Scholarship and Vandalism

Not many letters and emails are addressed to the editor, and angry ones are indeed a rarity. But one of a few received from those who are unhappy about recent published criticisms of the editorial work of Robert Haas, and of Deryck Cooke and Robert Simpson’s writings about editions, was phrased in such heated passion that it verged upon the libellous. The writer perceives in some of our contributors “incontinent personal dislike” of Cooke, sustained by “repulsive prejudices”, “nauseating views”, they are part of a “Mafia”, an “anti-everyone-else clique” conducting a “vendetta”, to quote just a selection from the ample repertoire of invective employed. This would seem a little intemperate and, given the lack of supporting evidence, unpublishable.

But what it does display is the strength of gratitude, appreciation and emotional attachment there is for the work of those three great Brucknerians, Haas, Cooke and Simpson. They played a large, wonderfully inspiring part in the promotion of Bruckner’s symphonies and those of us whose discovery of Bruckner dates from the post-War years have had our love for the music irretrievably entwined with an understanding conditioned by their writings. That young Siegfrieds should now be approaching with pretensions to shatter the spears of the Gods that built our Brucknerian Valhalla is a scandal; that they should be given space in The Bruckner Journal, the ultimate betrayal.

Before hurling the Journal in the bin, it is worth bearing in mind how much else there is to be found in its pages; but more important is the endeavour to consider the evidence dispassionately. If modern scholarship suggests the possibility of a truer picture of Bruckner and his music than was available to Cooke and Simpson, it is surely to be welcomed, even if that picture at first sight seems like an act of vandalism against the icon preserved since passionate adolescence in a hallowed corner of our beleaguered hearts.
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At the time of going to press there still remain some places available at The Eighth Bruckner Journal Readers Biennial Conference

This is a wonderful opportunity for Brucknerians to meet together in pleasant surroundings, hear papers from leading scholars in the field and from other Bruckner enthusiasts. As with the Journal itself, non-academic music lovers need not be intimidated and can be sure they will find a friendly welcome and much to enjoy, think about and discuss.

Conference papers will cover a variety of topics related to Bruckner, the man and his music, investigating aspects of the symphonies 3, 4, 6 & 8, Bruckner’s personality and relationship with Wagner, symphonies of Egon Wellesz and other topics; speakers to include Abram Chipman, Benjamin Korstvedt, Brian Newbould, Andrea Harrandt, Geoffrey Hosking, Louis Lohraseb, Paul Hawkshaw, Paul Coones and William Carragan. John Berky of abruckner.com has signified his intention to attend the Conference, and the proceedings will conclude with a performance of the 1874 version of symphony No. 4 transcribed by Prof. William Carragan for two pianos, four hands, and performed by William Carragan and Crawford Howie.

The Conference will take place on the evening of Friday 12th and all day Saturday 13th April, at Hertford College, Oxford, at the generous invitation of Dr Paul Coones. The Conference fee is £40.

If you wish to attend, please contact Raymond Cox, tel: 01384 566383 (from outside UK +441384 566383) by post to: 4 Lulworth Close, Halesowen, B63 2UJ, or by email to rymd.cox@gmail.com

For accommodation, there is some available at Hertford College in student accommodation. Enquiries should be addressed to Mr Fatjon Alliaj, +44 (0) 1865 279356. Also, www.oxfordrooms.co.uk is a useful site where rooms can be booked at reasonable rates at some Oxford University Colleges, or contact the Oxford Tourist Information Centre on +44(0)1865 252200, e-mail: tic@oxford.gov.uk, web-site: www.visitoxfordandoxfordshire.com

Donations

Many subscribers making use of PayPal added a small consideration to cover the commission we pay for that facility. This is much appreciated. The Bruckner Journal is also grateful to have received generous donations from:

- David Cheepen - Penzance
- Keith Gifford - London
- Colin Hammond - Radstock
- Gerard Robello - Wilmislow
- Lawrence Tomlinson - Penrith
- Kenneth Cooper - Enfield
- Geoffrey Gill - Worcester Park
- James Larcombe - York
- S David Sandercock - Canvey Island
- Bret McConachie - Michigan, USA

www.abruckner.com

Bruckner Tour of Austria 2013. The proposed date for the tour is September 22nd to October 2nd. The first Bruckner Tour in 2012 was an outstanding success, this is the testimony of those who took part in it. If you think you might be interested in coming along in 2013, fill in the ‘sign up’ form under ‘Latest News!!’ in the Editor’s Section at www.abruckner.com - no obligation, merely to register your interest.

NEW ON www.abruckner.com - Crawford Howie’s book, ‘Anton Bruckner - A Documentary Biography’, published in 2002, is being updated to take account of the increasing amount of new research material. As each chapter is updated it will be available as a PDF at www.abruckner.com. Chapters 1 & 2 are already there. This is a peerless resource for accurate, documented, English-language biographical information about Bruckner, and it's fantastic that it should now be freely available!

Bruckner Society of America - www.abruckner.com is the home site for resurrected Bruckner Society of America. You can find all news about the society’s activities here.

CDs, DVDs, Downloads, Bruckner-related collectibles, Articles, invaluable Links - all this and much more to be found, hosted by John Berky at www.abruckner.com

John Berky plans to attend The Bruckner Journal Readers Conference in April 2013 in Oxford UK. This is your opportunity to meet this renowned Brucknerian!
Anton Bruckner: a non-pathological view on his personality and implications for his approach to the task of composing.

Malcolm Hatfield C. Psychol. A.F.B.Ps.S

THE ORIGINAL version of this talk was given at the Bruckner Journal Readers Conference in April 2010; time constraints curtailed the full paper being given. In view of the interest created at the time and subsequently, and the apparent congruence between some of the ideas expressed and some of the more recent commentary on Bruckner and his work, in particular in relation to his passion for revision of his work, the paper has been amended. To assist clarification, explanation of the concepts is extended.

The author is a UK trained occupational psychologist and amateur musician and Bruckner enthusiast of many years. The ideas expressed arise from a perception that much of what has been written over the years about Bruckner’s personality has been done by non-psychologists and, in the writer’s view, has overly focussed on what may be termed a pathological perspective. This has had consequences which could well be misleading or even essentially erroneous. The attempt here is to show firstly that this ‘pathological’ approach is unnecessary and, secondly, that there are mainstream models from academic psychology which could well get us further down the track of greater understanding, without going into more esoteric and untestable quasi-pathological explanations. In doing so I generally avoid talking about the music as such, because I am not qualified to do so, but will focus instead on what may be seen as the task and indeed the life and career of being a composer in 19th century Vienna.

In this way one separates the content of the musical creativity from non-musical elements of Bruckner’s life such as the decision-making and choices made about what to write, where to write it, how to make enough money to live, what kind of social life might be available. Many years’ experience of studying jobs and tasks in varying organisational and social situations indicates to me that this is a realistic way of proceeding. The academic and theoretical psychological perspective employed is that of the experimental psychology of individual differences. This is non-clinical and indeed the author has no clinical training. The emphasis is on measurement of specific characteristics and the insight one can gain through the combination of these measurable characteristics to develop a more testable model of the behaviours and reaction of different individuals to the demands they face in life. It is my hope that this approach will become clear to readers as the argument develops. It is not the only academic theoretical approach to human personality, but in recent years there has been a coming together of thinking in this area which is now much less fragmented than it was a decade or more ago.

Here are quotations from two late 19th-century composers of symphonies. Both are about the creative process and the problem of form.

“How to interpret those vague feelings, which pass through one during the composition of an instrumental work without reference to any definite subject? A kind of musical shriving of the soul, in which there is an encrustation of material, which flows forth in the notes, just as the lyrical poet pours himself out in verse. Generally speaking, the germ of a future composition comes suddenly and unexpectedly. If the soil is ready, that is to say if the disposition for work, is there, it takes root with extraordinary force and rapidity, shoots up through the earth, puts forth branches, leaves and finally blossoms. But on the other hand, I have always suffered from my want of skill in the management of form. Only after strenuous labour, have I at last succeeded in making the form of my compositions correspond, more or less, with their contents.”

“Listen! There in the house is dancing, and over there lies the master in his coffin - that’s life. It’s what I wanted to show in my Symphony. The polka means the fun and enjoyment of the world and the chorale means its sadness and pain.”

“Please excuse me, Beethoven, if I’ve gone beyond you [...] but I’ve always said that the true artist can work out his own form and then stick to it."

“That Hunslick’s always saying that I’ve no form - no form! I mean, if someone could sound out Herr Doctor to find out what he means by form, well - I think - he wouldn’t be so sure himself. Doesn’t an artist have the right to choose the form for his works that suits him?”

The second group of quotations is of course from Bruckner. What do these statements tell us about the two composers concerned? Some composers are fluent in their verbal expression about what they are trying to do,

1 Watson, Derek Bruckner OUP 1996 p. 84 (from Göllerich - Auer IV/2 p 663)
2 Johnson, Stephen Bruckner Remembered Faber & Faber 1998 p. 160 (from Carl Hruby’s memoirs)
Tchaikovsky included, being the author of the first quotation. Interestingly, it is the supposedly insecure Bruckner who seems the most confident about form. Now it could be argued that a composer is writing music, and this music should contain the meaning within itself, and that if it requires verbal explanation, then it might be more interesting if the composer had chosen to be a writer rather than a symphonist. One rarely asks the novelist to explain what he means by writing a melody! However in Bruckner’s case, there does appear to have been a particular disinclination to express his feelings and emotions, other than in rather direct and seemingly simplistic terms and, not without relevance to understanding his personality, often only after he had spent an evening in the restaurant. In the absence of consistent evidence, commentators have latched onto numerous curious anecdotes, contradictions in behaviour, and his manifest apparent eccentricities and cheerfully made their own interpretations. Examples of contradictions are:

- Intense focus in detail vs. desire to create ever broader structures
- Regarded as great improviser vs. takes months of apparent indecision to produce
- Seen by some as warm, genial vs. “no one made the lives of his friends and admirers more difficult”
- At times chronic insecurity vs. absolute faith in self as composer
- Outwardly a simple man vs. music anything but simple
- Taught that one should master the rules first vs. critical of composers who don’t break rules

So in some senses there is a puzzle here and very strong and often contradictory assertions about Bruckner’s underlying personality have been made by commentators as some form of explanation for the underlying intention and purpose behind his creative art.

Some of these different ideas include Jamie James in *Music of the Spheres* on ‘working out his many neuroses’, Redlich’s ‘sexual inferiority’ complex, the ‘rustic genius’, Derek Watson’s Catholic mysticism of ‘visionary realms finding expression in music’ to Julian Horton’s anankastic personality as a subset of obsessive compulsive disorder. Readers will be aware of numerous others. What are we to make of all of these?

The picture below is an example of the ink blots used in the Rorschach test of personality and motivation.

The principle is that you ask people to say what this ink blot represents. Because the ink blot is such an ambiguous stimulus, it forces the persons concerned to respond in ways which may [or may not] reflect their own personality and motivation - without them necessarily realising what they are revealing. It is an example of what is known as a ‘projective test’, because the individual concerned projects their own feelings and attitudes into what they say. It is my suggestion that in the almost complete absence of anything written or recorded by Bruckner in great detail, but also with the plethora of his reported ambiguous and contradictory behaviours, his whole personality can be seen as a kind of projective test on which the personalities and the motivations of many of his past commentators have been allowed to exercise their imagination. So all of these ideas could well have more to say more about the writers than about Bruckner himself! And indeed the technical scientific reliability of measurement of projective tests such as the Rorschach are poor, so not only is it measuring the wrong thing it is not even likely to be doing that very well.

---
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I don’t like what may be called the ‘received wisdom’ explanations about Bruckner that are often given, and indeed continue to be so given. An example is the introduction to the BBC Prom broadcast of Bruckner’s 6th Symphony in the summer of 2012, that referred in a somewhat condescending way to his difficulties in establishing relationships. Of course the broadcast of the symphony was welcome, but not so welcome was the way the introduction worked to sustain what has become the conventional view. It is almost as if the intention is to prove that Bruckner was slightly crazy or a troubled personality, or simplistically focussed on the Catholic religion, or sexually repressed, or psychologically impaired in some other way. Even the Professor of Psychology at University College London (who introduced the writer to the GAM/DP theory of creativity in the arts to be discussed later) commented on Bruckner, ‘wasn’t he supposed to be rather OCD?’ Others seem happy, for example, to refer to Bruckner’s ‘numerosis’ in relation to his revision and numbering of the bars in his scores; however ‘numerosis’ does not exist as a psychiatric condition, so the use of the word could be interpreted as an attempt to claim understanding through use of a (probably spurious) label.

