against these editions that resulted in the first Complete Edition edited by Haas in the 1930s and early 1940s, and the second Complete Edition edited by Nowak from 1951 until his death and continued by others subsequently. The political dimension of Bruckner reception, notably the Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft’s links with The Nazi regime both before 1939 and during the course of the war and the choice of St Florian as a cultic and cultural centre is also thoroughly discussed. Gault rightly takes issue with Haas’s unjustified editorial interference that resulted in the “pick and mix” scores of the Second (1938) Eighth (1939) and Seventh (1944) Symphonies and the F minor Mass (1944) and highlights “the reunification of the two parts of Mus.Hs.19.475, the autograph of the 1877 version of the Third” in 1948 as a symbol both of post-war recovery and the beginning of a new and progressively happier era in Bruckner studies. In conclusion Gault deals with the persistence of the “Old Bruckner Orthodoxy”, represented in this country by the supporters (to a greater or lesser extent) of the Haas editions - Hans Redlich, Erwin Doernberg, Robert Simpson and Deryck Cooke. All made mistakes in their writings on Bruckner and, in Redlich’s case, editing of some of his works. Gault points out that for scholars like Redlich it was well-nigh impossible to gain access to the manuscript sources of Bruckner’s works in the 1950s, 60s and 70s and as someone who knew Redlich well, I can only say that I am convinced that his views would have changed if he had lived beyond 1969. He would certainly have welcomed the increasing openness and helpfulness of the Music Section of the Austrian National Library to Bruckner scholars. Gault ends this final chapter on a positive note, rejoicing in “the rich array of Bruckner’s work in all its versions”, not a problem to be lamented but “a largesse for which we must be grateful”. I am sure that he, like all Brucknerians, is delighted at the recent announcement by the International Bruckner Society and the Austrian National Library that an “entirely new edition of Bruckner’s works under the patronage of the Vienna Philharmonic” is in the planning stage – an edition for the 21st century that we hope will draw together all the strands of recent and ongoing Bruckner scholarship. In the
meantime Gault’s appendix – “The Versions of the Symphonies” – provides a bird’s eye view of Bruckner’s development as a symphonist from 1863 to 1896.

The New Bruckner is extremely well written and handsomely produced. I spotted only a few small typos (and the omission of a phrase or sentence in the second paragraph of p.218 requires attention). There are one or two factual mistakes: the third group in the recapitulation of Die Nullte does not begin “directly in D major” but in F major (p.40), and it was the Third Symphony, not the Fourth, which was heard at one of Dessoff’s Novitäts-Proben in 1875 (p.59). All in all, however, this is a fine and impressive contribution to Bruckner studies, and Dermot Gault is to be warmly congratulated on a splendid achievement.

© Crawford Howie, May 2011
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“This TINTNER? Tintner? Who is he? Where does he live? What does he know?” The rhetorical questions referred originally to Bruckner in Hugo Wolf’s castigation of the Viennese for their failure to acknowledge the genius in their midst in 1884. They are equally appropriate to the general ignorance of the composer and conductor Georg Tintner when the first Naxos recording in the Tintner cycle of Bruckner symphonies was published in 1997. Most Brucknerians, and indeed most of the classical music audience, knew nothing of him and faced with the outstanding performance of the Fifth Symphony by the Royal Scottish National Orchestra wondered where on earth or what celestial other-world he had sprung from. And when we discovered from the CD insert notes that he was already 80 years old, had been a member of the Vienna Boys Choir, sung Bruckner under Franz Schalk, had been assistant conductor for the Vienna Volksoper - but had to flee the Nazis and pursue a career in New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, England and Canada, the questions why we knew virtually nothing of him and had heard little or nothing of his work previously, and how come he was such a great Bruckner conductor, demanded answers. Tanya Buchdahl Tintner’s excellent book, Out of Time - The Vexed Life of Georg Tintner provides many of the missing clues.

It is an extraordinary life story that is told here. At times it leaves you seething with anger that such a talent should be wilfully ignored by bureaucrats and mediocrities, pompous little people with prejudices, who had the power to deny opportunities to an artist of such integrity and stature as Tintner; and at times exasperated with Tintner himself whose unbending commitment to often somewhat outlandish eccentricities and principles made him an unattractive candidate for inclusion in the conservative circles of the musical establishment of the post-war antipodean British Commonwealth. The sheer incongruities that arise from these juxtapositions lead to repeated moments of hilarious absurdity, such as when the answer to the question ‘Tintner? What does he know?’ is officially recorded in his New Zealand naturalisation certificate: ‘Composer, conductor, poultry farmer’; and moments that bring sentimental tears to the eyes at the passionate, though often ineffective, advocacy of his supporters, such as that of the New Zealand composer Alfred Hill who, a day or two after one of the rare Tintner orchestral concerts, addressed an Auckland luncheon audience as follows: “I want to tell you that my wife says the silliest thing on two legs is poultry. I think there are some people that are sillier. They are the people of this city that would let a man keep a poultry farm instead of conducting an orchestra.”

That he became such a great Bruckner conductor finds its origins in those early days in Vienna. When he was twelve, 1929, he was in a rehearsal of the Bruckner Mass in F minor conducted by Franz Schalk, who “was a truly nasty piece of work. We were absolutely terrified of that man. […] When it came to the Benedictus […] we suddenly noticed […] that his beat, which was a very good and very clear beat, got less and less clear and less and less good, and suddenly he stopped altogether and he went to the window and
started to cry. Just to cry. He was terribly ashamed of it, of course. I would say these tears were the most important tears in my life. It may be that they made me into a musician. I felt… what music can do to this dreadful man. […] This sentimental, perhaps slightly ridiculous, story was terribly important to me. But it would have meant nothing had I not loved [Bruckner’s] music as intensely as I did.” Also from that time in Vienna he reports that the superlative art of Lotte Lehmann “and the three Bruckner masses, made me into that bit of a musician I became.” The plan was for Naxos also to record the masses with Tintner - but in the event it was never to happen: what a terrible loss it is that we shall never receive the benediction of those performances.

There is much in this book that will be rewarding for lovers of Bruckner’s music to read. Bruckner was very special for Tintner, and contrasted to Mahler “It was important for Georg to perform Mahler because he understood it so well; he could recognise himself […] He preferred what Bruckner gave him, what he called his ‘assurance’, ‘that sort of cosmic feeling that, in spite of every horrible thing, the world can be a good place’, (a sort of non-theistic parallel to Bruno Walter’s famous statement to the effect that Mahler was always searching for God; Bruckner had found God.) Tintner’s views on versions and editions were firmly allied to the work of Robert Haas, regarding his post-war dismissal as purely political, and Nowak as an unworthy successor. It was intended that the 8th Symphony be recorded in both the 1887 and Haas editions. He refused to conduct the 1890 (Nowak) edition, and wasn’t entirely satisfied with the Haas: he hoped that if he had time he would make an edition of his own. As it happened he had time for neither the recorded performance nor the edition, but it is indicative of the strange persistence of the ‘Bruckner problem’ that even the most devoted Brucknerians feel there is a need for editions and versions beyond those supplied by the scholarly scores of the International Bruckner Gesellschaft. The book includes intriguing exchanges between Tintner and Prof. William Carragan about the scores of the 1st and the 8th symphonies.

“One of Georg’s burning ambitions was to promote Bruckner wherever he went,” writes Tanya Tintner, and the persistence with which he performed Bruckner and gave lectures on Bruckner is attested by the record of many such events in this book. He did much work with the National Youth Orchestra of Canada, and other youth orchestras, many of whose players report life-changing experiences, and Paul Hawkshaw’s lifelong devotion to Bruckner stems in part from his experience of playing the Fifth Symphony under Tintner in 1974. Some idea of Tintner’s lectures can probably be gained from the enthusiastic and characteristically opinionated insert notes he provided himself (at Tanya’s suggestion) for the Naxos recordings: they constitute clear and often evocative analyses of the works, together with enough biographical information to provide the reader with the context in which the work arose. But one’s appreciation of those recordings is deepened immensely by becoming acquainted through this book with the circumstances of their production. Georg was already afflicted by a cancerous growth in his mouth when the project began; it was removed, but by the time of the last recording an aggressive melanoma was diagnosed. The first recording with the New Zealand Symphony Orchestra, of the Sixth Symphony, was conducted under strained circumstances and if you sense in that recording a coolness not apparent in the recordings that followed, it doesn’t surprise you to learn that the recording was made during one of the coldest winters ever to afflict Wellington, and that the recording was frequently interrupted when the musicians’ union declared it too cold to continue. The description of how these recordings came about, and the varying circumstances under which they were made, provides an essential adjunct to the performances themselves, adding a dimension that increases their power and profundity. And when you add to this the life-history that led up to them, the greatness of this Bruckner conductor that shines through every performance acquires a back-story that helps to account for and magnify its stature.

There is much in this book that is not about Bruckner. There are many valuable observations on the art of conducting - and many extraordinary stories of what following that profession can demand. Tintner’s repertoire was extensive, and he conducted a wide range of operas, often in far-out places where interruptions might include an unscripted screaming mezzo in Madama Butterfly, who had just sat on a toad in the dark lavatory back-stage. The Australian opera tours were in every respect hair-raising, Tintner playing the piano and giving the cues for a hundred or so performances in as many days and in almost as many locations. Besides Bruckner, Tintner also promoted the compositions of New Zealand composer Douglas Lilburn, Pfitzner, Franz Schmidt, Hans Gal. He gave stunning performances of Beethoven symphonies and Fidelio, Mozart and Schubert – nearly always conducting without a score, even for the full length operas. His efforts to forge a career in the UK, against odds unfairly stacked against him, were oh so nearly crowned with success when Peter Heyworth wrote a highly laudatory review in The Observer of Tintner’s conducting of The Magic Flute at the Coliseum, March 1970. But by then it was too late: Tintner, after a depressing two and half years in which ‘nothing moved’, had already signed a contract to return to Australia, to Perth and the ‘semi-professional’ West Australian Opera Company.
And there is much in this book that is not about music, or at least not music alone. There are trenchant observations of and on anti-semitism, on life in New Zealand and Australia from the late 40s to the mid-1980s, on veganism, on friendship, betrayals and mistresses - and on wives and music: “You can’t compare music and wives, he said, but the comparison made itself in the amount of time he allotted to each.” There were three wives, Tanya being the third, and to say each found the role challenging is understatement. Whilst Tanya was on the phone to Georg’s third daughter by his second marriage, Georg, faced with his own disintegration and the intolerable prospect of making a nurse of his wife, jumped from the eleventh floor balcony. He died shortly afterwards. After his death Tanya Tintner spent several years trying to discover who it was she was married to for over 20 years, and what his life had been like before she knew him, conducting over 200 interviews and finally writing this extraordinary memoir. The book is divided into four chronological sections, with a prologue and an epilogue – but basically it falls into two parts, before and after the author’s marriage to Georg. ‘Before’ is a well-researched and well-told biography; after the marriage it has the added personal dimension of an emotional rollercoaster.

When you turn the last page you cannot think other than that this is a sad story: “What remains is regret and the torment of wasted opportunities.” But as you cast your mind back over what you have read, you can’t help but smile at the absurdities, and then be humbled by the achievements and sheer courage, against all the vexations, of the primary characters of this compelling history.

Brucknerians have reason to be grateful to Tanya Buchdahl Tintner not only for her role in facilitating those already legendary Naxos recordings, but also for this well-constructed, very readable book which is a testament to the power of Bruckner’s music, not only in those remarkable performances, but also in the vexed life of one of his greatest interpreters.

Ken Ward

---

2 Georg Tintner was a composer, but it became increasingly difficult for him, for reasons that are discussed in the book. What he considered to be his two finest works were the Violin Sonata, and a five-movement work for string quartet and soprano, The Ellipse. A recording of the Violin Sonata, and some pieces for piano, is available on Naxos, Catalogue No: 8.570258
3 Recordings of Tintner conducting Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, Brahms, Mahler, Strauss, Schoenberg, Pfitzner, Delius, Sibelius, Lilburn and others are available in the Naxos 13 volume Tintner Edition (available separately).

The famous Bruckner Symphony Versions Discography is to be found at www.abruckner.com

The discography is vast and, to all intents and purposes, complete. It is searchable by conductor, orchestra, version, date, key word, etc.

If you’re searching for CDs, downloads, books, Bruckner collectables, stamps to purchase, you’ll find it all at the Web Store at www.abruckner.com

Also at www.abruckner.com, in the Articles and Graphics section, is The Bruckner Journal archive: the first eleven volumes, from 1997 - 2007, as PDFs, with a search facility.

If you use the ‘Shop for Anton Bruckner at Amazon’ link in the Web Store at www.abruckner.com, you will help support the site (at no extra cost!)
Bruckner Society of America - Kilenyi Medal of Honor presentations

THE BRUCKNER Society of America was active from the 1930s and ‘40s, and increasingly sporadically up until the late 1990s. Readers of The Bruckner Journal will be aware that it has recently been reactivated, with the Board of Directors as listed below:


The Society commissioned the Kilenyi Medal of Honor from the American sculptor, Mr. Julio Kilenyi, in 1932, and the medal was awarded to a distinguished list of individuals and organisations. The last issue of the Bruckner Society of America publication, Chord and Discord, in 1998 listed the following recipients, possibly covering the 29 years since the previous issue: Chicago Symphony Orchestra, Georg Solti, Eugen Jochum, Bernard Haitink, Hans-Hubert Schönzeler, Istvan Kertesz, Karl Böhm, Eleazar de Carvillo, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation - thereafter all was silent.

The newly active BSA has now reinstituted the Kilenyi Medal awards, and is making up for lost time! In addition to the Medal of Honor awards previously reported in The Bruckner Journal, to Prof. William Carragan, Dr Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs, Maestra Susana Acre-Brache and Massimiliano Wax, the medal has been awarded to the following:

Professor Paul Hawkshaw - presented May 23rd 2011, at Yale School of Music, New Haven, Connecticut
David Aldeborgh - presented March 19th 2011, at the Beekman Arms Inn in Rhinebeck, New York.
Posthumously, to Georg Tintner - presented to his widow, Tanya Tintner,
and to Takashi Asahina - presented to his son, Chitaru Asahina.

The Medal of Honor award will be presented to Franz Welser-Möst on July 13th 2011 at Avery Fisher Hall, New York, and during 2012 to Stanislaw Skrowaczewski and Herbert Blomstedt.

Further details can be found at www.abruckner.com

THE LISZT SOCIETY
www.lisztsoc.org.uk

A charity dedicated to the appreciation and study of the life and works of Franz Liszt and the performance, publication and recording of his music.

We are a friendly, active society and welcome all who share a passion for the music of Liszt or who wish to simply know more about this extraordinary man. Our members form an international community of professional and amateur musicians, musicologists, academics, students and enthusiasts from all walks of life.

We offer a great deal for a very modest annual subscription:
• A free copy of the Liszt Society Journal, published annually in two volumes (one text, the other music)
• Regular newsletters filled with reviews, articles, advance notice of events and much more
• Discounts on scores purchased through the Society’s own publishers and other selected publishers
• Free entry to the Society’s “Annual Day”, comprising the AGM, lunchtime recital, masterclass, evening concert and an opportunity to socialize with other members.
• Invitations to events throughout the year such as members’ soirées, lectures, recitals etc
• A regularly-updated website with a wealth of news and general information

If you would like to join the Society or just have a chat about what the Society can offer please contact the Membership Secretary at: Jim Vincent, 3, Offlands Court, Reading Road, Moulsoford, Oxon OX10 9EX
Tel: 01491 651842 E-mail: jim.vincent@hotmail.co.uk

(Annual membership rates: UK - £25, UK Students - £10, Europe - £30, Rest of the World - £35)
Changing Times for Bruckner's Fifth

The Bruckner Journal Readers Conference in April focused in large measure on the Fifth Symphony.

The Fifth, over the years, has not had the same kind of influence, reputation or regard as some of the others, and this includes amongst Brucknerians. Some reasons are its abstruse elements, the fugal, analytical nature of the Finale, an elusive ambience etc., even though it is the most masterly work, and generally unrevised. It also possesses an apparent dispassionate and rationalised remoteness, its subtleties requiring the listener to patiently enter into its world. This is a world mostly free from the more psychological traumas and doubts sometimes engendered within later symphonies. While the composer’s initial inspirations for this work - the Adagio - may reflect a mental disturbance, this was overcome by transcendence.

It was surprising and revealing, therefore, to overhear passing comments on the work from attenders during the conference weekend. “It’s the best”. “It’s the finest”. “It’s the greatest”. “It’s close to my heart” (William Carragan). Other speakers indicated that they stand in awe of this work, without actually saying so. One could sense a speaker’s regard for it, and even an emotional response, even while an often intellectual dialectic was in progress. One such was Brian Newbould’s “reaching to the heavens” comment when the first brass entry of the Finale’s chorale was played.

In the wider world a recent CD note has musicologist Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs writing that “the Fifth is regarded by many as Bruckner’s greatest symphonic achievement. The Fifth is about surmounting the fear of death through faith”. In recent years there has been a growing number of recordings of the work, albeit that some are in the context of complete cycles. Moreover, around the world there is a substantially increasing number of concert performances. One prosaic reason for both of these could be that conductors simply want a change or to widen their repertoire beyond the Third, Fourth and Seventh (and to a lesser degree the Eighth and Ninth). But do other reasons lie deeper? What has happened?

Many readers will remember the epic science fiction film 2001 - A Space Odyssey (Stanley Kubrick, 1968, based on a story by Arthur C Clarke). In one vivid scene workers on the moon’s surface have dug out in a crater a huge magnetic black stone monolith placed there four million years ago by some ‘higher consciousness’. The astronauts are standing there around the rim looking at it, apparently in curious veneration and wonder. The experience reflects both some advanced technology combined with a step forward in consciousness. In a similar scene at the beginning of the film a noisy group of apes aeons ago in a stony African landscape are dancing about. They come across a similar tall stone monolith. Somehow they know it is different, unlike all the rest of the natural stone lying about. It is intended to be found. When one ape touches the stone out of curiosity they all start to become calm and still. A convergence of matter and spirit. A dichotomy without conflict.

An analogy may be found with Bruckner’s Fifth Symphony. We are similarly in awe because we sense that convergence which is also one of light/dark, and analysis/synthesis. More than in any other of the symphonies the one side serves to emphasize the other. This is why both the material and spiritual (mystical?) are so powerful in the Fifth, and can create a numinous revelation.

The present age is engrossed in the material whilst ever subconsciously groping for the spiritual within an increasingly fluid inner environment. Listeners who come to this work with patience may have a transcendent experience, a reflection of an inner and higher world.

Raymond Cox

(Also see The Bruckner Journal Volume 12/3 - 2008)
Counterpoint and Form in the Finale of Bruckner’s Fifth Symphony

Julian Horton


Introduction

Some years ago, I published a paper comparing the Finale of Bruckner’s Fifth with that of Mozart’s ‘Jupiter’ Symphony. My focus there was the claim that Bruckner’s Finale was the first major symphonic attempt directly to emulate the Jupiter, notwithstanding the gap of nearly 80 years separating the two works. I noted that intervening symphonic finales importing fugal techniques tended not to involve sonata form (Beethoven’s Eroica, for instance, which mingles fugue and variation, or the Ninth Symphony, the form of the Finale of which is open to debate), and that wholesale engagement with fugue remained largely the province of solo or chamber-musical finales (Beethoven’s Third Razumovsky Quartet, ‘Hammerklavier’ Sonata or Cello Sonata Op. 102, no. 2; Mendelssohn’s Octet; Brahms’ E minor Cello Sonata and F major String Quintet). But direct conflation of sonata and fugue of the kind that Bruckner attempts is hard to discover before 1875 at least.

The evidence for a reading of the Finale of the Fifth as a ‘misreading’ of the Jupiter also has biographical weight. It is known that the Jupiter was one of the works by Mozart with which Bruckner was most closely engaged; we learn from Friedrich Eckstein that Bruckner ‘never tired of urging its careful study’.

Bruckner also certainly knew Sechter’s seminal analysis of the Finale, which appeared in his edition of Marpurg’s Abhandlung von der Fuge, and which was prepared for reprinting by Eckstein. The Fifth, it seems, not only apostrophised a phase of compositional development having its roots in the advances of the Second Symphony; it also engaged a symphonic finale concept, which, in effect, bypassed Beethoven and stretched back into the late eighteenth century.

The analysis I undertook in that article, however, raised various issues – concerning the specific nature of Bruckner’s contrapuntal technique, the ways in which it is used to solve formal problems across the Symphony, and related questions of topic and genre – which I had no space to address in detail. It is these matters that I want to explore in this paper.

Bruckner’s Counterpoint

Bruckner’s synthesis of fugue and sonata involves the disposition, within an expansive sonata form, of three fugues, the first comprising the first-theme group in the exposition, the second and third forming the main substance of the development section. In addition, Bruckner introduces a second developmental passage between the reprise of the third theme and the coda, which is also substantially contrapuntal. By way of orientation, Table 1 locates the fugues within the movement’s overall design. Table 2 offers a summary of fugues 2 and 3 in the development, describing the form and the progression of entries of the fugue subjects in each case. Because Fugue 2 employs the second fugue subject to be introduced in the movement, I have designated it S2; because Fugue 3 reintroduces the subject of Fugue 1, I have designated its subject S1. The letter ‘i’ attached to a subject entry indicates an inversion. The designation ‘part’ indicates a motive extracted from one of the subjects. The suffix ‘ext.’ explains that a subject is extended; the suffix ‘false’ shows that a subject is freely altered during an entry.

1 I would like to thank William Carragan for offering his insights into the fugal character of this movement, and for many perceptive comments and suggestions.
Rather than provide a chronological account of these fugues, it is perhaps more instructive to isolate indicative passages as a means of elucidating Bruckner's contrapuntal technique. Fugue 3 is especially revealing in this regard, since it contains the most complex counterpoint in the movement, and possibly in Bruckner’s entire oeuvre. Its basic function is to make explicit the previously concealed fact that the Finale
not only combines sonata form and fugue, but more specifically sonata form and \textit{double} fugue, because it inserts within sonata form a fugue on two subjects, which can be combined. Fugue subject 1 (S1) is the Finale’s main theme, given its own fugal presentation in the Fugue 1 (Example 1a). Subject 2 (S2) (Example 1b) is prefigured as a chorale from bar 175 at the end of the exposition. The start of Fugue 3 (bar 270) marks the point at which this combination first becomes apparent (Example 2).

\textbf{Example 1a} \\
Bruckner, Symphony no. 5/iv: S1

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example1a.png}
\end{center}

\textbf{Example 1b} \\
Bruckner, Symphony no. 5/iv: S2

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example1b.png}
\end{center}

\textbf{Example 2} \\
Bruckner, Symphony no. 5/iv: combination of S1 and S2

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.7\textwidth]{example2.png}
\end{center}

Not only can the subjects be combined, however; they are also invertible, which means that each subject can act as either a soprano or as a bass in relation to the other. As Example 3 shows, the entry of the subjects in bar 278 exploits this property: S2 is now in the cellos and basses; S1 is in the second violins.

\textbf{Example 3} \\
Bruckner, Symphony no. 5/iv: invertibility of S1 and S2

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.7\textwidth]{example3.png}
\end{center}

This is the reverse of the presentation in bars 270–4, where S1 is conveyed in the bass.

So, we’re dealing with a double fugue (a fugue on two subjects) and a combinatorial fugue (a fugue in which the subjects are invertible). From bar 293, an additional property begins to emerge, which further complicates the picture. Bruckner here begins to treat S1 in stretto, which means that the entries overlap and S1 imitates against itself. Example 4 isolates entries of subject 1 in bars 293–8. You see that there is an entry
in the violas, followed two bars later by an entry in violin 2, which begins before the viola entry has finished. The violas enter on A, and the violins on G, so we call this a stretto at the seventh, that being the interval (difference in pitch) between the entries. In the next bar, the basses and cellos then enter with subject 1 on C, but this entry is not allowed to complete, merging into a sequence two bars later. The stretti here aren’t entirely strict, because Bruckner variously changes aspects of the subject.

Example 4
Bruckner, Symphony no. 5/iv: Fugue 3, middle entries 1

By this point, the fugue has redefined itself: we now have a combinatorial double fugue, which is also a stretto fugue on S1. In fact, I haven’t given a complete description of bars 293–8. Example 5 adds more detail, revealing two other, new contrapuntal devices.

Example 5
Bruckner, Symphony no. 5/iv: Fugue 3, middle entries 1, with S2 added

The entry of S1 in the bass is set against its inversion, beginning a crotchet later and a tenth higher in the first violins. In addition, Bruckner inserts S2 in the trumpets in the middle of the texture. We need yet another layer of explanation here: Fugue 3 is a combinatorial double fugue, in which S1 works in stretto with itself and its inversion (we call this rectus and inversus), and on both strong and weak beats (known as per arsis et thesis). And all of that can be combined with S2.

You might imagine that Bruckner has by now done more than enough to pass his counterpoint exam; but in fact, we still haven’t arrived at an adequate description of Fugue 3’s nature. Example 6 dissects bars 310–13, which begin with an inversion of S1 in the bass, played in stretto two crotchets later in the violas.
Example 6
Bruckner, Symphony no. 5/iv: Fugue 3, middle entries 2

The second violins then enter on the second crotchet of the bar with S1 *rectus*, and this itself is played in stretto with the first violins two crotchets later, although this stetto is discontinued at the start of bar 311. Bruckner, in short, is now attempting a stretto on S1 *rectus* and *inversus* at the same time: the subject strettos against its inversion at the same time as the inversion strettos against itself. Even more remarkably, the complex of strettos around S1 can be combined with the inversion of S2, made plain, as shown in Example 7, in bar 324, where S2 is reintroduced in inversion, against a fourfold stretto on S1 in inversion, entering on successive crotchets, each entry however slightly modifying the subject.