At a straightforward level this seems unfair, when for example, it does appear that Rossini lived with a high level of depression which prevented him from composing at all for very many years; Schumann was clearly a depressive, breaking down; Wagner ended up as a parody of himself in a flowery silk dressing gown; Tchaikovsky reportedly committed suicide; Beethoven and Brahms hardly could be said to have had successful short or long-term relationships with women; and Berlioz seemed more in love with the idea of love itself and was unable to sustain relationships... but how often are these issues used in general discussions or introductions to their music?

However, my major problem with most of the viewpoints presented about Bruckner’s personality in relation to his work and life are that they tend to demean the man, to enable us to stand above him, to feel that we are in a position to make critical comment about his work on the basis of a supposed (but probably erroneous) understanding. There have been continued criticisms of diagnostic labelling (even when done by experts with people who are alive), as once a diagnostic label is given then everything they do is interpreted as such or through this lens. A classic research example is David L. Rosenhan, “On Being Sane in Insane Places,” Science, Vol. 179 (Jan. 1973), 250-258, whose experiment consisted of sane people faking schizophrenic responses, getting admitted to hospital, and thereafter all of their rational behaviour being interpreted, to a frightening extent, as simply symptoms of their disease, when all were totally sane. The study concluded that ‘existing forms of diagnosis are grossly inadequate in distinguishing those with mental health disorders from those without’.

This is only one study and it does not necessarily imply that all psychiatric diagnoses are unreliable, however the crucial point here is it does show that we all have an inbuilt psychological tendency to interpret behaviour, particularly in uncertainty, through the lens of our predetermined labels. This will apply just as much to the writer of this paper, so it must be a warning to us all. Most academic psychologists are extremely wary of ‘psychobiography’ from a position of scientific evidence, so we need to be extremely careful when looking at a historical figure such as Bruckner.

So let us look briefly at where some of the tendency to pathological labelling comes from. The first is from Freudian psychoanalytic theory, and the second from reference to Obsessive Compulsive disorder, ‘OCD’. This can be quite a minefield in detail, but the aim here is to be brief and ask the reader to at least accept the general theme. Firstly, despite what may still be the popular stereotype, Freud’s ideas and psychoanalysis in general have been only a limited part of mainstream academic psychological thinking and research for the past half-century, because in comparison to Freud’s writings there is now so much detailed experimental psychology and scientifically tested theory about how people perceive, think, decide, and how their attributes differ and how these things can be measured with a level of accuracy. It is however the open-ended and untestable, whilst insightful, nature of Freudian ideas which make it stimulating to use the theory to try and understand the underlying motivation of dead artists. There have been some important ideas, such as that art and creativity gain inspiration from the challenge of reconciling apparently contradicting ideas, emotions and experiences, which I will come back to later. Much of this lies in the domain of what may be termed ‘motivation’, the wellspring of the creative process, what drives people to create what they do. My interest here is less ambitious and less speculative: the fact of Bruckner’s genius in composition is taken for granted; the question being addressed is that of how he chose to manage his life, the choices he made about what to do, how he approached the task of composition, why he reacted in the way in which he did to the things that happened to him.

My view is that the real problem with many Freudian explanations is that whilst Freud was a writer and a theorist, in popular perception he was a clinician, developing understanding of mental illness, and that what
may be termed non-professional discussion of his ideas, not made by psychologists or psychiatrists, easily lurches into a quasi-pathological description of underlying neuroses, ending up with a diagnostic label. And with a label, then it is assumed that there is understanding, such as ‘oh the real problem with Bruckner is that he was OCD’. My argument is that this is absolutely no understanding at all.

Giving someone a label is an illusion, not an explanation. Take ‘numeromania’ as an example. What does it mean beyond the fact that Bruckner liked counting things, and at times, once he got it into his mind that he wanted to know how many there were of something, he could not let it go until he did counted them all? It is not something that can be ‘caught’ or an entity which could be ‘cured’, or which tells us anything else about the man. The questions that might be asked are whether this counting so disrupted his life that he was unable to do anything else, or that his anxiety was so raised that his judgement was compromised. Indeed this labelling is lazy thinking because it does not allow us to look in more carefully and in detail into the dynamics of how he was dealing with his life and the actions that he took. And then it leads to a kind of patronising attitude, ‘in spite of all his problems he did kind of write some decent music’, with the implication that he would have written better music without these supposed problems.

I take the view that there is something arrogant in this attitude. It is simplistic and it does not necessarily examine in detail all the information now available, admittedly not all available at the time some of these views were developed. These are succinctly summarised in the introduction to Dermot Gault’s book, *The New Bruckner* in which Gault neatly concludes, “clearly perceptions of the man have influenced perceptions of his music” (p.3), whilst also commenting, “the difficulty has always been to see the various elements of his life and personality in due proportion” (p.7).

In considering obsessional compulsive disorder, OCD, let us take a brief look about what ‘disorder’ means. Put simply, to be classified as a disorder the behaviour or disruptions involved have to be maladaptive and dysfunctional and the individual would wish that he or she could be without them. Of the many different types of disorder, OCD shows aspects of perfectionism, excessive devotion to work, rigidity, stubbornness and dictatorial tendencies. There are clear definitions of OCD from the American Psychiatric Association, DSM IV, the internationally recognised source of diagnostic criteria, which lists OCD as a distressing anxiety disorder, that usually involves intrusive thoughts which lead to related compulsive tasks, which tend to neutralise the anxiety.

Obsessions are thoughts, impulses and images which are intrusive and inappropriate and which cause anxiety. As a hypothetical example, if Bruckner were praying to the Virgin Mary and in spite of everything he tried, became aroused at the thought of what she looked like, one imagines he would be very troubled. These thoughts are not just excessive worry about ongoing life; they are things that the person seeks to stop whilst recognising that they are in some ways inside themselves, and which are beyond their control, which is very distressing.

Compulsions are excessive actions that the person must perform to neutralise anxiety, leading to rigid rules which are not related in a realistic way to the situation. So as a sufferer you may need to wash your hands until they bleed. Bruckner is on record as praying a great deal, but was this to such an extent the he had not have the time to work, or to carry on a normal life? OCD in its full-blown form is really nasty and distressing and you do not cure it easily in three months in the 21st century, never mind with the water cure that Bruckner had in 1867 at Bad Kreuzen.

It is clear that Bruckner showed some behaviours which were obsessional in nature - although it is unclear from the information that I have seen how distressed he was about having them. And remember that full-blown OCD is crippling. Looking at the DSM IV behavioural criteria for this diagnosis, Bruckner may have had some but clearly not all. So I would take the view that for Bruckner, a diagnosis of OCD is not proven, and indeed is not needed and is counter-productive in developing relevant understanding of his personality and his actions.

If you accept that he has not got a full-blown neurotic disorder, you might feel that he has the potential for it, and against such a perception I cannot argue. For example Julian Horton, in Bruckner’s *Symphonies* comes to the conclusion that you can have aspiration, diligence and conscientiousness coexisting with doubts and insecurity - which is absolutely fine in my view - and the tension between the two can generate creativity. As Horton says, strongly marked personality characteristics “may be pushed into behaviour which is maladaptive, and threatens the subject’s ability to function within conventional social parameters”, which is again fine by me and consistent with mainstream psychological literature. However it does beg the question of how, after over a century has passed, we can determine whether or not this happened.

---
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So the conclusion made here is that an underlying assumption of pathology and associated labels is unnecessary, at best unhelpful and very likely to be misleading. A more rigorous, scientific approach would be not to make any assumptions until there is consistent evidence for them. We should not make quasi-pathological assumptions until more straightforward explanations, using proven and accepted theory about ‘normal’ people in general proves to be inadequate, but to my knowledge this has not been done. For example, Horton proceeds using Lacanian psychoanalysis as a theoretical perspective, which is in itself acceptable as an academic exercise; however, to quote from a review of a text on Lacanian Psychoanalysis from the UK British Psychological Society journal,¹⁰ “psychoanalysis is increasingly becoming a marginal section of psychology. Within psychoanalysis the position that goes by the name Lacanian is itself marginal”. The suggestion made here is that the need for this type of specialised theoretical approach is not proven until more straightforward ones have been shown to fail. The question I raise is that in a sense these speculations are in the same line of thinking as earlier commentators; they seek to find one best ‘answer’ or touchstone to the question.

This is another core issue for the writer of this paper. Human personality is complex, there are rarely simple explanatory models for typical behaviour and for predicting behaviour and performance. This has been the prime task of my professional career and it is notoriously difficult. We should not be looking for some simple answer. At least Constantin Floros, in his recent book, Anton Bruckner, the Man and his Work, (Peter Lang, Oxford, 2011) whilst describing Bruckner’s personality, avoids making unwarranted assumptions, or offering labels and importantly anchors some behaviour which seems odd to us in context of the time. Looking to the future, given the much larger body of detailed papers and reports currently available than has been the case until recently, it may be possible for collaboration between a professional psychologist/clinician and a Bruckner scholar to come to some resolution of these questions based on a comprehensive study. However the issue raised here about the problems of labelling would remain.

I am interested in Bruckner the man and how he lived his life and the choices he made: if he was such a simple-minded Catholic why did he choose to move away from church music and write symphonies? Why did he pitch himself in the Wagner camp and so expose himself to all the criticism which troubled him so much? Why did he keep revising his work? What was it about Wagner which so overwhelmed him? Why was he so acquiescent at times and at others so stubborn? What do our conclusions say about how he approached the task of composing?

I propose to start with one assumption and one methodological principle. The assumption is that there is unlikely to be a simple solution, it is likely to be multifaceted: the methodological principle is to start with the basic parameters of the academic consensus on human attributes and only if these fail to be illuminating should we move to considerations of pathology or more speculative approaches. Having set the context and tried to put most of the past interpretations behind us, let us look at Bruckner through the lens of well-established theory, the widely used, normal psychology of individual differences. This will make minimum assumptions and try to build a picture from what may be seen as first principles. And importantly, let us place him and his behaviour in the context in which he lived, for what a person does and chooses to do must be seen as an interaction between their basic characteristics and the external environment. I would much rather come to some view of the man as a human being with problems and unresolved issues in his psyche - as we all have - dealing with his aspirations and life as it came to him with all its difficulties and successes in as positive way as he could; as opposed to viewing him as controlled by some syndrome or personality flaw.

Approaching him in this manner, we start from crucial paradigms of measurement. As experimental psychologists we try to understand people by measuring, with a known level of accuracy, clearly separate attributes and elements of personality, and then from the dynamic interplay of the things we have measured we can then develop a picture of the person. Indeed, it’s probably a model that Bruckner himself would have appreciated, as it builds up a larger edifice and understanding from basic things which are measurable and well-known.

What follows is my interpretation of what Bruckner may have been like as a personality, measured against the basic set of parameters of psychological differences between different human beings. This is intended not as a final conclusion, and is not based on properly exhaustive research. The intention is to show what a different approach might yield and also to show how it might be interpreted and used to give rise to greater understanding of Bruckner the man. There is no ‘one best answer’ here although it does represent the conclusions reached from what I know. But at least the data is available about Bruckner, his letters, the reported behaviours and other information, which other psychologists could use to evaluate and confirm or challenge the conclusions reached.

¹⁰ The Psychologist, March 2011 p. 193
A model of Human Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>The Person</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past History</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>The Context</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>Stimulus</td>
<td>Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Constraints</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This basic model suggests that these things are multiplicative, i.e. zero of any element means zero behaviour. Importantly it suggests that to understand or predict behaviour, it is necessary to understand something about all the nine elements that lead to behaviour. Ideally we should be able to measure them all.