Example 7
Bruckner, Symphony no. 5/iv: Fugue 3, middle entries 3

To summarise: Bruckner inserts three fugues within an overall sonata form, the first occupying the first-theme group, the second forming the first main section of the development, but drawing on a theme introduced at the end of the exposition, and the third occupying the central part of the development. Fugues 1 and 2 are concerned with the treatment of contrasted subjects, the invertible combinatoriality and stretto properties both *rectus* and *inversus* of which are explored in Fugue 3.

**Counterpoint and Form**
All of this takes us a certain way towards an explanation of Bruckner’s counterpoint *as counterpoint*; but it leaves a critical question unanswered, which is: what function does this counterpoint perform? In other words, can we find an explanation for it within the context of the Symphony’s overall design, rather than simply in terms of contrapuntal method?

This question is closely bound up with issues of tonality. The Fifth formulates a technique that Bruckner first explored thoroughly in the Fourth Symphony, which is the idea that the first movement’s main
theme should encapsulate a tonal problem informing the entire work (I’ve engaged with this in brief before, and other commentators have addressed it in different contexts, notably Benjamin Korstvedt, William Benjamin and Paul Dawson-Bowling). The way this device is applied in the Fifth is however unique, because it is intimately related to Bruckner’s decision to foreground counterpoint in the Finale, a technique that none of the other symphonies explores to the same extent (the Finale of the Ninth is a putative exception, although its fugal writing is more localised). In short, the Finale’s conflation of fugue and sonata is the result of a decision to find contrapuntal solutions to tonal problems.

Examples 8a and 8b compares the main themes of the first movement and Finale.

Example 8a
Bruckner, Symphony no. 5/i: first theme

![Example 8a](image)

Example 8b
Bruckner, Symphony no. 5/iv: S1, showing Neapolitan harmony

![Example 8b](image)

The themes are related by the presence of what theorists term a ‘Neapolitan complex’, that is, the introduction of the chord of the flattened second and its near relations within the context of the tonic. The two themes exploit different aspects of this. The Finale’s main theme applies it directly, because its interior introduces C-flat major harmony within the tonic B flat (flat II is usually referred to as Neapolitan harmony). It is more oblique in the first movement’s main theme, which moves from B flat to G flat, the chord of the flattened sixth. G flat and C flat are closely related – the former is the latter’s dominant – and so can be understood as inhabiting a Neapolitan complex of keys contrasting the tonic.

The harmonic proximity of these themes is not only referential across the gap between the outer movements, but is also made explicit within the Finale, because Bruckner introduces an extension to the closing section in the Finale’s recapitulation, specifically in order to combine the first movement’s first theme with the Finale’s S1. The combination of the two themes is anticipated in the simultaneous presentation

---

of their initial motives in bars 518–19. This evolves two bars later into a complete combination, given together with the (somewhat free) inversion of the Finale theme (all of this is shown in Example 9). There follows a brief development of the themes moving into the coda, which begins at bar 564.

**Example 9**
Bruckner, Symphony no. 5/iv: combination of S1 and first-movement first theme

![Example 9](image)

The elephant in the room at this point is the chorale theme, or S2: we already know that this will combine with S1, which necessarily means that it shares a harmonic profile with that subject; this must also mean that it is related harmonically to the first-movement's main theme. In short, the Neapolitan complex relates all the themes treated combinatorially in the Symphony, and does so across the entire work.

We can view this characteristic in the first-movement theme as a structural problem, which awaits resolution (because the theme is constantly being pulled away from the tonic), and its conversion into a contrapuntal issue in the Finale as a means of supplying that resolution. This reaches its final confirmation in the Finale's coda, where all three themes appear in the broader context of a secure tonic B flat. The sheer impact of the chorale entry in bar 583 (surely one of the most extraordinary moments in the entire symphonic repertoire) resides in the fact that it is the last reference we hear to C flat, and the final time that theme makes its progress towards the tonic, marked spectacularly with the timpani entry in bar 587. Once the strains of the chorale have moved to a conclusive perfect cadence, achieved by bar 614, the final action of the Symphony is to present variants of all three themes, in which the Neapolitan inflections have been dispelled and replaced by an unyielding B flat tonic pedal, which takes hold from bar 614 up to the movement’s end.

All of this takes place within a larger scheme, which imbues the Symphony as a whole with a satisfying coherence. The outer movements share both theme and key, and so do the inner movements, since the main theme of the Scherzo is famously a variant of the Adagio theme, and both tonicise D minor. This creates a symmetrical design reinforced by both theme and key (see Example 10).

**Example 10**
Bruckner, Symphony no. 5: overall tonal trajectory

![Example 10](image)

One way of explaining the function of the first movement’s introduction is to view it as a preparation for the Symphony’s major tonal elements, since all of its main harmonic events relate to later, significant tonal characteristics (Example 11): after the first section has moved from tonic to dominant, the second important idea, commencing bar 15, begins in G flat, and the chorale that follows announces D major. This is then
Example 11
Bruckner, Symphony no. 5/i: significant tonal events in introduction

succeeded immediately by a return to B flat, and the introduction concludes with a large peroration on A, which can be read as V of D, as if Bruckner were supplying a harmonic preparation for the Adagio (an instructive precedent is found in Schubert’s ‘Great’ C major Symphony, the introduction of which does something very similar).

Counterpoint and Topic
To come, before closing, to some questions of topic and genre. The term ‘topic’ (from the Greek topos, meaning ‘place’) perhaps need some explanation. Music theorists use this term to define the characteristics that mark out styles and genres, especially in eighteenth-century music. To say that a piece is a minuet is to say that it expresses a minuet ‘topic’: we know that it is a minuet and not, for instance, a polonaise, because it exhibits certain musical features common to minuets in general (a moderate ¾ metre; various melodic turns of phrase). Topics are often defined in two categories: ‘types’ occur when the topic is synonymous with a whole-movement form (a ‘minuet’ can be a self-standing movement or piece); ‘styles’ are topics that are not synonymous with whole-movement forms (a theme can have the characteristics of a march, but function as the first theme of a sonata). Clearly, types can also be used as styles: I can write music of minuet character as the first theme of a rondo, sonata or variation set. In the eighteenth century, topics had strong social connotations: minuets spoke to aspects of aristocratic life; marches had military associations. By juxtaposing topics, composers could simulate a kind of discourse, which made a symbolic point about the music’s social context.

Much of the topical vocabulary of the eighteenth century persists in the nineteenth century; but its social resonances change, because music’s social context has changed. Nevertheless, composers still marshalled topical discourse to express social meanings. Bruckner’s music is especially rich in this regard, but its extent and implications for the music’s social commentary have not received thorough scrutiny, a
neglect that has perpetuated some very simplistic conceptions of Bruckner’s style (Robert Hatten’s essay on 
the Fourth and Fifth symphonies is an instructive exception).⁷

All of this is relevant to the Finale of Bruckner’s Fifth, because the two fugue subjects express contrasted topics: the first is a march; the second a chorale. These topics have antithetical social implications: march is secular; chorale is sacred. To contrast march and chorale is to establish a dialectic of the secular and the sacred; and to combine those themes is to attempt a synthesis of this dialectic. Counterpoint in the Fifth is therefore not only an end in itself and an agent of tonal resolution; it is also the means by which a topical dialectic is resolved. And because these topics convey social meanings, their combination through counterpoint embodies, in symbolic musical form, a commentary on the relationship between the sacred and the secular in Bruckner’s mind and in the society he inhabited. Counterpoint, in short, is the key to the Symphony’s social meaning.

The situation is, however, more complex than this, because additional topics are in play, which coexist with, and in some respects override, the basic opposition of march and chorale. In the first place, the use of counterpoint in itself accesses the eighteenth-century topic of the ‘learned style’, which also had sacred connotations. Although the two fugue subjects express opposed topics, they are related because their contrapuntal context is an expression of the learned style in both cases; we might imagine that the opposition of the secular and the sacred is overcome by the higher-order topical context of counterpoint itself, in which both subjects participate. This also has to be related to the one major piece of material I haven’t yet addressed, namely the Finale’s second theme. This could be characterised topically as a Schnell-polka, or quick polka, the polka being a fairly common second-theme topic in Bruckner’s finales. This introduces a further division, between the learned style of the fugal materials, and a second theme that invokes the dance.

Lastly, the fact that Bruckner employs a chorale in a broader context invokes a baroque genre, the chorale prelude, in which freely composed material is woven around a chorale melody, disposed as a kind of cantus firmus (dozens of examples could be cited, the most famous by Bach). This is implied in fugues 2 and 3; but it is magnificently realised in the coda, which is conceived as a chorale prelude on S2. Bruckner’s decision to close the Symphony by referencing a genre that foregrounds the chorale is rich with extra-musical connotations, implying that the oppositions of sacred and secular that inform the Finale and infuse the Symphony are resolved at the end into a higher sacred context, since the chorale-prelude topic allows other topical features (the martial themes, for instance) to be disposed around a central sacred idea. The temptation to relate all of this to the conditions of religion, and catholicism in particular, in Bruckner’s time and context is strong.

Conclusions

By way of conclusion, I want to offer a sketch of the Fifth Symphony’s broader meaning, which might provide a basis for explaining not only some of the work’s technical features, but also the extraordinary expressive impact that it has.

On the largest scale, I read the Fifth as an attempt to synthesise three major symphonic precedents with a number of older sources, as well as engaging one very modern concern. The obvious model, as we have noted, is the Finale of Mozart’s ‘Jupiter’ Symphony. The idea that the conflation of sonata and fugue can be used culminatively addresses a second precedent, which is the goal-directed ‘struggle-victory’ narrative bequeathed by Beethoven, and especially his Fifth and Ninth symphonies (the debt to the latter being most transparent in the procession of prior-movement quotations beginning the Finale). To this extent, Bruckner employs a Mozartian model to resolve a Beethovenian problem. The large-scale tonal plan, and especially the way in which it sets up key relationships outside the tonic-dominant axis, however invokes Schubert, as does the clear delineation of theme groups by topical character (the ‘Unfinished’ and the ‘Great’ C major both make use of this idea). And there is a further element in the mix: as baroque topics, fugue and chorale prelude evince what we might call ‘historicism’, a kind of musical atavism facilitating innovation within received forms.

In this sense, counterpoint is simultaneously the means by which Mozart is emulated and Beethoven transcended; or rather, we can imagine Bruckner rejuvenating the archaic and modern elements of a pre-Beethovenian finale as a way of composing a post-Beethovenian finale. And here we access a further, critical issue, which hinges on Bruckner’s relationship with Wagner. The question of how to justify the purely instrumental symphony in the wake of Wagner’s music dramas was a pressing one for symphonists of the late nineteenth century. If Wagner had marshalled the evidence of the Finale of Beethoven’s Ninth as a

---

⁷ A seminal exploration of this difference can be found in Leonard Ratner, Classic Music: Expression, Form, and Style (New York: Macmillan 1980).
justification for the transformation of the symphony into music drama, then late-nineteenth-century symphonists had to argue the opposite, that music drama was a stage on the way to the ‘not-yet-emancipated’ instrumental symphony, as Carl Dahlhaus put it.\(^7\) Bruckner’s Fifth Symphony constitutes one of two landmark Viennese responses to this problem, the other being Brahms’ First Symphony, begun in 1862 but not completed until 1876, a chronology that brings it directly into the orbit of Bruckner’s Fifth.

Bruckner, like Brahms, works with both vocal and instrumental topics, and moves to a conclusion that dispenses with the model of the vocal finale. In Bruckner’s case, the subsumption of the vocal urge is made possible by counterpoint, since the way he overcomes the tension between the instrumental (embodied in the first theme march) and the vocal (embodied in the chorale) is to combine them. The chorale can stride across the texture in the coda as its point of culmination without requiring voices as such (as Beethoven had done) because the claim of the instrumental finale has already been secured by asserting the primacy of counterpoint as an abstract means of uniting disparate tonal, thematic and topical threads. This, to my mind, is the true greatness of the Fifth Symphony: that from one idea – the notion that a symphonic form can also be a contrapuntal form – Bruckner can unite so many disparate aspects of the genre’s technique and history into a compelling and coherent whole.


---

**Bruckner’s Dissertation**

**Remarks on the Finale of the Fifth Symphony**

Some of the material of this paper was originally prepared for Benjamin Zander, December 2007

Revised and enlarged 2009-2011

Presented at the Seventh Bruckner Journal Readers’ Conference, University of Oxford, April 2011

Further revised, May 2011

William Carragan

Contributing Editor, Anton Bruckner Collected Edition, Vienna

... it was through the unforgettable performances under [Franz Schalk’s] baton that the divine inspirations of this lone Titan of music (for that is the vision that the Fifth conjures up) came to uplift the hearts of all mankind. Surely it is from some lonely eminence that these deeply moving utterances make their tremendous impact upon this world of ours, in all its infinite variety. This symphony reveals the utmost technical mastery of form, structure, and instrumentation. For all who have ever set foot in the mighty edifice of its polyphony, its melodic wealth, and its chorale, it remains an unforgettable experience.