Motivation, what do you want in life and what is important to you, and what you strive for, is to say the least important, although I am not discussing it in depth here. What is clear is that Bruckner had a great deal of drive and determination and focus, which he could apply very strongly to a narrow end. He was not a man to give up. However, thinking about his goals in life, at the age of 17 did he know that there was the possibility of being a professor of music in Vienna, and his music being performed all over the world? The interesting thing to me is the choices that he made. There is some indication that at one stage he wanted to be a lawyer, suggesting ambition, but if so, why not the church, given his undoubted religious nature? And if he was as beholden to the Catholic God as some people believe, why did he largely abandon composing religious music?

I’m not going to comment about Intellect. Bruckner clearly had musical talents and people said that he could learn about things that he was interested in learning. But we have to recognise that given from where he started, the limited perspective of the environment in which he grew up, his achievements are enormous.

The main constituent of the model I wish to investigate is Personality. Academic psychology has moved to a current agreement on a so-called ‘big five’ model of personality, that is that everybody differs but they can be described on five major dimensions of personality. And these can actually be measured rather reliably by questionnaires. This model is currently used in a wide variety of psychological research.

The first of these dimensions I wish to consider comes with a variety of names, but which for our purposes I will call emotional sensitivity or anxiety: a variable of normal personality. This comes out in virtually every theory of experimental psychology from Eysenck in the UK and Cattell in America, and more recently in the big five model first described as such by Costa and McRae. This typically has the following as a range of defining characteristics.

- A general tendency to experience negative affect such as fear, anxiety, anger, embarrassment
- Worrying, nervous, fearful vs calm, unworried
- Anger, bitterness vs easygoing, slow to anger
- Helpless/lonely/sad vs rarely ‘down’, resilient
- Shame, embarrassment vs not disturbed by difficult social situations
- Desires for food, indulgence, which the individual cannot resist vs tolerance for frustration
- Cannot deal with stress, dependent, panics vs capable of handling conflict

This is a scale of general emotional distress, a measure of our general tendency to react to situations and experience emotions strongly such as fear, sadness, embarrassment, anger, guilt, worthlessness. One must remember that this is an expression of normal personality variable in each individual. Low on this scale can be seen as calm, even tempered, relaxed, facing stress without being upset.

There are six sub sets of this dimension: anxiety, anger/hostility, depression, self-consciousness, impulsiveness, and vulnerability. It may seem that low is good on this scale and high is bad, however, there can be problems with people who are very low in terms of the way in which their responsiveness to things that happen around them is disassociated from their emotions. If you are high on this scale, then perhaps you may over-react emotionally to things which others deal with more easily; however, many effective and successful people score highly.

Modern evolutionary theory suggests that a variation of responsiveness in this characteristic is collectively of benefit to the species, so that high anxiety is not necessarily ‘worse’ than low (even though hard going for the individuals concerned). An important set of criteria for current theories of personality is

that they are both biologically useful (otherwise they would have disappeared due to natural selection) and that there is some form of neurological structure which can be seen in brain imaging studies. So Bruckner’s anxieties were most likely hard-wired genetically, albeit modified by his experiences in life.

In Bruckner’s case, it would seem to me that you can find evidence for all of the six sub elements of this scale in the anecdotal evidence, so I think that he would always have been high on this particular dimension of personality, but please remember that it is a generalised personality dimension of normality and not pathology. The important thing is that where you are on this scale profoundly affects other parts of your behaviour. For example, I have assessed successful chief executives of organisations with a high level of anxiety, working until they virtually fell over, because if they worked any less they would beat themselves up for not working hard enough. Could it be that Bruckner lived his life in the same way? Looking at him in this way, Bruckner’s issue was that he had a high level of motivation which pushed him into stressful and challenging situations, which in effect cranked up his anxiety. So, settling for a calmer life as a provincial organist was not for him. And there is nothing much that he could do: if you are high on this scale, you have to live with it and develop coping mechanisms. Ritualised behaviour is one common coping mechanism.

However, I do suggest that Bruckner’s early collapse in 1867 and the water cure that he undertook was due to fatigue and depression caused by overwork, to the extent that the overwork had become an ineffective coping mechanism for underlying anxiety. Three months of water cure does not fix underlying anxiety, nor would it fix real OCD either for that matter, but it will have stopped the overwork and interestingly, maybe usefully, imposed a different discipline on his day-to-day behaviour, which will have been important. Nevertheless, I feel that this will have only been a temporary respite, as some of Bruckner’s repetitive behaviours seem to have started around this time so it may be that the water cure in Bad Kreuzen put him back on a more even keel after his anxiety driven collapse, but at the expense of him developing another set of reassuring rituals.

But I remain unconvinced that these behaviours are completely pathological, and indeed the picture of his life suggests that he coped well enough for much of the time, but tended to fall back during particular stressful pressure situations, by getting angry, or depressed, or feeling vulnerable, all of which you can detect from the published anecdotes, and all of which are quite consistent with someone of high levels of this characteristic. The exact behavioural response is likely to be modified by the particular circumstances of the time interacting with his underlying personality structure.

But anxiety is only one of the five main personality dimensions: All of this emotionally responsive behaviour interacts with his intrinsic thinking style. The model I have chosen to illustrate thinking style is called the Myers Briggs type indicator. This is widely used, if a little old, and which has a lot of congruence with the big five model, but is particularly useful in this context (i.e. as a presentation) as a brief introduction to the possibilities of this kind of approach. This is because it combines the four dimensions it measures in a meaningful way, and secondly because it is a model of normal variation; all positions on all of the dimensions it measures are ‘good’ with their own particular characteristics and strengths and limitations. (Further, more exacting research in this area would better use the ‘big five’ model in its totality.)

The MBTI has four bipolar dimensions, and each person’s personality style is identified by the combination of the results on these four, so in total there are 16 types. Lest this seems simplistic, I can assure you that when you use this model properly it is anything but that. Each of the four dimensions has opposing poles which are seen as preferences, you can think of them as you would use your preferred hand: one is natural and competent; the other is more awkward and clumsy. The output of the process is a four letter code indicating your preference on each of the four dimensions. The descriptions below are the author’s.

**MBTI: 4 preference dimensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBTI Extraversion/Introversion</th>
<th>E or I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the external world of people and events</td>
<td>Focus on the inner world of ideas and experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks first, reflects later</td>
<td>Prefers to speak only after reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to communicate by talking</td>
<td>May prefer to communicate in writing or action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable, expressive</td>
<td>Appears reserved, usually has depth of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not necessarily mean loquacious</td>
<td>Does not necessarily mean shy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yields 16 basic types
MBTI Sensing or Intuition in looking at the world  S or N
Takes in information through senses to find out what
what is happening piece by piece
Builds on experience
Factual, accurate
Concerned for detail, suspicious of the big picture
Concerned to develop a big picture, looks at
relationships and connections
Trusts inspiration of the moment
Abstract, theoretical
Bored with detail: concerned for the overall picture

MBTI Thinking or Feeling in decision-making  T or F
Prefers to look logically at problems in a detached way
Use cause and effect reasoning
Seek objective truth
Fair
‘T’ does not necessarily mean cold
Consider what is important to them and others first
Guided by personal values
Compassionate
Strives for harmony and recognition
‘F’ does not necessarily mean emotional or soft

MBTI Judging or Perceiving about the world  J or P
Likes to live life in a planned way and control things
Organised, planful, likes deadlines
Systematic, structured, often dogmatic
Seeks completion, to have things decided and settled
Has a list as a plan of action to be implemented
Having taken action, moves on
Lives to understand life rather than to control it
Open ended, flexible, often never satisfied
Adaptable, takes on new thinking
Has a list as a reminder of what is interesting
and might be actioned when the time is right
Hates deadlines imposed by others

You can read these descriptions and decide for yourself, possibly, which of them you see yourself as, but
in particular, what you think Bruckner is. This could bear much discussion, but I presume to present my own
conclusions, based on a good deal of professional experience of what the theory means, together with my
much more limited knowledge of the Bruckner literature.

The crucial dimension here is Sensing versus Intuition. This difference is so fundamental in the way in
which people think, that it causes no end of mutual misunderstanding and disagreement between people,
even when they have known each other for a long time. In effect, Sensing people can’t see the wood for the
trees and Intuitive types conceptualise the wood and then bump into the trees that they haven’t noticed whilst
thinking about their big picture.

Now, you might think that all creative individuals are intuitive N’s, but this is not so – Berlioz yes,
Wagner certainly was in his desire to integrate all the arts, but Bruckner seems clearly to be an S, given his
focus on detail. In my view, Bruckner is an ISFP, as indeed I think Beethoven must have been. Such people
like to build on acquired expertise and deal in life with more open-ended outcomes. The text below comes
from one of the standard MBTI texts and is not my own.12

Profile of ISFP
Introvert, Sensing, Feeling, Perceiving
Faithful to duties and to people they care about
Stick to inner values and convictions but maybe find it hard to reveal them to others
Develops relationships in a close circle which evolves over the years
Often excel in craftsmanship
Must perform actions which contribute to things which matter
Perfectionist and work with huge energy over things they feel deeply about
Relaxes with joy over small things, food, music, friends
Good at things which need care and devotion
Can become overly sensitive and vulnerable with dwindling self-confidence
Under stress, let others take over, feel victimised and become sarcastic

This dimension focuses us on the contradictions about Bruckner’s life and music: here is this introvert,
sensing type, seeking to construct the overall integrated architecture of a 25 minute movement in a
symphony 80 minutes long. This is what he wanted to do, but he will have found it really hard, but then he
was never afraid of hard work… And as we discussed earlier Bruckner is a very anxious ISFP, which would
imply that he would be likely to demonstrate the tensions described above; in fact all the descriptions of how
tensions apply to an ISFP can be seen to apply to Bruckner. Lest it seem that this is another example of the
pathological labelling that was being challenged earlier, it should be pointed out that ISFP is one of the more

---
12 Rogers, J., Sixteen personality types at work in organisations. 1997 Management Futures Ltd
uncommon combinations of the four characteristics, but still about 2% of all of us are ISFP types.

To add to this, here are some quotes from a manual for the theory about ISFP types; “from their continual random scanning of available resources, they find just the right idea…..then they tinker with it until it feels like what is needed. They often get so absorbed in the creative moment, perfecting the piece, they can lose track of time.” “They often struggle with nurturing their own self-esteem and sometimes needlessly beat up on themselves” “I like recognition, I tend to be a workaholic at whatever it is I am doing, you might say that I am a perfectionist. I don’t want anyone to be unhappy with my performance and that is a kind of driving force.”

This is my choice of quotation so it can be critiqued from many perspectives; however, there seems to me to be sufficient mapping onto what we know of Bruckner the man to at least consider that this is a possible description.

If we can accept this for the moment then there are implications in this interpretation in terms of his life and career, which I think are quite illuminating. Firstly, it is essential for such a personality to ground what he does on what has gone before and demonstrable expertise. He will be able to build on what has gone before, but unless the ISFP knows what the rules are before potentially breaking them, he is unsure about what he is creating, and indeed the legitimacy of doing so. This is the typical I S and P attitude. Wagner, or Berlioz, probably being N types, probably wouldn’t notice or care.

Secondly, this interpretation would explain Bruckner’s lack of broad knowledge. He could never allow himself to be superficial, but he was not the kind of man to understand what the big picture might be. So individual things that capture his attention, such as medical issues or the Emperor Maximilian of Mexico, become issues that he has to know a great deal about. The view may be taken that his need to be totally grounded in theory is a response based on inadequacy and the need to reassure authority. However, in the interpretation I present here it is straightforwardly based on a sense of the proper way of doing things, and the natural way of progression, albeit pushed to an extreme, but always remembering he is very driven and very anxious.

I would like now to put in another model, this time a recent one which addresses the underlying basis of creative acts. This is the GAM/DP model, and William Thiervel, its author has written about composers, including an analysis of ‘Why Mozart and not Salieri’14. Let us start with my experience. I can find you the most potentially innovative and creative people in any group of applicants for a job. This is a fairly clear set of personality characteristics which can be measured. But if you hire these people will they actually be creative at work? And the answer is only if the organisation appropriately allows and supports such behaviour. All the available evidence on innovation and creativity suggests that you need both things, a person with the appropriate potential, and secondly, the environment, which stimulates the production of creativity. The GAM/DP theory is based on creative people, their experience in life, and also the environment in which they operate.