Leopold Nowak, 1951

I wouldn’t write something like this again for anything in the world.

Anton Bruckner

Indeed, why *did* Bruckner write this music? Coming as it does at the end of a continuous stream of composition beginning with the first sketch for the Second Symphony in October 1872, it could be thought of as Bruckner’s doctoral dissertation. Thus it follows his baccalaureate studies with Sechter and his master’s degree work with the committee including Kitzler and Herbeck. So that instead of having any overarching programmatic subtext, the Fifth, for all its narrative quality (as argued eloquently by Benjamin Zander in his lavish new production of the Fifth) and topical significance (as presented convincingly by Julian Horton in this issue), is above all Bruckner’s formal, athletic validation of his prowess as a composer. That would be reason enough for him to write a finale substantially more contrapuntal than any of its competitors. At the very least he is saying, “I am the son of a village schoolteacher, and now by my own efforts this is what I
can do.” But Stephen Parkany, in his own dissertation (U. Cal. Berkeley, 1989), went further by suggesting that Bruckner's real reason for undertaking such a monumental task was to show the administration of the University of Vienna that he deserved to be appointed to the faculty, no matter how much Eduard Hanslick might object. Whatever the reason, the result is one of the most impressive musical accomplishments of all time.

The fugue in the finale

The fugal portions of the finale consist of the following passages:

mm. 31-66, Fugue 1: exposition of the A theme in four parts (36)

mm. 223-269, Fugue 2: exposition and development of the first phrase of the chorale theme in four parts (47)

mm. 306-353, Fugue 3B: development of the A theme with occasional occurrences of the chorale (48)

mm. 306-353, Fugue 3A: simultaneous exposition and counter-exposition of the A and chorale themes (36)

mm. 362-373, dominant preparation (12)

mm. 364-365, dominant preparation (8)

mm. 374-397, summary statement of the two themes and closing cadence (24)

mm. 362-364, perorations: augmented A theme, chorale, descending scale, first movement theme (72)

These add to 367 measures, inviting awe-struck comparison to their most obvious prototypes: Mozart’s 41st or “Jupiter” Symphony, Beethoven’s “Hammerklavier” piano sonata, Op. 106, and “Grosse Fuge”, Op. 133, for string quartet, and possibly the three multiple fugues in Haydn’s quartets, Op. 20. Of these, only the Mozart truly integrates sonata and fugue, but Bruckner’s contrapuntal texture is much closer to that of Beethoven. Some of Bruckner’s 367 measures are more fugal than others, and perhaps 20 of them are basically homophonic transitions. But it is still an enormous contrapuntal concept. If one counts “Fugue” 4 and the coda, it is safely larger than any baroque fugue, the longest of those that I know being the extravagant 207-measure G minor triple fugue by Mattheson which combines all three themes vertically eight times before the end, and the mighty 206-measure six-voice ricercar of Bach with which he put things straight with Frederick II.

It may come as a surprise that in the development of the finale of the Fifth, both the chorale and A themes are strictly exposed in only four parts, entirely in the strings with wind doublings as needed. This is also true of the detached exposition of A in measures 31-66, where the entries are in the order B-T-A-S. There is hardly ever any doubt as to which voice a certain group of notes might belong, as there can be in even the most learned writing of the baroque. But even more restrictive than that, in the exposition of the chorale theme in Fugue 2, in the order T-A-S-B (measures 223-269), there are no statements of the chorale given only by the winds. The subsequent A-theme part of the fugue (Fugue 3, measures 270-389) has two successive expositions, both with entries in the order B-T-A-S just as near the beginning (the second exposition is much less clear than the first), while the chorale theme has an exposition of its own, also in the order B-T-A-S. This is an unusual entry-order in fugal technique, but it is very effective for the orchestra. In this section there are twelve entries of the chorale theme in the strings.

Correspondingly, in the whole Fugue 3 treatment of the A theme, spanning some 120 measures, there are few entries of the A theme given only to the winds. The most important exception is at measure 301 where the oboes and clarinets alone play the A theme inverted and off the main beat. When the four voices of the strings recover from this impertinence five measures later, they themselves mount a full exposition of the inverted theme followed by a threefold stretto in measures 315-320. Then the two themes occur together at 324, both inverted, leading to many entries both normal and inverted. The chromatic nature of both themes helps to make possible some amazing combinations; there are even two entries, at 336 and 340, where the A theme begins normally and continues inverted. Finally there is a very tight stretto of the normal A theme, accompanied by another chorale entrance, exploding into the sound-scape in measures 350-353. How long did it take for him to think of these things? It cannot have been easy. The ensuing dominant preparation, though highly strenuous, comes as a great relief after such tortuous complexities.
Where is the recapitulation? Some would say measure 270, where the A theme enters the fugue with the scales from the B theme tagging along. Others would say measure 374, which is the goal of the dominant preparation. Either choice has its analogues in other works by Bruckner. The choice of measure 270 would put the greater part of the fugue in the recapitulation, meaning that the development per se is rather short. This is the method undeniably employed in the finale of the Ninth. The choice of measure 374, on the other hand, would put almost the entire fugue in the long development, with a very short A-theme recapitulation accompanied by the chorale. That concept of a short recapitulation after an extensive development is used in the first movement of this same symphony, the Fifth. It seems to me that trying to choose here is rather pedantic, but ultimately I would have to say measure 374 where the fugal, developmental texture dissipates and we re-enter Bruckner’s usual world of juxtaposed, isolated theme groups. Whatever one chooses, the embedding of the fugue, with its special techniques and goals, into three widely-separated regions of a fully developed symphonic form, so that we hardly know how to analyze it according to accepted norms, is a work of genius, the jewel in the compositional crown. How outrageous the suggested cut of measures 270-373 given by Bruckner himself in the score, which would eliminate the most daring and venturesome part of the whole symphony! Yet he did the same thing to the Second, so that listeners had to wait from 1872 to 1991 to hear how close to Schoenberg and Webern Bruckner could come. Schalk’s cut, eliminating the recapitulation of the second theme instead, is very different in effect, but is hardly more felicitous.

Among the not-so-fugal measures listed above are those in the coda, especially in the Steigerung (measures 496-563) leading up to the statement of the A theme in augmentation. The scale texture of the B theme and the interval of the seventh from the adagio are present everywhere, with the angular A-theme and eventually the first-movement theme set boldly against them. There is a lot of counterpoint, but there is no coherent exposition of the first-movement theme and therefore it is not really a triple fugue as promised in the score. Still, it was a great and unprecedented achievement to integrate the fugal material within the sonata form. Beethoven only attempted that in the piano sonata in A major, Op. 101, where the fugue is conveniently confined to the development. It is also remarkable that Bruckner’s fugal methods come straight from Beethoven, and through him from Haydn, not through Mozart from Bach.

In filling out the fugal material in my completion of the finale of the Ninth, I maintained Bruckner’s strict reliance on the strings, giving the winds only decorative and supplementary roles. In the Ninth the fugue is of three, not four, voices, in an exposition by Bruckner and a counter-exposition mainly by me, but there is plenty of other sound to make the result sufficiently impressive. It still took me many years of composition and revision to come to the point where I felt I had a Brucknerian texture. The fugue of the Fifth was a great help to me, and I was glad I did not have to go beyond its formal and textural methods, even though Bruckner probably would have.

Details of the great fugue in the development

Here are more extensive comments on the central fugue of the movement, divided for analysis into five sections.

(1) This extraordinary passage is announced by a four-phrase chorale beginning in measure 175, strictly speaking at 175.5, extending to 196. (Most subsequent entries of the chorale in the fugue proper also begin in the middle of the measure.) It continues with a cadence leading to the dominant (197-210) and concluding the exposition, and a short passage (211-222) introducing the development. The chorale occupies the position of a codetta, harking back to the quotation of the Benedictus of the F-minor Mass at the same position in the Second Symphony. But its effect on the subsequent course of the music is incomparably greater.

(2) Fugue 2 (223-269), on the first phrase of the chorale, is in four voices developed in the strings. The wind writing is entirely decorative. The style is flowing and lyrical, although certain moments, such as the apparent stretto at 258.5, hint strongly of the turmoil to come.

(3) The first part of Fugue 3 (fugue 3A, 270-305) begins with a four-voice exposition of A in the strings with contrapuntal entries of the chorale in the winds, ½ measure after each entrance of A. It continues with an interlude with two half-entries of A and the chorale. Then starting at 290 there is a counter-exposition with
four more entries of A in the strings, accompanied by three more entries of the chorale in the winds. It’s not as clear as the first exposition. Near the end is an entry of the inverted A theme in the winds.

(4) The second part of Fugue 3 (fugue 3B, 306-353) begins with a half-stretto and continues with 12 strettos in the strings, most in four voices. Some of the strettos can be grouped; strettos 2, 3, and 4 (mm. 315-323) form an episode, as do strettos 8 and 9 (mm. 333.5-338).

There are a few entries of the chorale. There are also several wind entries of the A theme, and Stretto 7, beginning in measure 330, contains organic entries in the winds. The winds could be omitted and we would still have the fugue on A, but the wind entries of A and the chorale have important signaling properties. Earlier entries in measures 317 and 319 are begun by the trombone and completed by the horn; an entry near the end of 315 has only the horn conclusion. The music is very quiet here and the perky brass dialogue can be heard clearly.

(5) The third part of the fugue (fugue 3C, 354-397) consists of a short descending sequence, the dominant preparation, a final statement of A and the chorale, and a transition leading to the second theme group. The descending sequence (mm. 354-361) and the dominant preparation (mm. 362-373) can also be considered to be episodes.

Thus the chorale and induction (175-222) comprise 48 measures, fugue 2 on the chorale continues with 47 measures, fugue 3A treating the A theme and the chorale has 36 measures, fugue 3B which is mostly given over to strettos and episodes on A has 48 measures, and fugue 3C, a transition and grand concluding statement doubling as the recapitulation, has 44 measures. These five symmetrical sections remind me of the symmetrical organization of time in the four sections of the development of the finale of the Second, to be seen in its full scope only in the early version of that symphony. But here the grand scheme not only includes the whole development, it includes significant adjacent material in both the exposition and recapitulation.

Toward the end of the movement, the ornately contrapuntal segment beginning at 462 in the recapitulated third theme group and extending past 489 into the coda, involving simultaneous treatment of A and the first movement theme, referred to as “Fugue” 4 above, is contrapuntal but not really fugal. In this region there are no entries of the chorale at all until the grand peroration at 583. Consequently the movement as a whole is not really a triple fugue, though it treats three themes contrapuntally in extenso. It is still mightily impressive, though. Dermot Gault has the mots justes (The New Bruckner, Farnham, 2011, page 63): “Never again, arguably, did Bruckner bring a symphony to such a powerful conclusion... Nowhere else does Bruckner emerge from a symphonic process with such a palpable sense of victory.” In other words, he got his doctorate long before the University conferred it on him.

The Gesangsperioden

If it were possible, the counterpoint in the second-theme groups of the finale is even more complex than that of the fugue. Certainly it is harder to render on the piano. There are two main melodic motives or cells. The first motive (B1) is an adaptation of the Ländler-like B theme of the scherzo, which as we have seen has its roots in the C theme of the first movement. The second motive (B2) is an upward leap of a seventh followed by a scale in the opposite direction, all the way down to the beginning note. The interval of the seventh reminds one of the sevenths in the A theme of the adagio, and the infilling of the scale comes from the introduction at the beginning of the symphony. These ideas are developed in full four-voice counterpoint, though not fugally; the second motive is frequently inverted, but not the first which would not react well to that treatment. If we call the two motives B1 and B2, the Gesangsperioden can be analyzed in this way:

mm. 67-82, B1 (D flat major) and episode (G flat major) (16)
mm. 83-92, B2 (E major) (10)
mm. 93-106, B1 (G major) and episode (German sixth) (14)
mm. 107-116, B2 (C major) (10)
mm. 117-124, mini-chorale (A flat major) (8)
mm. 125-136, B2 to close (F major, the dominant) (12)
mm. 398-413, B1 (F major) and episode (B flat major!) (16)
mm. 414-423, B2 (A flat major) (10)
mm. 424-443, B1 (B major), B2 (E flat major), and episode (German sixth) (20)
mm. 444-459, B2 to close (moving to B flat major, the tonic) (16)

As always, the second theme group is shorter in the recapitulation than in the exposition. Here the lovely mini-chorale of descending chords appears only once, like the prayer in the first part of the adagio of the Fourth, or the Farewell to Life in the first part of the adagio of the Ninth. Descending chords seem to be found in all of Bruckner’s symphonies and here they are, perhaps preparing an echo in the quiet third phrase of the mega-chorale at the end of the exposition, 72 measures later.

The recapitulation Gesangsperiode begins with the same material as the one in the exposition, but a major third higher, which provides an early taste of the return of B flat major. But Bruckner collapses the second B2 entrance into the middle of the second B1 entrance, and then moves through the German sixth, now a major second lower than the exposition, to a close leading to the tonic. In the exposition, the resolution from the German sixth to C major is up a semitone in the bass, while in the recapitulation, the German sixth resolves to the dominant of B flat by moving down a semitone in the bass. Bruckner’s clever handling of this Beethovenian technique creates a sense of direction, of moving to a great conclusion, out of all proportion to the tininess of the device. Two mere quavers acquire a significance stretching over hundreds of measures. The German sixth is the composer’s friend here, as it can resolve very flexibly however the writer desires.

The coda of 1876

The composition score of the Fifth Symphony, Austrian National Library Mus.Hs. 19.477, is a veritable battleground of creation and revision. In it Bruckner recorded all, or nearly all, of the work he lavished on this, his most elaborate production. We know that he finished the symphony, composing the movements in order, and then went over all of it, roughly in reverse order, making many changes including metrical revision and the addition of the tuba. Because all of the work is in one manuscript, and because he had no copy scores made until both the original work and the revision were finished, it is mostly impossible to isolate a coherent score which could be called an early version, without the tuba and the metrical revision. However, according to the Haas/Nowak critical report, the coda of the finale has an identifiable early version. Much of it, comprising the crescendo to the chorale, is set out in the report. Other indications point to the deletion of two measures later in the chorale, which can be restored. In 1997, I was asked by the conductor Shunsaku Tsutsumi to prepare the early coda for a performance of the whole symphony, which I did, adding the tuba for consistency with the rest of the piece but not adding the two measures of the chorale out of a principle of non-interference. It was to be understood by listeners that the result was an experiment in which the fascinating development of Bruckner’s thought could be experienced. A recording was made of that performance. Since then, Takanobu Kawasaki has gone over the whole symphony as given in Mus.Hs. 19.477 and painstakingly deciphered early versions of every measure where they can be made out. A recording of the fascinating score emerging from that daring project, under the conductor Akira Naito, is also available. That recording of course does contain the two measures in the chorale, and shockingly, near the end it does not contain the chord-and-drumroll measure 630 which was added in revision.

A great deal could be said about the differences between the late, familiar coda of 1878 and the early version of 1876. Recently I went over the coda, tabulating Bruckner’s metrical numbering, which exists in as many as three layers. In the *Steigerung* (crescendo) of the later version, Bruckner took pains to make the phrases more regular, and his work is especially apparent in these locations:

first outburst 1876: mm. 506-514 (7+2) 1878: mm. 506-513 (6+2)
second outburst 1876: mm. 523-528 (6) 1878: mm. 522-525 (4)
third outburst 1876: mm. 529-536 (5+3) 1878: mm. 526-531 (4+2)

In these places alone, the early version gains five measures. Two more measures are picked up in the final crescendo. But in the chorale itself, the situation is different. This table shows the result:

transition 1876: mm. 571-590 (8+8+4) 1878: mm. 564-582 (8+8+3)
chorale (first 2 phr.) 1876: mm. 591-606 (8+8) 1878: mm. 583-598 (8+8)
chorale (last 2 phr.) 1876 mm. 607-622 (8+8) 1878: mm. 599-613 (8+7)
The two extra measures of 1876, which are not in the Tsutsumi performance, are identified in my reconstructed score of this passage. Here it can be seen that in revising the most significant passage in the symphony, the moment of its utter culmination, Bruckner stepped away from regular phrase lengths of 4 and 8 to create irregular ones of 3 and 7. One could argue endlessly about the merits of this move. But I must mention that ever since I heard this symphony for the first time fifty-four years ago, to the present, I have more than once felt that in this greatest of all symphonies, the coda appears one measure too soon, and the last phrase is one measure too short. It comes to me with amazement that Bruckner deliberately created these audience-disrupting anomalies. But Dermot Gault, in a discussion of this same passage, appropriately says on page 92 of The New Bruckner: “There is surely no better demonstration that Bruckner’s system of metrical control was neither doctrinaire nor mechanical, but was instead part of a deeply considered adjustment of the music’s sense and overall pacing.”

The Heger score

Several years ago I was able to obtain copies of the Haas conductors’ scores of the Fourth and Fifth Symphonies which had belonged to Robert Heger (1886-1978), an opera composer and conductor whose career was in Vienna, Nürnberg, and Berlin, and after the war, at the Bavarian State Opera in Munich. He also conducted at Covent Garden for ten years. These scores are full of the most detailed tempo information, very intricate though sadly without metronome markings. I have compared these markings with those in the Schalk-revised score and to those in the Nowak score based upon Bruckner’s composition manuscript Mus.Hs. 19.477. It seems that Heger was attempting to enter into the somewhat bare Haas score the nuances and traditions which he wished to use, as an aide-memoire while conducting. While the Schalk score was all that he had been able to experience theretofore, he did not accept its annotations uncritically, particularly of the tempos to be used during the development of the first movement. By great good fortune, there is a recording of a performance of the Fifth by the Danish Radio Symphony led by Heger. The recording dates from 1967, when Heger was 80 years old, and the marks in the score in my possession give every indication of coming from a lifetime of experience, and there is a quite close correspondence between the score and the recording. The two resources together provide a unique document of the development of the tradition of Bruckner conducting.

The arrangement of the Fifth Symphony for two pianos

My arrangement, which was performed at the Bruckner Journal Readers’ Conference in April of this year, was not derived from an earlier version, in the way that the arrangement of the Eighth played at the last conference was derived from a four-hand version by Joseph Schalk. Instead, it was made directly from the score. The first part, which was played by Crawford Howie, mainly represents the strings, and the second part, which I performed, largely comes from the woodwinds and brasses, although here and there certain lines are exchanged in order to maintain melodic integrity and continuity and to render as much of the orchestration as possible while still creating a pianistic texture. In the fugal passages, the first part specifically contains the notes of the first violins and violas, while the second part has the notes of the second violins and the cello-bass combination. Other materials, such as the entries of the chorale and the wind entries of the A theme, are put in as they can be, and occasionally disturb the neat assignment of the string parts. The availability of two instruments makes this division possible, and a much more musical result can be achieved than with two duettists at one keyboard. One of my projects for the next few months is to participate in the making of an accurate studio recording of this arrangement. It is very interesting and many aspects of the symphony are clarified by it more than one might anticipate.
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FIFTH IN THE SERIES OF GUIDES BEING PUBLISHED IN THE BRUCKNER JOURNAL.

On the occasion of the first East Coast Brucknernathon at Simsbury, Connecticut, USA, September 5th, 2009, William Carragan provided charts of the formal events in various movements of symphonies I, II and III, and of his completion of the finale of symphony IX. These specified the exact time into the recording that each event took place and, used together with a large elapsed-time display on a laptop, they enabled those interested to follow the structural progress of the music. This was a great assistance to those of us not so adept at reading scores, analyzing music, recognizing keys or placing significant moments.

It seemed to me a good idea that such a facility be shared with readers of The Bruckner Journal, and Prof. Carragan has very kindly offered to provide such charts for all the symphonies, using timings taken from well known recordings. On the following five pages we publish the fifth of these analytic charts. To use them you need only the specified recording, and either the display of elapsed time on your CD player or some other method of marking the time in minutes and seconds. Of course, other recordings can be used, the timings will be approximate but the structural events should not be too difficult to locate. kw

Timed Structure Tables for Bruckner Symphonies
Professor William Carragan

V. Symphony in B flat major

The recordings selected for these tables span seventy years of Bruckner interpretation. They are (1) Eugen Jochum’s performance with the Hamburg Philharmonic from 1938, from which many of us seniors learned this symphony, (2) Volkmar Andreae’s vigorous performance from the Vienna Symphony cycle of 1953, beautifully restored by Aaron Snyder for Music & Arts, (3) Robert Heger’s veteran reading with the Danish Radio Symphony from 1967, (4) Georg Tintner’s widely-distributed performance with the Royal Scottish National Orchestra from 1996 on Naxos, and (5) Benjamin Zander’s amazing, tradition-infused rendition with the Philharmonia Orchestra from 2008, on Telarc.

Notes on the first movement

In the most recent printing of the International Bruckner Society score, there is an editorial suggestion that Bruckner wanted the brass chorale of the first movement to be fast when recapitulated at measure 338, not slow as it is in the introduction at measure 18, where it is typically played at about half note = 32. Now the fanfare theme occurs with an explicitly-marked Adagio tempo at measures 15 and 23, and again, Adagio, at measures 241 and 259, but it also serves as the motor for the development at the Allegro tempo, beginning at measure 283 with its latter half expanding into a brilliant cascade of counterpoint at measure 303, as well as in the coda or “second development”. But that use of a developed form of the fanfare in the midst of elaborate counterpoint does not make it appropriate to take the solemn brass chorale at a similarly fast tempo when formally recapitulated at 338. In Mus.Hs. 36693, Bruckner’s notation of a tempo at 338 is only needed to cancel the riten. at measure 335. At the most this notation means that the tempo of the chorale is the same as that of the B theme at measure 101 or measure 325. It is not a sufficiently strong piece of evidence to justify an allegro tempo anywhere in this passage. Tintner’s 1996 performance on Naxos goes pretty far in that direction. In the introduction his tempo for the chorale is in the 40s, similar to his tempo for the B theme, but in the recapitulation he has it at about half note = 54, not far from his A-theme tempo of 60. Just as he promises in his program notes, he goes charging through all of the highly-varied thematic material from 303 past the recapitulation at 363 at substantially the same tempo. Tintner faithfully follows Haas’s tempo indications, or rather his usual lack of them, by keeping the tempo quite steady. But he makes up for that lack of nuance in tempo by highly-sensitive handling of phrasing and small-scale expressive devices, and a really blistering brass sound. Meanwhile, as far as the editorial argument goes, we must remember that neither the composition score nor the Schalk publication was edited to modern standards, and the omission of conceptually desirable tempo indications should not be over-interpreted. Dermot Gault discusses this situation perceptively on page 200 of The New Bruckner.

In the Schalk version, a fast tempo for the coda requires that the acceleration marked at 437, intended for C2 at 441, be carried through continuously, through the beginning of the coda at 453, to Beschleunigtes Zeitmaass (sic: accelerated tempo) for the peroration at 493. The Schalk score has no special marking at the beginning of the coda itself. Many conductors like to get fast here, sometimes very fast (Furtwängler, Eugen Jochum, Andreae). Fast is good, but clarity is good too, and all the details of the writing, which even involves the ornate fanfare rhythm of the introduction (m2), should be clearly audible at whatever pace is taken. Heger writes very stern instructions for himself at measure 453: “l’istesso tempo / (nicht zu rasch! an den Schluß des Satzes denken! keine Stretta!).” That is, “the same tempo, not too fast! think of the end of the movement! no tightening up!” And at measure 493, the peroration: “Hauptzeitmaß / l’istesso tempo,” or “Principal tempo, the same tempo.” Yet in the recording he takes a quite fast tempo at that very measure 453, presumably holding that very piece of paper in his hand, a tempo which he had not previously reached in the movement. Of course this could represent the cumulative effect, on one man over many years, of many conductors like Jochum who liked to conduct the coda at a speed not previously encountered in the movement. And he did not get as fast as Jochum did.

Other notes, on the specific performances in the table: Jochum’s coda is very fast; his B theme is very slow. Andreae, Heger, and Tintner all take the ritenutos in the B theme very deeply. In defiance of Schalk’s admonition to get slower, Zander accelerates to measure 324, near the end of the development. It is an odd effect, but very exciting.
Bruckner: Symphony no. 5
I (Kopfsatz)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m1 (scale)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0:04</td>
<td>0:01</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m2 (fanfare)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1:27</td>
<td>0:55</td>
<td>0:58</td>
<td>0:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m3 (chorale, brass)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1:39</td>
<td>1:04</td>
<td>1:08</td>
<td>1:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m4 (strings)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2:31</td>
<td>1:49</td>
<td>1:56</td>
<td>1:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loud A major chords</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2:50</td>
<td>2:07</td>
<td>2:15</td>
<td>1:57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exposition

| a | 51 | 3:24 | 2:29 | 2:44 | 2:22 | 2:50 |
| B (F minor) | 101 | 4:52 | 3:56 | 4:16 | 3:57 | 4:14 |
| C (D-flat) | 161 | 8:15 | 6:23 | 6:52 | 6:39 | 6:45 |
| Ck (B-flat) | 199 | 9:41 | 7:38 | 8:20 | 8:05 | 7:59 |
| K | 209 | 10:01 | 7:57 | 8:43 | 8:28 | 8:18 |

Development

| induction | 225 | 10:38 | 8:30 | 9:26 | 9:06 | 8:55 |
| m1 (scale) | 237 | 11:13 | 8:57 | 9:57 | 9:39 | 9:26 |
| m2 (fanfare) | 241 | 11:35 | 9:10 | 10:14 | 9:53 | 9:44 |
| A (contrapuntal) | 261 | 12:51 | 10:00 | 11:26 | 10:49 | 10:54 |
| A, m2 (contrapuntal) | 283 | 13:27 | 10:34 | 12:05 | 11:36 | 11:31 |
| m2 (contrapuntal) | 303 | 14:01 | 11:11 | 12:45 | 12:18 | 12:05 |
| m3 (chorale, brass) | 338 | 15:13 | 12:28 | 14:05 | 13:33 | 13:16 |

Recapitulation

| A (loud) | 363 | 16:13 | 13:22 | 14:59 | 14:23 | 14:11 |
| B (G minor) | 381 | 16:46 | 13:52 | 15:31 | 15:01 | 14:43 |
| C (E-flat) | 429 | 18:58 | 15:48 | 17:22 | 17:08 | 16:33 |
| Ck (E-flat) | 441 | 19:33 | 16:20 | 17:57 | 17:45 | 17:03 |

Coda

| A (B-flat minor) | 455 | 19:56 | 16:45 | 18:26 | 18:15 | 17:26 |
| A, m2 | 477 | 20:25 | 17:24 | 19:03 | 19:00 | 17:59 |
| peroration (B-flat major) | 493 | 20:47 | 17:54 | 19:31 | 19:33 | 18:25 |
| end | 511 | 21:11 | 18:26 | 20:03 | 20:11 | 18:55 |

Notes on the adagio

In the B theme of parts 2 and 4, all performances speed up when the eighth-note ostinato chords appear except Tintner’s. In fact Heger writes into his score, “eine Spur fließender wegen der Hörner” (a bit more flowing for the sake of the horns). None of our five conductors uses the later ending from Mus.Hs. 36.693.