![GAM DP Model of Creativity. W A Thiervel](image)

From this description, Bruckner, as reported in the literature, has the G A and M. Interestingly, DP suggests that in order to really be creative, you have to be placed at the division of power. Let us relate this idea to Bruckner. He is a driven, creative individual, inspired by the sound world of Wagner. But he is not a broad, curious, or indeed an integrated pioneer - he would rather take what has gone before and do better and better. So he settles on the symphony. You could say that Beethoven was the same: he takes Haydn’s symphonic model, and hugely expands it. Bruckner tends to do the same. In this analysis he settled upon the symphony, and like his whole approach to life, simply continued to develop expertise in the symphony and

13 Linda V Berens, Dario Nardi The 16 Personality Types: Descriptions for Self Discovery Telos Publications, California 1999
not much else; so that piano concertos, songs and chamber pieces etc. are much less important. In this view, I would align myself with those that feel that in some ways he has made a pragmatic choice: he is striving to achieve what he can in this world.

If praising God was an end in itself, he might have stuck to church music; he would never challenge Wagner and write an opera: the symphony, well, Beethoven is dead, and in Bruckner’s own words he was confident in going beyond him. The problem of course was Brahms! So in making this choice, he finds himself in a classic DP conflict. There is another symphonist in Vienna, another who sees himself as the heir to Beethoven, another introvert who can’t develop relationships with women. The GAM/DP model suggests that the Wagner and Brahms debate and Hanslick’s criticism is actually a stimulus to creativity in Bruckner. The personal problem for him is that given his basically anxious temperament, he is totally stressed for much of his life and has near catastrophic setbacks. In this interpretation, the nature of decisions about his life’s aims and focus is not contradictory. This model also grounds his decisions in his own life and personality in the situation in which he finds himself and not, for example, aspiring to God driven inspiration. I see religion for Bruckner as a modifier of his behaviour and the support for his anxiety but not as an end in itself in the process of creative activity.

A final thought coming from this view relates to the many revisions of his symphonies. As I have indicated, the ISFP personality does not have a “vision” or a big picture. The overall picture has to be worked on, as it were from the ground up, and there are many possible solutions. For example, Grieg is said to have worked on his piano concerto throughout his life, tinkering with the details. Bruckner tends to tinker with the detail, but also with the structure. The form and structure was indeed extremely important to him, which is why the criticism of Hanslick and others hurt him so much. He has put such huge effort into it, although he is not necessarily able to explain this well in non-musical terms.

But with this kind of personality, one must make clear that there is no one best solution. All of these works are works in progress, and as his ideas and experiences develop, and in his own view his own expertise develops, he would likely have seen other options to some of the problems that he grappled with in earlier works. So it is not that he’s indecisive, or that his judgement was poor; he may well have had further thoughts that have to be worked through. And as a sensing personality and not an intuitive, he would have had to rebuild the entire symphony up again from scratch. The result could well be different, given the different solutions applied to the essential formal problem. As listeners, we may prefer one to the other by taking some kind of overview. But all of them are Bruckner’s and it could well be that he just was incapable himself, because of his personality type, of really evaluating which were the “best”. The P part of his personality structure means that he would not even seek to finish something off never to return to it; to him this would be taking an intellectual short cut.

However remember my other comments that under pressure the ISFP typically will revert to type - missing the obvious by being stuck into too much detail, and in consequence curing one problem whilst creating another. However under extreme pressure he might then flip into intuitive behaviour, in which he is both uncomfortable and less effective, and thereby make huge mistakes, such as cutting out huge swathes of the work and letting it go ahead. So this reading also has some explanation of what appears on the surface to be contradictory behaviour.

So where does this leave us? I’ve done a typical piece of intuitive behaviour here: throwing in ideas, suggesting some conclusions, without doing a great deal of detailed study or analysis. There are also many aspects that I have not touched upon, but this is intended as a starter talk not a PhD! However, I hope that I have offered enough of an alternative view to stimulate some thought and to see Bruckner as we all are: an individual personality, striving in different ways to make the best of our lives in a situation in which we find ourselves. I believe this view is a more optimistic one, looking at his personality in terms of focus, conscientiousness, courage and aspiration, even though the stress that this created opened many demons in his own life. So on this reading, he is not a kind of flawed or inadequate indecisive rustic genius, locked into a 19th-century Catholicism or the restrictions of obsessive compulsive disorder, but a much more human individual, certainly prone to worries and anxieties, but always driven to create something new in the way in which he saw it, from the unique blend of his grounding in the musical past, and his inner vision of what might be.
Following the publication of Dr Benjamin Korstvedt's article, "Constructing the Bruckner Problem" in the July 2011 issue, Vol.15 no.2 of The Bruckner Journal, several readers expressed reservations about the criticism of the work of Deryck Cooke contained in that article, and pointed out Cooke’s great achievements, especially in his work on Wagner and on the performing version of Mahler’s 10th symphony.
Dr. Dermot Gault here continues his comments in detail specifically on Cooke’s influential work on Bruckner symphony versions and editions.

Versions and Editions:
Deryck Cooke’s Contribution Clarified (Part two)

THE FIRST part of this article looked at Bruckner’s first six numbered symphonies, and discussed how scholarship has advanced since Deryck Cooke published his influential article ‘The Bruckner Problem Simplified’1 and his entry on Bruckner for the 1980 New Grove.2
The main issue scholars today have with Cooke’s work is his over-reliance on the first series of Gesamtausgabe editions edited by Robert Haas in the 1930s and 40s. The earlier Haas editions (of Symphonies 1, 4, 5 and 6, along with Alfred Orel’s pioneering edition of the Ninth) undoubtedly rendered an enduring service to Bruckner, but it has become clear that the later Haas editions (principally of Symphonies 2 and 8, but also including his editions of the Seventh Symphony and the Mass in F minor) are seriously flawed. Obsessed with removing ‘alien influence’ (fremder Einfluß), Haas devised best-of-all-worlds composites which did not correspond to any manuscript source and which in the cases of Symphonies 2 and 8 included details added by himself. This was not clear in Cooke’s day. He was to some extent aware that Haas’s editing was interventionist, and was prepared to concede that the postwar series edited by Leopold Nowak might be closer to the manuscript sources, but argued that Haas’s editions were a truer representation of what Bruckner really intended.
Writers at that time were disadvantaged, as access to the manuscript themselves was at best limited. Most of Bruckner’s manuscripts are housed in the Austrian National Library, where Leopold Nowak, as Director of the Musiksammlung, guarded them jealously. One authority has told me that, as a student researcher in the 1970s, Nowak did indeed allow him to see a Bruckner manuscript – he was allowed to see the first page.

The situation has now changed to the extent that, as explained in the previous issue, readers can now see many of Bruckner’s manuscripts for themselves, free of charge, at the Austrian National Library’s site. The scores include the autograph manuscript of the Seventh Symphony (Mus. Hs, 19.479 – at present only the first three movements are available).

Symphony No 7
READERS who access this source will see, first of all, the characteristic format of a Bruckner manuscript. Bruckner used oblong ‘landscape format’ pages for most of his career, eventually changing to upright format 24-stave manuscript paper while working on the Eighth Symphony. As usual with autograph scores, clefs and key signatures are not used after the first page, the main reason for the many redundant accidentals found throughout Bruckner’s manuscripts. Bruckner later had some of his manuscripts bound, but originally most of them would have consisted of a stack of unbound bifolios (a bifolio being a sheet of paper folded over to make four sides). The bifolios were numbered by Bruckner himself in the top right hand corners on the first page, but as the manuscript of the Seventh also served as the printer’s copy for the first edition, the publisher added further numbers in red pencil. The original format of a stack of bifolios meant that individual bifolios could be replaced in the course of either composition or revision. This had important consequences when Bruckner came to revise the finale of the Eighth Symphony, as it was sometimes possible to amend an existing bifolio, and sometimes simpler to write a new one.
Readers will also see Bruckner’s characteristic period numbers. By this time, regular periodicity had become an integral part of Bruckner’s style, and we do not see widespread alterations made in order to effect regular periodicity (contrast, for example, the scherzo and trio of the Fifth Symphony). This does not mean that there are none at all: when the autograph of the finale becomes available, it will be seen that bar 146 – the second bar of drum taps at the start of the development – was squeezed in at the end of a page to provide an even number of bars before the start of a new period at bar 147.

We can also see that this is a working manuscript (Bruckner did not make fair copies of his mature works), and that there are signs of emendation from the first page onwards. Some lines were initially pencilled in and subsequently inked over, with Bruckner taking the opportunity to change or elaborate details. We can also see places where the text has been scratched out and overwritten, and others where manuscript patches have been painstakingly glued over the original.

On the first page, for example, the upper string parts in bar 6 have been changed, and a horn chord in bar 9 has been scratched out. Later, at letter A, we can see that the lower string parts in bars 25-33 were rewritten, and that a patch has been pasted over the bassoon and horn 1 & 2 parts at bars 24-28. Similar changes are found throughout the autograph. These alterations, which are entirely typical for Bruckner, apparently affect details in scoring and the layout of chords, and are presumably merely changes which Bruckner made as he went along.

Nevertheless some alterations do appear to have been made later, and this is where textual issues arise. Were all of these alterations made by Bruckner, and if not, what should our attitude to them be? In normal circumstances one would accept alterations which we can be sure have been made in the composer’s hand without further question, but in view of the peculiar personal dynamic which Cooke, Haas and others held to exist between Bruckner and his Apostolen, matters may not be so straightforward, a particularly vexed issue being the added percussion in the second movement.

This is why, good though it is to be able to look at Bruckner’s manuscript, it needs to be studied in conjunction with Rüdiger Bornhöft editorial commentary.3 ‘Required reading’ is an overworked term, but Bornhöft really is essential for anyone with an interest in the textual issues surrounding the Seventh, especially as neither Haas nor Nowak published an editorial report for this work. In fact, the online availability of the manuscript has made the critical support Bornhöft supplies all the more necessary. Bornhöft clarifies what is and what is not in Bruckner’s handwriting, so far as is possible, and gives a full account of the surviving sketches, together with comparisons between the various printed editions. He also lists the printing errors which have plagued every edition of this work, the critical editions of Haas and Nowak included.4 A lot of dedicated work has been done by Bruckner scholars in recent decades, and Bornhöft’s handwriting identifications are the outcome of years of analysis by native speakers working with the original materials. If readers are wondering how seriously to take Bornhöft’s findings, the answer is ‘very seriously indeed’. It is just unfortunate that it should have appeared nearly sixty years after the publication of Haas’s edition, and that it has not been translated into English.

COOKE’S discussion of the Seventh is based on the printed scores and the sometimes cryptic comments of their editors. He refers to three editions – the Gutmann printing of December 1885 and the critical scores of Haas (1944) and Nowak (1954). There is a fundamental difference in editorial stance between the two editions, for while Nowak is faithful to the autograph – or at least, to the final state of the autograph – Haas omits various tempo indications in the outer movements and changes some details of orchestration, most of them reversions to earlier stages in the evolution of the manuscript.

The first published edition of the Seventh was the first Bruckner score to be seen through the press by Josef Schalk and, as readers will hardly need reminding, the first published editions were condemned outright by writers of Cooke and Simpson’s generation. But each of them needs to be understood in the context of Bruckner’s changing relationship with his helpers. The first edition of the Seventh dates from the very start of this process, and the correspondence paints a picture of amicable consultation with Josef and others, with no hint of unilateral editing on Josef’s part. It was published in Bruckner’s lifetime and served as the basis for several performances, and Bruckner was happy to present a copy of the score to the conductor Karl Muck, who noted several subsequent amendments given to him by Bruckner, which included moving the pizzicati at the end of the slow movement to bar 217 (a reading adopted by Haas). Can it therefore be dismissed?

Cooke bases his stance on the statement in Haas’s Preface that the autograph reveals ‘alien influence’, not only in the added percussion in the Adagio, but also ‘in the instrumentation and performance directions, and in many large and small details’:

In short, in the autograph score both the notes and the directions are full of additions in the hand of others; this outside participation can be detected in both individual details and in its wider meaning, just as the deletions could be analysed and deciphered, and so the original text could be restored.

---

4 Haas added key signatures in the horn and trumpet parts, in line with Bruckner’s practice, but did not always add the necessary accidentals. The result is that he created misprints where there had not been any previously – see for instance the six extra wrong notes on page 12 of his score.
This paints a dizzying picture of almost unlimited interference, but we have to remember that when Haas’s edition was published the only other editions had been based on the first printing. Readers could see many minor differences between Haas’s score and the scores that had gone before, mostly concerning slurs, dynamics and tempo indications rather than the notes themselves. But in the absence of an editor’s report, no-one could have any idea of how many of these changes had originated in the first edition, and how many were autograph accretions which Haas had identified as ‘additions in the hand of others’.

Ten years later, in 1954, Leopold Nowak published his edition, which reflects the autograph score as it is. A comparison between Haas’s score and Nowak’s shows surprisingly few changes in the notes themselves, and most of them are in the opening stages of the first movement:

103-104  horn 3  
123-128  oboes  
148-149  clarinets and bassoons  
154 & 156  violin 1 lower octave doublings

Some of the features Haas omits do indeed appear to be later additions. The horn 3 part in bars 103-104 is written in darker ink, and the wind chord in bars 148-149 is clearly an addition (we can still see the original rest signs in bar 149). But we don’t have any reason to believe that they were added by someone other than Bruckner. Bornhöft identifies the handwriting as Bruckner’s, and the changes look and sound like final retouchings rather than ‘alien interference’. Far from sounding more Brucknerian, Bruckner. Bornhöft sees the playing of the wind in bars 148-149 in the first movement leaves the second trumpet sounding very bare on its own, and several ostensibly Haas-edition recordings retain the wind at this point.

In other places Haas restores details which have been scratched out but which are still, in varying degrees, legible:

123-130  brass. This relates to the removal of the oboe part in the same passage. The brass parts in bars 123-126 were thoroughly deleted, but the deletion was less thorough in bars 127-130 on the next page.  
319-321  oboe 1.

But is Haas restoring Bruckner’s ‘original’, or is he reversing work-in-progress changes? We also have to ask – as Nowak does in his Preface – why Haas restores some details and not others. We can see from the manuscript that the trombones originally supported the Wagner tubas in several passages in the Adagio, including bars 1-6, 33-36, 74-75, and 164-168 (the trombones do play at the beginning and the end of this passage, but they originally played something different), as well as bars 184-193 – the famous ‘elegy’ – and bars 211-214 near the end. Why did Haas not restore the trombones in these passages? The obvious answer is that the trombones would have made these passages intolerably brassy, and Bruckner evidently realised this by the time he came to the Finale, for there is no sign that the trombones ever supported the Wagner tuba entries in bars 73-74 and elsewhere. But this shows that Haas was making changes on the basis of instinct and judgement rather than on the consistent application of any textual principle. Haas may for instance have been doubtful concerning the brass in bars 123-130 in the first movement as this is the only place in the work where the bass / contrabass tuba plays on its own, without the trombones. Nowak himself considered omitting the tuba at this point, and its eventual inclusion was a last minute decision.

Haas’s Preface begins by stating that ‘the editing of the Seventh...promised few surprises’. But the fact that so many of his interventions concern the first half of the first movement makes one suspect that he set out with the idea of ridding the score of ‘external influence’, found that this could not be done in any consistent and meaningful way, and gave up.

Haas’s main concern was however with the added tempo indications, which we can see were indeed in some cases added later. Many commentators, Cooke and Simpson included, have assumed on the basis of Haas’s statements that these additions perpetuate performance traditions which neither originated with the Bruckner nor reflect his wishes.

---

5 We can also see that the second bassoon originally had e sharp in bar 148.
6 See the discography in John Berky’s website, which also clarifies the mixing of editions found in so many recordings.
7 Bornhöft page 43. Bruckner’s manuscript calls for a bass tuba in movements 1 and 3 and a contrabass tuba in movements 2 and 4, but only in order to avoid confusion with the bass Wagner tubas (‘Wagner tuba’ is an informal term; the score says simply ‘Bass-Tuben’). See Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs, ‘Low Brass Instruments and Pitch in Vienna after 1862’, TB/14/2 (July 2010) page 26. Bruckner’s terminology is respected in the first published editions, but not in the Haas and Nowak scores, possibly because Haas effected his edition by amending a copy of the Universal Edition score, which specifies ‘contrabass tuba’ throughout.
This brings us to Bornhöft’s main revelation – which is that the directions Haas omits in Bruckner’s handwriting after all, including the *molto animato* at bar 233 in the first movement and the slowing-down at the end of the first theme in the Finale – the very indications which most exercised Simpson and Cooke. In other cases directions which are definitely by Bruckner confirm others which may or may not be by him, for the *a tempo* at bar 354 in the first movement must relate to the *etwas gedehnt* (‘somewhat drawn out’) three bars earlier, while in the Finale the similar *a tempo* at bar 155 only makes sense in relation to the *ruhig* in bar 151. Likewise, another *a tempo* in bar 213 confirms the *inner breiter* at bar 209.

The *ruhig* at bar 123 in the first movement (at the start of the third group) does not seem to be in Bruckner’s hand, but it is confirmed by a scrawled comment in Bruckner’s ‘Leipzig notebook’ that the third theme is to be taken more slowly: ‘Schlußthema langsamer’. The time signature indications are however Bruckner’s, including the important direction ‘4/4 Tact’ written into the 3rd trumpet line. Also Bruckner’s is the *a tempo* in bar 123, which I suggest cancels an implied *rit.* in bars 121-122 rather than a return to the initial tempo of the movement.

Some will of course query if even directions which are in the composer’s own handwriting might not reflect the dreaded ‘*fremder Einfluß*’. Is it not merely a question of substituting ‘alien influence’ for ‘alien input’? The perception of a helpless composer under the thumb of ‘the Schalks’ dies hard, and the fundamental question this raises, of how we perceive Bruckner as a person, will be considered below. In the meantime, we need to consider another body of evidence – the surviving correspondence.

THE SEVENTH was completed in September 1883 and accepted for performance by Nikisch in March 1884. In July of that year Bruckner wrote to Nikisch to inform him that ‘frequent tempo changes’ (*oftmaliger Tempowechsel*) would be needed, and in a subsequent letter he states that ‘in the score many important and also frequent tempo changes are not marked’.9

Arguing against the tempo indications found in Nowak’s edition, Robert Simpson suggested that the trouble with written tempo indications is that they inevitably get exaggerated in performance’, adding that while ‘no sensitive conductor is going to march metronomically through Bruckner’s music...insensitive ones will make grinding changes of gear at every excuse’.10 One could reply that the editor’s duty is to reproduce the composer’s directions, regardless of what conductors may do with them. But Simpson does raise the issue many composers have faced, of how much to make explicit. I believe that Bruckner wished for a non-disruptive, unobtrusive flexibility in tempo which he was originally content to leave to his performers to carry out, but which he subsequently realised would have to be made more explicit. Bruckner’s letters to Nikisch were written following piano performances at the Wagner-Verein,11 which had evidently shown him that inflexions of tempo which were obvious to him were not after all obvious to his interpreters.12 After explaining the need for ‘frequent tempo changes’ in his 17 July letter, Bruckner diplomatically adds that ‘with a gifted conductor like you in charge, all of this will no doubt happen anyway’. But he then stresses the importance of his presence at the last two rehearsals – perhaps not so sure after all that the required tempo changes would indeed ‘happen anyway’! It is a great pity that the score and parts used for the first performances in Leipzig and Munich have not survived, so it is hard to know which changes were made when.

But the *Leipzig Notizbuch* comment specifying a slower tempo for the third theme of the first movement suggests that the process of clarification continued at least through the preparations for the first performance.

Traditional commentary downplayed or ignored the evidence of Bruckner’s letters, too readily accepted Haas’s contentsions, and failed to understand the extent to which Haas’s editions were products of the inter-war Bruckner Movement. Haas’s omission of the added tempo directions in the outer movements, with the resultant implied stately tempi, positioned the Seventh in the mystical *Bruckner-Bewegung* ethos, which held that Bruckner ‘did not take the experiences of earthly life as the inspiration for his art’, and that his music ‘has no tendency to dramatic effect or affect’.13 One should at the very least be aware of the attitudes and assumptions embodied in Haas’s editorial stance.

---

9 Letter of 5 November 1884, Briefe I page 225.
10 Josef Schalk and Franz Zotmann had played the first and third movements as early as February 1883, and Bruckner’s 17 July letter to Nikisch refers to a performance of the finale by Josef and Ferdinand Löwe. The November 1884 letter mentions a Wagner-Verein performance of the Adagio.
12 In a letter to Josef of 16 January 1884 Bruckner stresses that he would like to hear it once ‘for the sake of the tempo’.
13 Both comments come from Hans Weisbach’s ‘*Der originale Bruckner*’, an article for the programme note of the 1937 Regensburg Bruckner Festival. This is available on John Berky’s website. See also the discussion in Dermot Gault, *The New Bruckner* (Farnham 2011, pp. 212 and 231-233).
TANTALISINGLY, the correspondence also mentions discussions about the orchestration. In December 1884 Nikisch suggested that Bruckner should ‘change certain places in the instrumentation; they are impractically written and do not sound well.’14 He does not say what these places are, but a clue is provided by the manuscript of the Finale, which contains several glued-on patches in the neat handwriting of the copyist Karl Aigner. Nowak suggests that Bruckner could have made changes during the preparations for the first performance, changes which would have been entered into Nikisch’s conducting score and subsequently transferred to the autograph by Aigner. Unfortunately, the loss of the score and parts used for the first performances means that we don’t know to what extent the text on the patches differs from what was originally there. The patches are mostly small, sometimes covering a bar or even less, and appear to be mainly concerned with discreetly lightening the scoring in tutti passages (for example, in bars 191-194 and 204-208). Some are more significant:

58 (second half) to 60 oboes, clarinets and horns (rests included)
83-86 flutes, oboes, clarinets
118-121 strings

Haas accepted the resultant text in these passages – he was obliged to, as the alternative would have been invasive surgery on the manuscript – but no-one has ever found these passages stylistically inconsistent. One nevertheless cannot help wondering what modern forensic techniques could tell us about how the score originally stood.

OUTSIDE interference is still all too commonly and casually assumed in popular commentary, but it cannot be assumed without evidence. However, in this case evidence exists, for the correspondence shows that Bruckner had discussed unspecified alterations with Josef Schalk as early as August 1884.15 The brothers subsequently discussed possible changes between themselves, and although the correspondence is short on specifics, Josef does mention the reinforcement of the low timpani pedal E by the double basses towards the end of the first movement – a change which was enforced, but it was enforced in the first published edition, and it was not added to Bruckner’s manuscript.16 We do not know if any alterations suggested by either of the Schalks went beyond minor changes of this type, or whether any of them ended up in the autograph – with one notorious exception.

That exception is of course the added percussion (cymbals, triangle and timpani) at the climax of the Adagio, which remains an intractable problem. A letter of Josef Schalk refers to ‘the cymbal clash we wanted’, adding that Nikisch had insisted on its acceptance.17 It is not clear from the context if the ‘we’ refers to Franz and Josef, or to Josef and Ferdinand Löwe,18 although it does appear that this feature did not originate with Bruckner. But what was his final attitude to it? What do we make of the question marks that have been added at the side and then crossed out, or the pencilled words ‘gilt nicht’ [‘not valid’ or ‘does not apply’]? Haas suggests that the words are ‘in the handwriting of Bruckner’s old age’, but they do not look like the shaky handwriting of the last sketches for the Ninth, and those who I have consulted agree with Bornhöft that neither word has been written by Bruckner. An additional question – which readers may decide for themselves – is whether the words ‘gilt’ and ‘nicht’ were written by the same person.19

Bornhöft’s tone is unbiased and he is scrupulously fair to Haas, but his findings firmly vindicate Nowak. He thereby contradicts everything that has been written on the subject by Cooke and Simpson, not to mention the reams of record reviews and the hours of air time on Radio 3 devoted to explaining why ‘Haas’ is superior to ‘Nowak’. But experience shows that a little discreet flexibility regarding tempo can go a long way towards minimising what might seem to be fundamental differences between the Haas and Nowak editions – and without ‘grinding changes of gear’.