In sharp contrast to the usual modern conceptions of uniformity and quietude for this movement, best embodied in these five performances by Tintner who keeps his horses under strict rein, are a number of early performances, including particularly those of Furtwängler, 1942 and 1951, and conceptually including Böhm 1937, Abendroth 1949, the Jochum brothers in 1938 and 1944, Andreae 1953, Richard Burgin 1959 (from the Schalk score), and perhaps Knappertsbusch 1959. All of these performances contain in one way or another a great acceleration in part 3 of the adagio, beginning long before Schalk’s mild suggestion of poco a poco accel. at measure 98. The effect, particularly when it is underlined by Schalk’s addition of brass and timpani in 95 and 96, is hair-raising. In all of these cases the tempo is substantially faster than at the already high levels of measure 93. Furtwängler exceeds quarter note = 80 at this point, and Burgin nearly reaches 100, which is almost unbelievable. It makes all of part 3 seem like an independent tone poem, though by starting at the basic tempo at the beginning, and returning to that tempo at the end, these wild excursions still remain in logical continuity with the rest of the movement.
The early style, that of Furtwängler and so many of his contemporaries including Burgin, does not stem from notations in Schalk’s score, except from his lone request for an acceleration late in part 3 at measure 98, far later that the place where a real climax must begin. This style seems instead to be either Furtwängler’s own, assuming the others are consciously imitating him, or, more likely, a common witness from the pre-Haas days of a method of rendering this movement in an emotionally gripping manner through tempo fluctuations. Today, with so much information from the early period not generally available, an excessively slow or uniform interpretation can be seen as an expression of the “Urtext” mentality, which says that if there is no direction in the original source or the score at hand to do something, nothing should be done. But we all know that in the area where Urtexts have been most influential and most beneficial, that of baroque and early music, a very great deal has to be done which is not written down, including the most basic determination of tempos. In the first movement of the Fifth, the Collected Edition score, presumably an Urtext, has no indication to take the B theme slower than the A theme. But it is simply not successful to take the B theme at the speed of the A theme, even though only in the Schalk score is there such an indication. Ideologues have averred that Schalk’s tempo designations are perversions of Bruckner’s intent. But people who actually listen to the music realize that a tempo change must be made, and thus the tempo and indeed dynamical excursions we hear in these early performances cannot be rejected on theoretical grounds.

II: Adagio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1 0:01</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>string melody</td>
<td>19 2:00</td>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>1:18</td>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>1:16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 2</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>“die schöne Stelle”</th>
<th>climax (A-flat major)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>2:09</td>
<td>2:03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2:55</td>
<td>3:03</td>
<td>3:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>4:13</td>
<td>4:19</td>
<td>4:28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 3</th>
<th>A (loud)</th>
<th>quiet transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>5:31</td>
<td>5:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:26</td>
<td>6:11</td>
<td>7:02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 4</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>“die göttliche Stelle”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>6:32</td>
<td>7:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>7:11</td>
<td>8:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>8:41</td>
<td>9:40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 5</th>
<th>A (decorated)</th>
<th>climax 1 (E major)</th>
<th>climax 2</th>
<th>quiet (D-flat major)</th>
<th>climax 3 (F major)</th>
<th>climax 4 (D minor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>196½</td>
<td>12:49</td>
<td>14:14</td>
<td>14:45</td>
<td>14:24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coda</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>A (horn)</th>
<th>end</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>13:22</td>
<td>14:54</td>
<td>15:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>15:04</td>
<td>15:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>13:58</td>
<td>15:44</td>
<td>16:15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes on the scherzo

Jochum is wonderfully fast, even with the murky recording. Andreae takes a deliberate but vigorous tempo for the main scherzo, and his trio tempo is so slow that the clarinet riff at measure 63 actually sounds melodic. Heger, after beginning the second section of the development (m. 289) at an appropriately slow tempo, moves to a faster one at 205, writing in his score: “eine Spur bewegter / (neues tempo) / und so bleiben / bis Takt 239”, that is, “a touch faster (new tempo), remaining that way until measure 239”. None of the other four conductors do this, but I have heard it elsewhere. Then at the end of the trio, he takes a substantial ritardando in the last four bars. The score marks off measures 143 and 144 as a two-bar group and 145-148 as a final four-bar group with calando above the staff. And that is how he played it. Neither of these actions is called for in either the Collected Edition or the Schalk score.
III: Scherzo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0:04</td>
<td>0:02</td>
<td>0:01</td>
<td>0:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0:18</td>
<td>0:18</td>
<td>0:17</td>
<td>0:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accelerando</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0:46</td>
<td>0:49</td>
<td>0:50</td>
<td>0:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0:58</td>
<td>1:02</td>
<td>1:02</td>
<td>1:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>1:27</td>
<td>1:27</td>
<td>1:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fast</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1:43</td>
<td>1:57</td>
<td>1:55</td>
<td>2:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slow</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2:21</td>
<td>2:40</td>
<td>2:38</td>
<td>2:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>205</td>
<td>2:39</td>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>2:58</td>
<td>3:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recapitulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>3:23</td>
<td>3:49</td>
<td>3:35</td>
<td>3:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>3:25</td>
<td>3:51</td>
<td>3:37</td>
<td>3:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>3:38</td>
<td>4:07</td>
<td>3:52</td>
<td>4:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accelerando</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>4:05</td>
<td>4:36</td>
<td>4:22</td>
<td>4:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>4:17</td>
<td>4:49</td>
<td>4:35</td>
<td>4:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>4:38</td>
<td>5:14</td>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>5:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>5:02</td>
<td>5:45</td>
<td>5:30</td>
<td>5:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5:04</td>
<td>5:49</td>
<td>5:33</td>
<td>6:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5:45</td>
<td>6:46</td>
<td>6:16</td>
<td>6:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6:10</td>
<td>7:18</td>
<td>6:42</td>
<td>7:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>6:56</td>
<td>8:20</td>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>8:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposition (scherzo da capo)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6:58</td>
<td>8:24</td>
<td>7:37</td>
<td>8:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>8:26</td>
<td>7:38</td>
<td>8:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7:13</td>
<td>8:42</td>
<td>7:53</td>
<td>8:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accelerando</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7:42</td>
<td>9:14</td>
<td>8:26</td>
<td>8:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7:53</td>
<td>9:26</td>
<td>8:38</td>
<td>9:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8:15</td>
<td>9:52</td>
<td>9:03</td>
<td>9:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fast</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>8:39</td>
<td>10:21</td>
<td>9:31</td>
<td>10:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slow</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>11:05</td>
<td>10:14</td>
<td>10:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>205</td>
<td>9:34</td>
<td>11:25</td>
<td>10:34</td>
<td>11:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recapitulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>10:17</td>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>11:11</td>
<td>11:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>10:19</td>
<td>12:17</td>
<td>11:12</td>
<td>12:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>10:33</td>
<td>12:32</td>
<td>11:28</td>
<td>12:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accelerando</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>10:59</td>
<td>13:01</td>
<td>11:58</td>
<td>12:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>11:11</td>
<td>13:14</td>
<td>12:11</td>
<td>13:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>11:57</td>
<td>14:08</td>
<td>13:06</td>
<td>14:03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes on the finale**

Here Heger gives us plenty to talk about. In the Gesangsperiode, both the CE and Schalk scores ask the interpreter to slow down for the B2 theme at measure 83; the CE score writes *Etwas mehr langsam* (which probably means “somewhat more slowly”). Most people do that, especially Andreae whose B1 is fleet and elfin. But not Heger, who writes in his score, “*animato, sehr ausdrucksvoll* Löwe” and keeps charging along. Schalk (not Löwe, of course) writes *Etwas breiter* (“somewhat broader”) above the staff, and *ausdrucksvoll* (“full of expression”) only in the horn and viola parts where the melody lies. Heger doesn’t really follow these instructions, but his reading is eloquent in its way.
The next thing he does is cut eighty measures of the fugue, from 270, the joint entrance of A and the chorale, to 350, the last and most dramatic of the strettos before the dominant preparation. It isn’t as bad as cutting the 104 Measures from 270 to 374, as the CE score unwisely suggests, which would eliminate the dominant preparation too. Heger marked his cut in his score with vi-de in red pencil. But copious annotations and abraded pages in the intervening material show that he did not always take the cut. The movement is quite a bit better with no cuts.

There are some other adjustments as documented in his score. By far the greatest of these is his addition of three E-flat trumpets and three trombones in measures 583 through 615, that is, the peroration of the chorale. These are not Schalk’s parts, but Heger’s own. The trumpet parts go up to concert C-flat, and the added high concert B-flat at 614 sounds out with the incisive, nasal Franco-Russian style popular in Denmark at that time. This performance is really worth hearing. It is a product of a different mentality than ours, a mentality that deletes the intellectual core of the movement and gilds the lily at the end. Still, it has its own voice for which we must find some degree of acceptance. Some would say that Haas’s crimes against the Second and the Eighth were far worse.

All of these performances are excellent, and the Andreae is a real discovery, along with the rest of his restored cycle. But Zander’s bold interpretations and swashbuckling fugue set a new standard for this symphony. From this distinguished Mahler interpreter, we need to hear more Bruckner.

### IV: Finale

**Introduction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jochum</th>
<th>Andreae</th>
<th>Heger</th>
<th>Tintner</th>
<th>Zander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st movt. descending scale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0:01</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:01</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st movt. theme (FMT)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0:56</td>
<td>0:44</td>
<td>0:44</td>
<td>0:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd movt.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>1:07</td>
<td>1:09</td>
<td>1:06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exposition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jochum</th>
<th>Andreae</th>
<th>Heger</th>
<th>Tintner</th>
<th>Zander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (Fugue 1, exposition)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1:52</td>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>1:36</td>
<td>1:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4:07</td>
<td>3:34</td>
<td>4:11</td>
<td>4:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mini-chorale</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>5:04</td>
<td>4:26</td>
<td>5:18</td>
<td>5:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk(B2)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>5:24</td>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>5:41</td>
<td>5:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C(B2)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>5:54</td>
<td>5:13</td>
<td>6:15</td>
<td>5:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chorale (K)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>6:59</td>
<td>6:11</td>
<td>7:22</td>
<td>7:18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jochum</th>
<th>Andreae</th>
<th>Heger</th>
<th>Tintner</th>
<th>Zander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>induction</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>9:24</td>
<td>7:53</td>
<td>08:57</td>
<td>9:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugue 2 on chorale</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>9:58</td>
<td>8:26</td>
<td>9:27</td>
<td>9:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugue 3A on A and chorale</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>11:34</td>
<td>10:06</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stretto 12</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>11:06</td>
<td>14:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugue 3C: sequence &amp; dom. prep.</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>14:07</td>
<td>12:38</td>
<td>11:14</td>
<td>14:34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recapitulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jochum</th>
<th>Andreae</th>
<th>Heger</th>
<th>Tintner</th>
<th>Zander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>16:15</td>
<td>14:39</td>
<td>13:36</td>
<td>17:03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>16:40</td>
<td>15:05</td>
<td>14:05</td>
<td>17:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>17:23</td>
<td>15:46</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>18:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (&quot;Fugue&quot; 4)</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>17:59</td>
<td>16:19</td>
<td>15:44</td>
<td>19:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMT</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>18:02</td>
<td>16:22</td>
<td>15:48</td>
<td>19:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm of A</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>18:05</td>
<td>16:25</td>
<td>15:51</td>
<td>19:14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coda**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jochum</th>
<th>Andreae</th>
<th>Heger</th>
<th>Tintner</th>
<th>Zander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A and C</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>18:57</td>
<td>17:16</td>
<td>16:49</td>
<td>20:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMT</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>19:12</td>
<td>17:35</td>
<td>17:07</td>
<td>20:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A and FMT</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>19:28</td>
<td>17:48</td>
<td>17:21</td>
<td>21:03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Heitor Gonçalves has written to inform *The Bruckner Journal* of an on-going Bruckner cycle in Brazil, that takes place in Teatro Municipal de Santo André, part of the metropolitan region of São Paolo. The Municipal Orchestra of Santo André, conducted by Carlos Eduardo Moreno, have been performing all the symphonies and will include the Te Deum. They did magnificent work in 2010 with the 1st, 2nd and 5th symphonies. Concerts in 2011 included the 8th symphony preceded by Mozart’s piano concerto, K467 (26, 27 March); the 6th symphony coupled with Sibelius Violin Concerto (30 April, 1 May). On 25, 26 June Bruckner’s 9th symphony is played in a concert with Vaughan Williams Tuba Concerto, and on 24, 25 September Bruckner’s 3rd follows a performance of Bach Toccata and Fugue BWV 565, arr. Zangheri. The Te Deum will be performed on 10, 11 December. The 4th and 7th symphonies remain to be performed in 2012.