Cooke plunges into the discussion with his customary zeal, but he is too quick to pounce on Nowak and too concerned to seek pretexts to justify Haas. Ignoring the evidence of Bruckner’s letters, he instead announces that the tempo directions are ‘simply Nikisch’s “conductor’s markings”’ – presenting guesswork as proven fact.20 He accuses Nowak of adopting tempo directions (in brackets) from the first edition, which

14 Briefe I, 21 December 1884, page 232.
15 Letter of 6 August 1884, Briefe I page 218.
18 This is the only evidence of involvement on the part of Ferdinand Löwe.
19 The issue has since become fertile ground for suppositions and conspiracy theories of all kinds.
20 Vindications page 65.
is both unfair and potentially misleading because, as Nowak explains, the indications derive from the manuscript; and as it happens, one of the indications to which Cooke most objects, the *molto animato* at bar 233 in the first movement, is not in the first edition, which here has ‘Tempo I’. Nor – contrary to what is stated by Robert Simpson – is this direction found in any publication, whether full score or piano arrangement, before Nowak’s. It may seem a strange indication for such a powerful and massive passage, and it should perhaps be understood ‘locally’, with respect to the previous more placid passage. The much-vilified first edition’s ‘Tempo I’ can therefore be seen a clarification or correction.

Most of the changes in the first edition have little impact in performance, and listeners and reviewers alike have listened happily to vintage performances of the Seventh based on the much-maligned first edition. But the underlying issues of authorial identification, external influence / intervention, and the editorial decisions of Haas and Nowak – not to mention Cooke’s attitude to these editors – are serious, and have a major impact on the last work we shall discuss, the Eighth Symphony.

**Symphony No 8**

ONCE AGAIN, Cooke discusses three scores: the 1892 first publication, the Haas edition of 1939 and Nowak’s 1955 edition of the 1890 version. He was prepared to concede that Nowak’s 1955 edition of the 1890 version was faithful to the manuscript – something which readers can now verify for themselves – but felt that the Haas composite was closer to Bruckner’s intentions. But now that the ‘for later times’ fallacy has been disposed of, Cooke’s case rests entirely on the supposed involvement of Josef Schalk in the revision process.

Cooke’s *New Grove* article states that the 1890 version was ‘recomposed with J. Schalk’. How did this perception arise? The nearest thing we have to evidence comes from a letter from Josef to Franz of 31 January 1890, in which he tells Franz that ‘the day before yesterday Bruckner finished the revision of the Eighth. The first movement now ends pianissimo, as we wished.’ But this reads like one of Josef’s progress reports, and the likelihood is that, of the options Bruckner was considering, this was the one that the brothers preferred.

There is not a single entry in Josef’s handwriting anywhere in the manuscripts of the 1890 version, or in any of the manuscript sources of the Eighth. Bruckner effected the final version of the Adagio by emending a copy of the 1887 version, but all the alterations are in his own hand. The finale is entirely in Bruckner’s handwriting. The crossing-out of some bars is made in a manner familiar from other Bruckner manuscripts – readers can, for example, compare the changes in the Eighth with the alterations Bruckner made in the manuscript of the Fifth Symphony (last two movements). The excisions are confirmed by Bruckner’s metrical numbers and in one place also by the comment ‘weg’ (away). Once again, we need to look at how the manuscript was made up. In the case of bifolio 6, which contains 1890 bars 121-134, Bruckner simply removed the original bifolio and replaced it with a new one, although as the new version was shorter than the old, the last side and a half are blank. However, the passage between letters O and P was split between two bifolios; rather than write out the best part of two bifolios again (and upset his numbering in the process), Bruckner crossed out 1887 bars 223-242 and wrote 1890 bars 211-214 over the two final bars.

An impressive 473 letters exchanged between the brothers survive, and one cannot help feeling that if Josef had had an active role in the revision, he would have let Franz know. Instead, he complains of being unable to persuade Bruckner to change anything: witness his letter of 10 June 1888, in which he complains of the changes Bruckner is making to avoid consecutives, and adds that Bruckner ‘is immovable in the face of any objection from Lowe or myself’; or his letter of a few months later, on 5 October 1888, in which he tells Franz that Bruckner was ‘unfortunately still sweating away on the first movement of Third, and laying waste all around him. One can’t do anything about it.’

In the same letter Josef tells Franz that Bruckner ‘would like to submit all of the many changes, which he is

---

21 Robert Simpson, *The Essence of Bruckner*, page 158 (1967 edition) / 188 (1992 edition). A word of warning: at least one online source which purports to be a pre-war edition is in fact the 1958 edition of Hans Redlich, as can be shown by various annotations which are unique to this publication (see for example page 20).

22 Mus.Hs. 19.480 contains movements 1, 2 and 4 of the 1890 version and the 1887 Adagio. Mus.Hs. 40.999 is the 1890 Adagio. The first two movements of the 1887 version are in Mus.Hs. 6083 and 6084.


24 New Grove article, page 367.

25 Quoted in Thomas Leibnitz, *Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner* (Tutzing 1988) page 129. In the event the revision would not be ‘entirely finished’ until 10 March 1890.

26 Apart of course from the printer’s copy – which we know Bruckner was not involved in. See Professor Hawkesaw’s Bruckner Journal article.

27 Leibnitz page 134.

28 Leibnitz pp. 135-137.
now with quite extraordinary industriousness making to the Eighth and the Third, to your assessment’; \(^{29}\) but it is Bruckner who is making the changes, not Josef; and it is Franz, not Josef, who is being asked for his opinion. \(^{30}\)

Active involvement by Josef seems even more unlikely given what we now know about his relationship with Bruckner. This is where Leibnitz is especially helpful: drawing on unpublished correspondence, he shows how Josef’s relations with Bruckner declined swiftly after the publication of the Seventh. Bruckner’s sharp annoyance with Josef’s programme note for the Vienna première of the Seventh was followed in 1886 by a major falling-out over the private two-piano première of the Fifth Symphony, and another rift is hinted at in a letter to Franz in August 1889, where Josef, referring to a lost letter from Franz, regrets ‘...that you find it necessary to tell me all about what Bruckner has said about me...I hope that Bruckner will change his mind about me – if not, I cannot help him’. \(^{31}\) This episode occurred just as Bruckner was revising the Finale of the Eighth.

Above all, we have to recognise that – regardless of who may have suggested what – the decision whether to adopt any suggestions was Bruckner’s alone. Traditional commentary denied the principle of authorship and laid heavy emphasis on what I have politely called the ‘psychologically disabled model of Bruckner’s personality’. This tradition goes back to Haas’s report for the Fourth Symphony, which ascribed a huge importance to Levi’s rejection (in October 1887) of the 1887 version of the Eighth. Although there is no doubt that this was a body blow, Haas presented it as a life-changing trauma and used it to explain away the 1888 version of the Fourth Symphony, the 1889 version of the Third, and ‘the huge amount of work undertaken on the Eighth’. This ignores the fact that Ferdinand Löwe had ‘with Bruckner’s consent, improved and re-orchestrated many parts of the “Romantic” already prior to May 1887’. \(^{32}\) Haas saw Levi’s approach to Josef Schalk concerning the 1887 version of the Eighth as evidence of the influence Josef wielded over Bruckner. But Josef was an obvious person for Levi to approach because of his access to Bruckner, and because they had already corresponded concerning the first publication of the Seventh, and not because he possessed the unlimited influence assumed by earlier commentators.

I THEREFORE do not feel that it is realistic to suggest active involvement by Josef Schalk in the revision of the Eighth. But where did this notion come from? Not from Haas’s Preface, which states only that Josef ‘pressed for changes’. Far from attributing any changes in the last two movements to Josef, Haas puts the blame for what he calls ‘Sinnlosigkeit’ [‘things which make no sense’] squarely on Bruckner himself. \(^{33}\) After acknowledging Bruckner’s labours on the first movement, Haas states that ‘the other movements had been taken care of earlier without such expenditure of energy. The Finale especially betrays in its externals a more superficial and casual type of organisation, and even a lack of inner involvement, for the cuts made cannot be explained in any other way’ (the absence of any discussion of these remarks in traditional commentary is striking).

A stronger suggestion of fremder Einfluß is found in Nowak’s Preface, in which he suggests that ‘the Master here, as elsewhere, followed the suggestions of his friends.’ \(^{34}\) But in describing the 1890 version as ‘recomposed with J. Schalk’, Cooke is once again going much further than any previous writer.

Josef’s involvement in the first editio n is a different matter. He had early assumed the role of seeing Bruckner’s publications through the press, which involved a huge amount of unpaid work, dealing with publishers, proof-reading orchestral parts, and making the piano arrangements then issued with orchestral scores. Josef took it on himself to cut bars 93-98 in the Finale because of a passing resemblance to bars 197-200 in the first movement of the Seventh Symphony, but stressed, in a letter to Max von Oberleithner, that Bruckner must be kept unaware of what they were doing (perhaps having learnt that Bruckner would not scrutinize the printed version too closely after the first few pages). \(^{35}\) But it is important to be clear about the difference between the 1890 revision and the 1892 first edition. It is unfortunate therefore that Nowak should have suggested that Josef’s cut in the Finale

...was not entirely wrong, because the cut made [angeordneten] by Bruckner himself before Oo in the recapitulation omits the entire passage...and so the thematic balance was disturbed.

This gave Cooke the cue for one of his most tortuous arguments:

\(^{29}\) Briefe II, pp. 45-46.  
\(^{30}\) This letter incidentally suggests a date for the ‘Intermediate’ version of the Adagio.  
\(^{31}\) Leibnitz page 140.  
\(^{32}\) According to a letter from Josef to Franz Schalk dated 9 May 1887 – Leibnitz, page 267.  
\(^{33}\) Haas does not specify what they are, but one can only suppose he was referring to the ending of the second group recapitulation, where the dominant of A minor is followed by the third group in C minor.  
\(^{34}\) Leopold Nowak, Preface to ABSW Band VIII/2, VIII. Symphonie c-moll, Fassung von 1890 (Vienna 1955).  
\(^{35}\) Letter of 5 August 1891, quoted in Leibnitz page 276, and translated in The New Bruckner page 177.
It can only have been that [Bruckner] made the cut in the recapitulation...to satisfy Schalk...but that he overlooked the equivalent passage in the exposition...And in 1891, when the score was being prepared for printing, Schalk must have realized – the old man had forgotten! Hence his letter to Oberleithner, asking for the truncation in the exposition.  

But Cooke is too dogmatic in claiming that Bruckner

could not possibly have made ‘decisions’ which ‘disturbed the balance of the motives’...  

Note the inverted commas around ‘decisions’! After stating that ‘in spite of Nowak’, Josef was ‘quite wrong’ in tampering with the score

Nevertheless, in making the cut in the exposition he did show that he cared about the ‘balance of the motives’, whereas Nowak, by leaving out what Bruckner and Schalk had cut in the recapitulation and keeping in what Schalk had cut of his own accord in the exposition, achieved only a piece of musicological pedantry which makes no structural sense at all.

This set the tone for much subsequent popular commentary on Nowak – even when his fidelity to his source was acknowledged, it was characterised as a blind enforcement of academic principle. But once we shed the notion of Josef’s involvement, we are obliged to accept that Bruckner’s decisions were his own. Would Cooke have been so quick to accuse Bruckner of making ‘no structural sense at all’?

ONE OF THE problems with the Eighth is that the musical world came to know the various versions in almost reverse order – the first edition (1892); the Haas composite (1939); Nowak’s edition of the 1890 version (1955); and finally the first version of 1887 (1972). In 1969 Cooke had very little idea of how the 1890 version related to the 1887 original, but unfortunately the revised version of his article still lists bars 609-615 in Haas’s score of the Finale among ‘the cuts made in the revised version’. In 1969 it may have seemed a fair assumption that this passage was one of the passages of 1887 material incorporated by Haas, but by the time the revised version appeared the publication of the 1887 version had made it clear that it does not derive from the earlier version. We can now see for ourselves that the passage appears to have been worked up from a few notes pencilled into the flute line on the cancelled third page of bifolio 26.