**Corrections** - Vol 15, no. 1, March 2011

Bruckner Symphony No. 8 “Renewal Version” ed. Takanobu Kawasaki, that was reported due to be performed on 26 March 2011 the Tokyo New City Orchestra, conducted by Akira Naito, was postponed following the earthquake and tsunami that devastated part of Japan. This performance has now been rescheduled for 5 September 2011 - see concert listings page 43.

In the first concert review, of a concert in Pershore Abbey, 20 Nov. 2010 the works performed were omitted from the heading. They were: Vaughan Williams – Fantasia of a theme by Thomas Tallis and Bruckner – Symphony No. 4. The performers were Cheltenham Symphony Orchestra / David Curtis. Apologies for this omission.
Bruckner in the Tabloid Press

Thanks to Stephen Pearsall for this from the *The Daily Mirror*, 15 January 2011, in which their travel writer, Andy Stenning, under the heading “Time Off in Lu”, has headed to Engelberg in the Titlis Mountains to ski. But he can’t do that because the winds are too high, so the unfortunate journalist is obliged to go to the Lucerne Festival to find something to tell his readers. On a wee thumbnail picture of the interior of the Lucerne Culture and Convention Centre is a ‘speech bubble’: “I’m no expert but Bruckner’s 4th Symphony was an incredible musical experience”. In the main text he writes, “I’m no expert but the sound quality of Bruckner’s 4th Symphony was an incredible musical experience. The romantic music conjured up images of the mountains and valleys and as I closed my eyes I could almost see myself on the mountain slopes.” So HE was impressed - maybe some of his readers were able to save themselves the expense of the trip and avail themselves of Claudio Abbado’s much-lauded Lucerne Festival Orchestra recording.

Less likely to encourage the readership to learn about and appreciate the music of Bruckner was a cartoon strip “MEANWHILE”, sent in by Florence Bishop, which appeared in the *The Daily Mail* in March 2011. A man is shown sat in a chair, loudspeaker in background, a woman, presumably ‘the wife’, leans over the back of his chair.

Box 1: Wife: WHAT ARE YOU LISTENING TO? Man: BRUCKNER’S NINTH SYMPHONY
Box 2: Wife: HE WROTE NINE OF THESE!? Man: HARD TO BELIEVE, ISN’T IT?
Box 3: Wife: WHY DIDN’T HE GET IT RIGHT THE FIRST TIME!

Maybe the real joke here is that most of the readership wouldn’t know that Bruckner was an inveterate reviser, and that the wife’s closing comment does indeed raise an interesting question…

Letter to the editor

Dear Sir

Österreichische Musikzeitschrift (ÖMZ) Special Edition: Music in the Danube Region

This month I received a copy of the above booklet with the compliments of the Austrian Embassy in Malta. The booklet includes four articles on music and the Danube region, as well as one-page statements from the countries of the Danube region on their recent national music developments. The publication is extremely interesting and I think it helps a lot to promote European and international music cultural policy.

In the Foreword by Dr Martin Eichtinger, Director of Cultural Policy at the Austrian Ministry of European and International Affairs, reference is made, amongst others, to Anton Bruckner within the context of the immense contribution of the Danube region to European music history. The pertinent extract reads as follows:

‘One needs only recall the European Franz Liszt - whose 200th birthday we are celebrating this year - the Classicist Joseph Haydn, the Romantic Anton Bruckner or the classical modernist Gustav Mahler. Scarcely any other region in the world has produced so much high musical culture, very often inspired by a living folk tradition.’

With best regards

Martin E Spiteri
Director, Malta Customs Department - 12 May 2011

Martin Spiteri delivered a short presentation followed by a screening of a video of Takashi Asahina’ performance of Bruckner’s 8th from 1993. The response was ‘fantastic’ from the 40 or so people who attended in the 16th century main hall of the German-Maltese Circle’s Messina Palace. Martin reports, “They were all amazed by Bruckner’s music.”
Bruckner Concerts Worldwide
A selected listing from 1 July – early November 2011

Considerable effort is made to ensure this information is correct, but total accuracy cannot be guaranteed: advice is to check with the venue for confirmation.

AUSTRALIA
15 July 8 pm, Brisbane, QPAC Concert Hall +61 73840 7478
Beethoven - Piano Concerto No. 2  
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Queensland Symphony Orchestra / Johannes Fritzsch

2 July 6 pm  St Florian, nr Linz +43 (0)732 77 61 27
Bruckner - Psalm 112  
Bruckner - Symphony No.3 (1887/8)
Bruckner Orchester Linz / Dennis Russell Davies

7 July 7 pm, Erl, Passionsspielhaus, +43 (0)51257 888813
Lampson - Passacaglia  
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Tyrol Festival Orchestra / Gustav Kuhn

6 Aug 8 pm, Grafenegg, Wolkenturm +43 (02735 5500
Janacek - Sinfonietta  
Bruckner - Symphony No 4
European Union Youth Orchestra / Jaap van Zweden

BrucknerTage 14-18 Aug St Florian
inc. Wed 17, 8 pm
Bruckner - Symphony No 4 (arr. 4 hands)
Klaus Laczikza pf; Matthias Giesen pf.
Thurs 18, 8 pm
Bruckner Improvised - Jazz Concert
Christian Mühlbacher and friends.
Fri. 19, 8 pm
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Salzburg Youth Philharmonic / Remy Ballot

29 Aug 8:30 pm Salzburg, Grotes Festspielhaus, +43 662 840310
Britten - Nocturne, Op 60 (Ian Bostridge)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Berlin Philharmonic / Sir Simon Rattle.

7 Sep 7.30 pm Vienna: Musikverein +43 1505 8190
Bruckner - Symphony No 8
Staatskapelle Dresden / Marek Janowski

15 Sep 7.30, Linz, Brucknerhaus +43 (0)732 775230
Mendelssohn - String quartet VII, fragment
Dallinger - Quintet for Accordion and String Quartet
Bruckner - String Quintet
Ambassador Quartet, Alfred Melichar

16 Sep 7.30 St Florian
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Gewandhaus Orchester Leipzig / Riccardo Chailly

18 Sep 7:30 Linz, Brucknerhaus +43 (0)732 775230
Bruckner VIII
Ohad Talmor Ensemble Mass Transformation
Featuring the String Quartet

21 Sept 7.30 Linz, Alter Dom +43 (0)732 775230
Bruckner - Vocal Works, part III
Dür Herr in A major  
O Du liebes Jesukind  
Herz - Jesu
In jener letzten der Nächte (i) solo voice, choir (ii) mixed choir
Ave Maria for solo voice and piano
O, die ihr heut mit mir zu Grabe geht  
Frühlingslied
Wie bist du Frühling  
Im April
Festgesang: St. Judok spross aus edlem Stamme
Du bist der Vater deiner Herde  
Du pflegst das Herz
Nicht minder pflegt dich edles Wissen
So sei denn Gott auf deinen Wegen  
Herbstkummer
Mein Herz und deine Stimme
Magnificat
Soloists and Orchestra of the Anton Bruckner Privatuniversitat / 
Thomas Kerbl / Robert Holzer, bass

24 Sept 2.30 pm Traunreut Kulturzentrum
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Junge Philharmonie Salzburg / Remy Ballot

30 Sep 7.30pm St Florian nr Linz +43 (0)732 77 61 27
Bruckner - Symphony No. 2 (1872)
Bruckner Orchester Linz / Dennis Russell Davies

4 Oct 8pm Innsbruck, Congress +43 512 59360
7, 8 Oct 7.30pm Vienna: Musikverein +43 1505 8190
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
hr-Sinfonieorchester / Paavo Järvi

BELGIUM
19 Oct 8pm Gent, de Bijloke Concertzaal +32 (0)9269 9292
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3, arr Mahler, Krzyzanowski
Reger - Introduction, Passacaglia and Fugue for 2 pianos
Mozart - Adagio K546, Fugue in b minor, K 426
Geoffrey Madge. Daan Vandewalle, pianos.

BRASIL
22 Sep 8pm Antwerp, deSingel +32 (0)3 248 2828
Dvorak - Cello Concerto  
Bruckner - Symphony No.7
Rotterdam Philharmonic Orchestra / Yannick Nézet-Séguin
24, 25 Sept. 8 pm Santo Andre, Municipal Theatre
Bruckner - Symphony No.3
Bach (arr Zangheri) - Toccata and Fugue, D minor
Orquestra Sinfonica de Santo Andre / Carlos Eduardo Moreno (part of 
a continuing Bruckner Symphony cycle & Te Deum on 10, 11 Dec)

DENMARK
24 Sep 7.30pm Copenhagen, Konzerthuset, DR Byen +45 3520 6262
Mozart - Piano Concerto 21  
Bruckner - Symphony No 7
Danish National Symphony Orchestra / Nikolaj Znaider

CZECH REPUBLIC
24 Sep 8pm Prague, Rudolfinum +42 (0)227 059 352
Dvorak - Cello Concerto  
Bruckner - Symphony No.7
Rotterdam Philharmonic Orchestra / Yannick Nézet-Séguin
8 Oct 7.30pm Prague, Rudolfinum +42 (0)227 059 352
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
hr-Sinfonieorchester / Paavo Järvi

FINLAND
16 Sept 7pm, Helsinki, Musiikkitalo
Mozart - Symphony No. 36 „Linz”  
Bruckner - Symphony No 7
Finish Radio Symphony Orchestra / Kurt Masur

FRANCE
3 July 5pm Colmar, Eglise Saint Mathieu + 33 (0)3 8920 6897
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Radio Symphonie Orchester Berlin / Marek Janowski
23 Sep 8pm Paris: Salle Pleyel +33 (0)14256 1313
Mozart - Oboe Concerto K314  
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Orchestre Philharmonique de Radio France / Myung-Whun Chung
8 Oct 9pm Paris: Salle Pleyel +33 (0)14256 1313
Mozart - Symphony No. 35 „Haffner”  
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Lucerne Festival Orchestra / Claudio Abbado
24 Oct 8 pm Paris: Salle Pleyel +33 (0)14256 1313
Brahms - Begräbnisgesang op 13  
Stravinsky - Symphony of Psalms
Bruckner - Mass No. 2 in E minor
Monteverdi Choir
Orchestre Revolutionnaire et Romantique / John Eliot Gardiner
25 Nov. 8 pm Paris: Salle Pleyel +33 (0)14256 1313
Straus - Four Last Songs  Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Orchestre Philharmonique de Radio France / Myung-Whun Chung

GERMANY
7 July 8 pm Erl, Passionsspielhaus  Bruckner - Symphony No 4
Orchester der Tiroler Festspiele / Gustav Kuhn

7 July 7 pm Eltville im Rheingau, Kloster Eberbach  Bruckner - Symphony No4

Wagner - Siegried Idyl, Bruckner - Symphony No.9
WDR Symphony Orchestra Köln / Eliahu Inbal

10 July 7 pm Wies, Wieskirche +49 (0) 611 7949680

Bruch – Violin Concerto No. 1  Bruckner – Symphony No. 7
Members of the Munich Philharmonic / Joseph Kräus

Ebracher Musiksommer in Ebrach Abbey
29 July 7 pm  +49(0) 9552 2 97
Bruckner - Symphony No.1 (1866, Carragan)
30 July 5 pm  Bruckner - Symphony No.2 (1872, Carragan)
31 July 5 pm  Bruckner - Symphony No.3 (1874(4) Carragan)
Philharmonie Festiva / Gerd Schaller

2 Aug, 8pm Trier, Konstantin-Basilika, +49 (0)651 9941188
Ravel - Pavane pour une Infante defunte
Mendelssohn - Organ Sonata No.3 (Mira Cieslak, Organ)
Liszt - Prelude and Fugue on B-A-C-H
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Landesjugendorchester Rheinland-Pfalz / Daniel Beyer

4, 5 Aug 8 pm, Bayreuth, Katholische Schlosskirche
Liszt - Symphonic Poem “Festklänge”  Bruckner - Mass No. 1
Choir, Orchester, Soloists, Conductor not known.

7 Aug, 5pm, Landau, Jugendstil-Festhalle +49 (0)6341 13120
Ravel - Pavane pour une Infante defunte
Mahler - Kindertotenlieder  Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Landesjugendorchester Rheinland-Pfalz / Daniel Beyer

28,29 Aug. Darmstadt, Staatstheater +49 6151 2811600  Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
J S Bach - Suite in C, BWV 1066  Pärt - Fratres
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Orchester des Staatstheaters Darmstadt, / Constantin Trinks

4 Sep 7:30 Schneeberg (Saxony), St. Wolfgang +49 (0)341 141414414
Bruckner - Mass No. 2 in E minor
Debussy - Prélude à l’après-midi d’un faune
Poulenc - Gloria
MDR Symphony Orchestra and Radio Choir / Karl-Heinz Steffens

6 Sep, Essen, Philharmonie +49 (0)2018122 8801  Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Staatstheater Dresden / Christian Thielemann

8, 9 Sep 8pm Leipzig Gewandhaus +49(0)341 1270 280  Wagner - Tannhäuser Overture and Bacchanal
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchestra / Riccardo Chailly

15 Sep 8pm, 18 Sep 11am, Hamburg, Laeiszhalle, +49 (0)4034 6920  M. Haydn - Missa Quadragesimalis
Bruckner - Requiem  Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
North German Radio Orchestra and Choir / Thomas Hengelbrock
Part of a Bruckner Cycle in memory of Günter Wand

25 Sep 8pm Nürnberg, Münchnerhalle +49 (0)911 2314000 28 Sep 8 pm Hamburg, Laeiszhalle, +49 (0)4034 6920
1 Oct. 8 pm Dortmund, Konzerthaus +49 231 22696 200
Mozart - Violin Concerto No. 3  Bruckner - Symphony No. 8 (ed Haas)
Rotterdam Philharmonic Orchestra / Yannick Nézet-Séguin

26 Sep 8 pm Freiburg im Breisgau, Konzerthaus +49 (0)761 38 81552 27 Sep 8pm Frankfurt am Main, Alter Oper +49 (0) 6913 40400
4 Oct 8 pm München Philharmonie im Gasteig, +49 (0)89/54 818181
Dvorak - Cello Concerto  Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Rotterdam Philharmonic Orchestra / Yannick Nézet-Séguin

30 Sep, 8pm Bonn, Beethovenhalle, +49 (0)2221 30 1310
Dvorak - Cello Concerto  Bruckner - Symphony No. 8 (Haas)
Rotterdam Philharmonic Orchestra / Yannick Nézet-Séguin

29, 30 Sep 8 pm Frankfurt am Main, Alter Oper +49 (0) 6913 40400
Liszt – Piano Concerto No. 2  Bruckner - Symphony No.8
hr-Sinfonieorchester / Paavo Järvi

2 Oct, 6pm Cologne Philharmonie +49 (0)221 280 280
Mozart - Violin Concerto No. 3  Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Rotterdam Philharmonic Orchestra / Yannick Nézet-Séguin

4 Oct 8 pm, Puchheim, Basilika Maria  Bruckner - Symphony No 2 (1872)
Bruckner Orchester Linz / Dennis Russell Davies

6 Oct. Baden Baden, Festspielhaus +49 (0)7221 30 13101
Mozart - Symphony No. 35 “Haffner”  Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Lucerne Festival Orchestra / Claudio Abbado

8 Oct 4pm, 9 Oct 8pm Berlin, Philharmonie +49 (0)30254 88999
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Deutsches Symphonie-Orchester Berlin / Herbert Blomstedt

24 Oct, 7pm , Berlin, Philharmonie +49 (0)30254 88999
Concert celebrates the 10th anniversary of the Jewish Museum, Berlin.
Bruckner - Symphony No.7
Staatstheater Berlin / Daniel Barenboim

27, 28, 29 Oct 8pm, Berlin, Konzerthaus +49 (0)30 203092101
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Konzerthausorchester Berlin / Mario Venzago

30 Oct 8 pm Bayreuth, Katholisches Schlosskirche
Liszt - Pater noster for Choir and Organ
Klose - Prelude, double fugue, chorale on a theme by Anton Bruckner

Bruckner - Mass No. 2
Weimar Music High School wind ensemble, chamber choir
Evangelical Sacred Music High School Bayreuth Studio Choir, Torsten Laux, organ;

24, 25 Nov. Leipzig Gewandhaus +49(0)341 1270 280  Berg - Violin Concerto  Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchestra / Herbert Blomstedt

ITALY
4 Aug 8.30pm Bressanone Cathedral, (Brixner Dom)
5 Aug 6.30pm Toblach, Kulturzentrum +39 (0)474 976 151
Ravel - Pavane pour une Infante defunte
Mahler - Kindertotenlieder  Bruckner - Symphony No.4
Landesjugendorchester Rheinland-Pfalz / Daniel Beyer

JAPAN
18 July 6pm, Tokyo Opera City +81 3 5353 9999
19 July 7pm, Tokyo Suntory Hall +81 3 3584 9999
Hindemith - Flying Dutchman, parody for string quartet (arr. Tatsuya Shimono for string orchestra)
Hindemith - Concerto for Orchestra

Bruckner - Symphony No.4
Yomiuri Nippon SO / Tatsuya Shimono

5 Sep 7pm Tokyo Bunka Kaikan +81 3 38220727
Sato - Burbure (first performance - conducted by Daisuke Soga)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8 (1890, with “Adagio 2”, newly corrected
and revised from original manuscript sources by Takano Kawasakri)
Tokyo New City Orchestra / Akira Naito
20, 21 Sep 7pm, Osaka, Symphony Hall +81 (0)6 64536000
Bach (arr Berio) - Contrapunctus XIV, from The Art of Fugue
Boccherini (arr Berio) - 4 Versiones de la "Ritirata Notturna di Madrid"
Bergen Philharmonic Orchestra / Andrew Manze
Bruckner - Symphony No. 2
Osaka Philharmonic / Tatsuya Shimono
30 Sep 7pm Tokyo Bunka Kaikan +81 3 38220727
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Bruckner - Te Deum
Bayerisches Staatsorchester / Kent Nagano

NETHERLANDS
9 Aug 8:15pm Amsterdams, Concertgebouw +31 (0)20 6718345
Janacek - Sinfonietta
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
European Union Youth Orchestra / Jaap van Zweden
26 Aug 8:15pm Amsterdams, Concertgebouw +31 (0)20 6718345
Mozart - Piano Concerto K 503
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Netherlands Radio Philharmonic / Jaap van Zweden
15 Oct, 8:30pm Breda, Chassé Theater
16 Oct 2:15pm Eindhoven, Frits Philips Hall, +31 (0)40 244 2020
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9 (with Finale, SPCM 2010)
Het Brabant Orkest / Friedemann Layer
27, 28 Oct 8:15pm Delft, Raamstraatkerk
Bruckner - Requiem
Britten - The Company of Heaven
Randstedeik Begeleidings Orkest / Johan Sonneveld

NORWAY
15 Sep 7:30pm Bergen, Grieghallen +47 5521 6150
16 Sep 7:30pm Haugesund, Fartein Valen Festival
Valen - Piano Concerto
Mozart - Piano Concerto K453
Bergen Philharmonic Orchestra / Andrew Manze

ROMANIA
13 Sep 7:30, Bucharest, Palace Grand Hall +40 (0)730 240 249
Mozart - Piano Concerto K491
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Staatskapelle Berlin / Daniel Barenboim

SWITZERLAND
19 Aug 7:30pm Luzern, Kultur- & Kongresszentrum +41 41226 7777
Mozart - Symphony No. 35
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Lucerne Festival Orchestra / Claudio Abbado
19 Aug 10pm Lucerne, Luzerner Theater +41 41 228 14 14
Strauss - Sextet, Capriccio
Glass - String Quartet No. 5
Bruckner - String Quintet
Soloists of the Mahler Chamber Orchestra
20 Aug 6:30pm Luzern, Kultur- & Kongresszentrum +41 41226 7777
Mozart - Recitatives and Arias - K369, K272, K418 (C. Schäffer)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Lucerne Festival Orchestra / Claudio Abbado
1 Sep 7:30pm Luzern, Kultur- & Kongresszentrum +41 41226 7777
Britten - Nocturne
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Berlin Philharmonic / Sir Simon Rattle
9 Sep 7:30pm Luzern, Kultur- & Kongresszentrum +41 41226 7777
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Staatskapelle Dresden / Christian Thielemann
15 Sep 7:30pm Luzern, Kultur- & Kongresszentrum +41 41226 7777
Wagner - Tannhäuser Overture and Venusberg Bacchanal
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchestra / Riccardo Chailly
16 Sep 7:30pm Luzern, Kultur- & Kongresszentrum +41 41226 7777
Mozart - Piano Concerto K491
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Staatskapelle Berlin / Daniel Barenboim

THE VATICAN
22 Oct 6pm
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Bruckner - Te Deum
Bavarian State Orchestra / Kent Nagano

UK
2 July 2011 7:30pm, St John’s Church, Waterloo Road, London SE1
Beethoven - Leonora Overture No. 3
Matthew Taylor - Hamor eskes for viola and orchestra
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Sinfonia Tamesa / Matthew Taylor
18 Aug, 7 pm London Royal Albert Hall 0845 401 5040
Larcher - Double Concerto
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
BBC Scottish SO / Ian Volkov
18 Aug. 7.30 Horncastle, St Mary's Church
Lincoln and Lincolnshire Internation Chamber Music Festival
+44 (0)1522 873 894
Works by Bach, Messiaen & Purcell,
Mendelssohn – Variations concertantes Op 17
Bruckner - Quintet
30 Aug 7.30 London, Royal Albert Hall 0845 401 5040
Mozart – Piano Concerto K 503
Bruckner – Symphony No. 8
Netherlands Radio Philharmonic / Jaap van Zweden
10, 11 Oct 7.30 London, Royal Festival Hall 0871 663 2500
Schumann - Piano Concerto (10th Oct);
Mozart - Symphony 35 (11th Oct)
Bruckner - Symphony No 5
Lucerne Festival Orchestra / Claudio Abbado
12 October 7.30 London, Barbican Centre +44 (0)207638 8891
Rachmaninov - Piano Concerto No. 3
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
BBC Symphony Orchestra / Jiri Belohlavek
2 Nov. 7.30 London, Royal Festival Hall 0871 663 2500
Brahms - Double Concerto
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
London Philharmonic Orchestra / Christoph Eschenbach

USA
9 July, Ohio, Cuyahoga Falls, Blossom Center +1 216-231-1111
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Cleveland Orchestra / Franz Welser-Möst
10 July, Ohio, Cuyahoga Falls, Blossom Center +1 216-231-1111
Adams - Violin Concerto
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Cleveland Orchestra / Franz Welser-Möst
July 13 - 17 “BRUCKNER (R)EVOLUTION”
New York, Lincoln Center +1 212 875 5656
July 13 8 pm Adams - A Guide to Strange Places
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
July 14 8pm Adams - Violin Concerto
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
July 16 8pm Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
July 17 2pm Adams - Doctor Atomic Symphony
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Franz Welser-Möst and the Cleveland Orchestra

A recommended web-site for locating
Bruckner (and all other) concerts:
www.bachtrack.com

With gratitude to Mr. Tatsuro Ouchi whose web-site
www.bekkoame.ne.jp/~hippo/musik/konzertvorschau/bruckner.html
is the source for much of the above information
Neue Bruckner Ausgabe
New Bruckner Edition

EDITORIAL BOARD:
Paul Hawkshaw • Thomas Leibnitz • Andreas Lindner
Angela Pachovsky • Thomas Röder

The tradition of the Anton Bruckner Collected Works Edition dates back to the 1930s. A pioneering publication at the outset, it has been revised and expanded piecemeal through the years as practices have changed, sources have been reexamined, and new materials have surfaced.

The International Bruckner Society and the Austrian National Library are now pleased to announce the publication of an entirely new edition of Bruckner’s works. An international panel of Bruckner experts will oversee the preparation of a uniform series of volumes in light of the most up-to-date editorial and performance practices as well as the most recent research.

Leading Bruckner scholars from around the world have been engaged to edit the individual volumes with the practical requirements of performers and scholars in mind.

Overview:
- Each volume will be printed in both full-sized conductor’s score and study score
- Performance parts will be available on a rental basis
- Piano reductions and individual octavo scores will be available for vocal works
- Each volume will contain a detailed Foreword in German and English
- The notation will reflect the most modern standards
- Each volume will contain an Editorial Commentary with essential philological information
- The latest research and editorial standards will be brought to bear on all volumes
- The new edition will have a website with updates and new information

MUSIKWISSENSCHAFTLICHER VERLAG WIEN
www.mww.at