Cooke admits that Haas restored ‘what he considered felicities, which had been spoiled in the revision. A dangerous undertaking, no doubt, and yet his score always seems the more Brucknerian.’ But there are details in Haas’s score of the third movement which do not derive from the 1887 version, such as his omission of the clarinet in 1890 bars 169-176. In any case, Haas had no business incorporating – or ‘restoring’ – details from a different version, even if the results were felicitous – which is questionable, and not merely because of his grotesque treatment of the climax of the Adagio, which does not correspond to any source.

The conclusion is that the Haas edition is a composite of two distinct versions with additions by Haas himself, and that Nowak gives us the 1890 version not only as Bruckner wrote it, but also as Bruckner wanted it: a conclusion which has long been uncontroversial for academics and researchers, but one which the musical press continues to resist.

COOKE’S discussion of textual issues in the New Grove is more objective in tone than his article, but he complains, concerning Nowak, that ‘in no case is there a Revisionsbericht, and this makes it impossible to assess the validity of the alterations’. A fair point, but an odd one for Cooke to make, in view of his disregard of Haas’s reports; and if one is going to accuse Nowak of not producing reports, one also has to acknowledge that Haas never produced a report for Symphonies 7 and 8 or the F Minor Mass, three of the Haas editions most in need of one.

Running through Cooke’s work is the burning feeling that Bruckner has been the victim of injustice, a feeling one must respect. We also have to remember that Cooke and Simpson were writing at a time when denigration of Bruckner’s music was accompanied by widespread denigration of Bruckner himself. Unfortunately, we have to ask if Cooke ever entirely freed himself from this negative view of the composer.

---

36 Vindications page 68. The wording reflects the widespread but mistaken view that Oberleithner was the sole editor of the first published edition. Josef’s letter is not asking Oberleithner for anything; he is informing Oberleithner of a cut he himself has made (as Nowak correctly states in his Preface).
37 Vindications page 68.
38 See The New Bruckner pp. 224-225 for a fuller discussion of this passage.
39 Vindications page 69.
40 New Grove page 361 column 2. Note that it is the ‘alterations’ in Nowak that need to be justified!
This is surely the central issue, for the most regrettable feature of his New Grove entry is the heavy and one-sided emphasis on Bruckner’s psychological problems. Bruckner’s various eccentricities are paraded without any attempt to see them in proportion, and then deliberately linked to his supposed inability to assert himself, solely for the purpose of excusing Haas at the expense of the composer’s own manuscripts.

There is more to Cooke’s New Grove entry than his skewed presentation of textual issues, but on the whole it is a good thing that it has now been replaced by Timothy Jackson’s lucid exposition, which remains the best short introduction to this composer.41

Malim cum Scaligero errare...?

AT THE opening of the 2007 Bruckner conference in Birmingham Ken Ward played three versions of the passage leading up to letter Q in the Adagio of the Eighth – the original, intermediate and final versions. It struck me then with renewed force that Bruckner knew what he was doing. The 10-bar 1887 passage is too long, especially when incorporated by Haas into the more active 1890 version. The music is beautiful but too lingering, and the tutti at letter Q abruptly resumes a process from which the music has become detached. The Intermediate Adagio might seem to have the best of both worlds; the quiet passage is reduced to six bars and it is linked to the following tutti. But there are still too many peaks and troughs, and the final version works best in context. Likewise, we can see that the 1890 Finale has its own broad cogency which is disrupted by the passages included by Haas. I do however suggest that this perception is easier to arrive at once we accept that the 1890 version is Bruckner’s own work.

I suspect that the Haas Eighth is defended today, not because anyone really believes that ‘the old man had forgotten’, but because listeners are used to it and like it. The Haas edition has of course been around for a long time, and many of us grew up with it. I write as one who got to know the Eighth through Haitink’s Prom concerts and the Karajan EMI recording, and I certainly do not wish to spoil listeners’ enjoyment of their Haas-edition recordings. But we have to acknowledge that a grave injustice has been done – and is still being done – to Nowak. The worst that can be said of Nowak is that he was not the best advocate for his own editions; but unfortunately, casually derogatory references to Nowak and his work have become commonplace in some quarters. Whatever we think of some of Haas’s later editions we surely have to acknowledge that injustice has been done here, and that it is time to put it right.

I DO NOT unfortunately have the space here to deal with certain other Brucknerian pseudodoxia which accumulated in the course of the twentieth century – the arguments over Bruckner’s will, the allegations of Carl Hruby, Bruckner’s supposed gift of the manuscript of the Ninth to Karl Muck ‘in case anything happens to it’ and so on. They are however discussed in Professor Korstvedt’s article and my own book and in various other writings which have appeared in these pages over the years.42

In 1969 it may well have seemed that Cooke was ‘simplifying’ the ‘Bruckner Problem’ instead of adding to it; but he was writing without access to the manuscripts and without the knowledge of the background we have now. If we think differently now it is because we are better off as far as information is concerned. The pity is that this information is not being implemented more widely. As Ken Ward recently remarked, ‘when commentators today are still happy to quote Deryck Cooke, without qualification or comment, we are entitled to question whether they have done their homework and kept in touch with Bruckner studies in the last quarter of the 20th century to the present day.’43

IN THIS article I have sometimes been critical of the writings of two authorities who have shaped perceptions of Bruckner for an entire generation. I would like to end, therefore, by referring to a slightly less well-known commentator. In my book The New Bruckner (pp. 144-145) I refer to Max von Oberleithner’s edition of the Mass in D minor, regretting that he removed a dissonance at the climax of the Kyrie (bar 116), ‘thereby losing the long-term reference effected when the repetition of the same phrase in the Angus Dei does not end in the same dissonance’. Like many readers, I daresay, I got to know this work through the old Jochum recording, where the dissonance in the Kyrie makes a striking effect. It fits with Mayfeld’s reference to ‘strident dissonances’ made following the 1864 première, and with the pattern throughout the first editions of removing features that might be considered unusually bold, striking, or awkward. All the ingredients of the modern myth are there – the familiar recording, the familiar score, the assumption made on the basis of a

perceived ‘pattern’, the contemporary reference which ‘fits’. But beware when everything seems to ‘fit’. In fact, the dissonance is simply a misprint which has been corrected in subsequent printings – as readers can now verify for themselves by going online and accessing the autograph manuscript.\textsuperscript{44}
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and others that further searching will reward

Some of these autograph scores have now become available, and may be more easy for English language users, at  
Petrucci Music Library  
www.imslp.org
Eckstein, Steiner - and Bruckner

Raymond Cox

THE VIENNA CAFÉS in the last decades of the 19th century and beyond were often the scenes where business was carried on and art, music and philosophy were discussed, where actors discussed their roles and historians their theories. And where lawyers and psychoanalysts discussed their cases.

Bruckner would most likely have been a participant in such gatherings with friends and acquaintances. One of these people was Frederick Eckstein. The Austrian historian and writer Rene Fulop-Miller wrote, in a 1952 article, that “Frederick Eckstein, wisdom personified, sat from morning until night at his table in the Café Imperial. He had a goatee; his eyes were of oriental shape; his age was unknown. All of Vienna’s celebrities liked to join him: Hugo Wolf, Johann Strauss, Helen Blavatsky, Annie Besant, Anton Bruckner, Rudolf Steiner, Freud, Adler and Trotsky. They all consulted with him.” It is intriguing that the esotericists such as Theosophists Helen Blavatski and Annie Besant were included, as well as Rudolf Steiner, who was a student when in Vienna. It would have been even more intriguing if Bruckner indeed sat with them, together or singly on separate occasions. Eckstein was consulted on wide-ranging matters: plays, poems, architectural drafts, mathematical equations, physics formulas, musical drafts (did Bruckner take anything with him?).

Frederick Eckstein (1861-1939) was an Austrian polymath, theosophist - he was an official of the Theosophical Society - and a friend of Freud. And he was also a pupil, friend, financial benefactor and private secretary to Bruckner, and often took care that Bruckner’s affairs went smoothly. He was also a great traveller. His leanings towards occultism stemmed from his membership in the late 1870s of a vegetarian group which discussed Pythagoras and the Neo-Platonists. He later developed his esoteric interests to include the legends surrounding the Freemasons, the Templars, oriental religions - and Wagnerian mythology.

There are some interesting anecdotes connecting Eckstein and Bruckner. In 1889 they travelled to the monastery of Stift Heiligenkreuz to consult the abbot there about details concerning the tragedy which had just occurred when Austria’s Crown Prince Rudolf and his mistress were found dead in mysterious circumstances at his hunting lodge at Mayerling. The Mayerling tragedy had much affected Bruckner, as the deaths of others had always done.

It was a cold February day when Bruckner persuaded Eckstein to accompany him on a sledge ride to the Cistercian monastery (where Bruckner had liked to play its organ), at first saying nothing about where they were going. They took the train to Baden before continuing by sledge. The abbot, who had blessed the body of the prince a few days before, was a friend of Bruckner. Following this visit Bruckner and Eckstein then continued on to Mayerling. The hunting lodge was in darkness, but a single light shone from a window where nuns were gathered in prayer. This scene deeply moved Bruckner. Perhaps a certain destiny had brought the two friends together to partake of this experience...

Another story connecting the two comes from earlier in their association. In 1884 there was a serious fire at Vienna’s Stadttheater. Bruckner was very upset when he saw the blaze. It may well have brought back painful memories of the fire in the Ringtheater of 1881, and his sensitive soul seemed unable to cope with what was happening, but it was fortunate that a young man standing behind him was able to offer support. It was Eckstein, recognisable from his long dark hair and large beard, the person who had already attended Bruckner’s lectures and exercises for over four years. Eckstein had over that time repeatedly expressed the wish for Bruckner to accept him as a private pupil, but he had always been turned down. It seems that the reason for this was that Eckstein had become a factory manager at the age of 21 and Bruckner, in a rather naive and deferential way, felt unable to accept a factory manager as a private pupil. On this occasion it seems they had met at the right moment for both of them - the dramatic incident of the fire. Eckstein took Bruckner to a café where the composer calmed down. After a short while Bruckner produced a piece of paper upon which were written some Latin verses. He asked Eckstein to translate them. It was a hymn by Bernard of Clairvaux, the French Cistercian abbot. Eckstein stood up and recited the Latin ode by heart and also translated it into German for Bruckner. After this the composer said to him “Come to me tomorrow and I shall teach you harmony”. This was how their greater musical association came to fruition. Eckstein went on to be of much help to Bruckner. This included preparation for concerts, when scores had to be taken for printing etc... By such ways does the destiny of individuals become manifest.

Eckstein’s affinity with music also included a pilgrimage to Bayreuth to be present at the opening performance of Parsifal in 1882. He met Wagner and was also a friend of Wolf. (Esotericists have considered that an occult element in the ‘new’ music, exemplified by Wagner, Wolf, Bruckner and others towards the later years of the century was what made the alternative ‘school’, represented by such as Brahms and the critic Hanslick to be so furiously opposed to it - because it was determined that music was to be kept in the exoteric realm. This subject is beyond the limitations of the present article.) It was extraordinary that, as a Jew, Eckstein went on living in Vienna until 1939 and was involved in
many cultural movements. But around 1902 he had already diverged from the path of Theosophy and from Steiner when the latter began to give lectures to the Theosophical Society. (Later he helped bring the works of Dostoyevsky from Bolshevik Russia by an adventurous route.) Eckstein would continue to sit long hours at his table at the Café Imperial, yet - it is said - without a penny to his name, after being a rich man in earlier times. His presence there was considered a privilege.

Rudolf Steiner (1861-1925) developed Anthroposophy (Spiritual Science) from his membership of the Theosophical Society. His all-embracing teachings found a synthesis between science and religion. His vast outline concerning the spiritual nature of man and the universe, which included esoteric Christianity later also involved the practical life in the arts, including architecture and drama, and in education, agriculture and medicine. His student days in Vienna, at the Vienna Institute of Technology, from 1879 to 1883 included courses in mathematics, physics, chemistry, botany and biology. Steiner was imbued with his own feelings of destiny and came into contact with certain individuals who were very influential in his practical and spiritual life, especially the herb gatherer Felix Kogutzki, whom Steiner first met when he was 21 on a train, and who spoke about the spiritual world “as one who had his own experience therein”.

Steiner would also see the spiritual world as being as real for him as the physical. Soon Steiner was reading Goethe’s works on natural science. Then one of Steiner’s teachers referred him to Joseph Kurschner, the chief editor of a new edition of Goethe’s works, whereupon Kurschner asked Steiner to become the natural science editor. This was an exceptional opportunity for a young student without academic credentials or publications to his name, and in 1888 he left Vienna for Weimar where the Goethe archives were held.

Some of Bruckner’s lectures were included in those which Steiner attended at the University of Vienna. Whether or not during his life Steiner heard any of Bruckner’s music he did comment, at least, on the Ninth Symphony in one of his many lecture cycles. It was in fact in the lecture cycle given on one of his visits to England (1924) which has the title True and False Paths in Spiritual Investigation. Here he refers to what he terms the “Christ Impulse” in music, which in future will be expressed through music, and which had already been portrayed in Pre-Renaissance and Renaissance painting. It was anticipated in Wagner’s Parsifal, but not successfully, likewise with Bruckner’s Ninth: “While we admire its greatness...we find a hesitant approach to the true elements of music, and a failure to achieve a full realization of these elements which can only be experienced in the way I have described, i.e. when we have made strides in the realm of pure music and discover therein the essence, the fundamental spirit which can conjure forth a world through tones.” Whether or not the phrase “failure to achieve a full realisation...” was referring to the difficulties Brucker had with the Finale is speculative, but, as Steiner was unlikely ever to have been acquainted with the fragments it would really refer to a more esoteric element which Steiner was portraying in these lectures.

A further connecting of Bruckner’s Ninth and Rudolf Steiner came about when, in later years, Bruno Walter, who would come to hold the symphony in great esteem and which would be of spiritual importance for him during his life as he gave numerous performances of the work, also developed an interest in the study of Steiner’s anthroposophical world view. Indeed, he never left it, as witnessed increasingly in both his public and private writings. In his book Of Music and Music-Making Walter wrote of Bruckner “As a result of my lifelong occupation with Bruckner I am audacious enough to express the opinion that he has lived on this earth already, not in the sphere of Time but of Eternity...Bruckner’s music is a bridge to transcendental regions and only those longing for higher spheres will respond to the apostolic calls sounding forth from his work”. (He was partly referring here to the knowledge of reincarnation as taught by Steiner) And Walter had similar views regarding Mahler, suggested that he would have also become attracted to Steiner’s teachings “had fate brought them together”.

It would have been natural for Steiner to become involved with those who met together at the cafes such as the philosophers, poets and theologians, and especially the esoteric group. Eckstein himself was the same age as Steiner. It was through Eckstein that Steiner became aware of the history of occultism throughout human history and Steiner was also introduced to Goethe’s science and the key to Goethe’s own occult symbolism.

So then with the café meetings of Vienna’s celebrities and others, where Steiner would have been present and perhaps would have been with Bruckner on certain occasions - in addition to attending the composer’s lectures. How fascinating it is to contemplate the subjects and words which may have passed between Eckstein, Steiner and Bruckner and others in those days. Bruckner, whilst not a literary person, would not have been averse to listening in and discussing other-worldly matters. And what would have passed through his mind as he walked home from those occasions, to continue work on the current symphony he was creating?

Sources:
2. The author’s collection of Steiner material. See also references to Rudolf Steiner in The Bruckner Journal Vol.22; Vol.6/3 and Vol.12/3
"As we get older, we do not get any younger."

THANKS TO Peter Palmer for drawing our attention to an article in The Independent, 18 December 2012, entitled “Another year, another birthday – but don’t let’s get hung up on mortality” in which Dominic Lawson meditates on the passing of time, and how “a sense of timelessness, however much of an illusion that is, becomes ever more attractive. ... I confess a weakness for the music of Bruckner, in part because the sheer length of his symphonies prolongs the time we as listeners are lost in his world of almost mystical reveries.” He recognises this ‘weakness’ does not afflict all music-lovers: “Some serious musicians hate this sense of timelessness; that excellent critic Jessica Duchen wrote earlier this year that despite all the well-meaning attempts of colleagues to convert her, she remained ‘pathologically allergic... Bruckner’s symphonies are stiflingly, crushingly, oppressive. Once you’re in one, you can’t get out again. Spend too long in their grip and you lose the will to live. They are cold-blooded and exceedingly long and they go round and round in circles.’”

Yes, they do go round in circles, so that the listener does indeed lose track of time – rather like walking in one of those dense Austrian forests that the composer knew so well; but that is exactly the attraction. Duchen went on to observe that Bruckner – whom she described as “the Lumbering Loony of Linz” – was an obsessive-compulsive with a counting mania. This is true; but perhaps the reason his monumental compositions appeal so much to those of us seeking a transcendental escape from the strictures of time is that they were the composer’s own route to peace of mind."

Returning to his university town, Lawson feels himself to be a youngster again - but then catches sight of his true image reflected in a shop window: “Time to listen to some Bruckner: either that, or to grow up, however late in the day,” he concludes.

Never To Be Repeated...

“... The present fashion of playing symphonies without pause or opportunity for applause between the movements might be injurious rather than helpful to the effect of the music. A case in point is the performance of Bruckner’s Eighth Symphony given by Otto Klemperer yesterday afternoon in Carnegie Hall with the New York Symphony Society... It need hardly be said that it is entirely too long, that there are useless repetitions ... But when a symphony in four movements lasts more than a solid hour it is unreasonable to give the audience no point or occasion for an instant’s relaxation.”

This is the comment of American music critic, Olin Downes (1886 - 1955), reviewing a concert on February 5th 1926. Beyond the general exasperation, it is interesting to learn both that in those days it had perhaps been usual to applaud between movements, and also that Klemperer was part of a fashion that somehow managed to prevent this happening.

But Mr Downes had a further complaint, “The scherzo would be an exceptionally fresh, jocose, Beethoven-ish affair, with a quiet contrasting section of pastoral loveliness, if Mr. Klemperer had not been set upon giving it with all the repeats...” There is, of course, only one repeat and that is the complete da capo, so it’s hard to know what the impatient critic would have had him do. But before we scoff at the opinions and practices of a bygone era, not merely was there stormy applause after each movement of Bruckner’s Eighth at its first performance, but as recently as February 2010 Kurt Masur and the Philharmonia gave a performance of the Fourth Symphony which abbreviated the Scherzo da capo by the simple expedient of stopping halfway through, presumably under the strange impression that the London audiences shared Olin Downes’s impatience. One would hope that this practice will not be repeated: the anxiety is perhaps better addressed by the 1888 edition of the 4th symphony that manages to abbreviate the da capo in a way that at least allows the movement to finish in the right key. kw

Bruckner on the Terraces

ONE EVENING, one of those odd coincidences that come to us often occurred when I had just had a cause to look up a piece about Elias Canetti, the novelist who was interested in the study of crowd behaviour (See his Crowds and Power), when a Brucknerian acquaintance telephoned to say that whilst watching some European football matches he heard the chanting of the main Allegro theme of the first movement of Bruckner’s Fifth Symphony. As I am not a football person I hadn’t seen the matches and so had not heard this, and I can’t recall
any reference by any Brucknerians to such chanting in the past.

A simple theme it is but it seems there is no coincidence here. Indeed, there are numerous internet sites telling the story! And Bruckner may now even be one of the most popular, most played and most sung of composers around the world! The theme was a direct inspiration (from the symphony as far as one can tell) of the brother and sister rock duo, The White Stripes, and the tune is on the first track on their album called *Elephant*, released in 2003. The track is titled *Seven Nation Army* (Semi-acoustic guitar player, Jack White, states that Seven Nation Army is what he used to call the Salvation Army as a child.) When released as a single it reached #1 on Modern Rock Tracks, and it has been placed #8 by Q magazine in its list of 100 Greatest Guitar Tracks! Elsewhere it has been placed as #5 on the list of 50 Greatest Tracks of the Decade; also #21 on a list of the 100 Greatest Guitar Songs of All Time. Other accolades include the Best Rock Song of 2004. (One of the websites describes Bruckner as an Austrian giganticist!)

The song has an underlying riff, playing throughout, sounding like a bass guitar, but, it seems, actually created by running a semi-acoustic guitar through an octave pedal set down an octave, something like this:

This is the Bruckner theme, here transposed to compare:

The White Stripes’ riff is most reminiscent of Bruckner at the point when Bruckner repeats the opening two bars of his theme on woodwind seven times in the first movement coda (bar 455). *Seven Nation Army* became popular as a ‘pump-up’ song in American football and basketball as well as becoming popular at soccer games in Europe, then spreading around the sports world. By time the massed crowds are chanting it, the rhythm is simplified.

Who said the Fifth was never popular? But the story does bring up some interesting questions. Where did Bruckner himself find the theme? Was it a simple thought, quite arbitrary, or some inspiration from the subconscious? (We recall the theme in the Seventh Symphony which was supposed to have inspired by hearing it in a dream.) Or a derivation from a folk theme? If Jack White knew Bruckner’s symphonies what led him to use this particular theme? (Any feedback welcome.)

It’s quite astonishing to realise that this theme from the Fifth must have become, in recent years, one of the best-known and most sung and played themes from all classical music, being reflected in the world of popular rock music and in football crowds. Crowds have in some way visited one of the most powerful, yet at the same time most reflective, of symphonic works by default. And maybe not an insubstantial number have proceeded from the *Seven Nation Army*, to listen to the Bruckner’s Fifth for themselves.

Raymond Cox

---

"There is no other book on Wagner quite like it"

Paul Dawson-Bowling, contributor and subscriber to *The Bruckner Journal*, has written

**THE WAGNER EXPERIENCE - and its meaning to us**

2 volumes in slip case, generously illustrated with many colour plates, £30

Old Street Publishing 978-1-908699-43-5 (to be published May 2013)

Before taking us through the ten great dramas themselves, Paul Dawson-Bowling discusses Wagner's formative experiences, his aspirations and his mentality, also his first wife Minna and her immense but unrecognised impact. This sets up better lenses through which to view not only Wagner the man and his less appealing aspects, but more importantly his stage works, since, as Dawson-Bowling insists, the best encounter with Wagner's dramas is the direct one.

Uniquely drawing on a lifetime's experience in General Medical Practice, the author brings a wisdom, humanity and psychological understanding to his study of the life and work of Wagner, with special reference to the thought of Carl Jung. Above all the book draws out the vital lessons which Wagner's extraordinary didactic dramas can offer us. It reveals their lessons as life-enhancing, capable of transforming our society, our lives and ourselves. There is no other book about Wagner quite like it.

Paul Dawson-Bowling studied Classics at school and Philosophy at Oxford, and joined the Civil Service before beginning at 29 to train as a Doctor of Medicine. For 30 years he was a family doctor in Kent. In retirement he remains a trustee of the Sick Doctors Trust. In 1958, when still a schoolboy, he bicycled across Europe for the Bayreuth Festival. For 25 years he has been a principal reviewer for *Wagner News*. He has published articles in the UK and America; he is also a well-known lecturer. He is married to the harpsichordist Elizabeth de la Porte, whose great love of Bach and Couperin he shares.
IF ONE were seeking nominations for the accolade of ‘Greatest Living Bruckner Conductor’, Stanislaw Skrowaczewski would have to be up there on the short list, alongside such devoted and venerable Brucknerians as Barenboim, Haitink and Blomst. Born in October 1923, making his conducting debut at the age of 13 in 1936 (as soloist and conductor in Beethoven’s Third Piano Concerto!), Skrowaczewski is still going strong at 89, touring and conducting Bruckner at venues across the world in the USA, Europe, and Japan. His devotion to Bruckner began with a revelatory experience when, at the age of 7, walking in the streets of Lwów (then Poland, now L'viv, Ukraine) he heard the sound of music coming from an open window. He was transfixed: “I was in a trance. I was in heaven - the world didn’t exist for me.” It was, as he wrote in the reply to a card I sent him after a deeply moving performance of Bruckner’s 6th at the Royal Albert Hall, (BBC Proms, 5 September 1996), that “metaphysical shudder that great music can produce.” The music he had heard coming through the window on that occasion over 80 years ago was the Adagio of Bruckner’s 7th Symphony.

Frederick Harris Jr.’s magnificent biography, *Seeking the Infinite*, traces the life of this great maestro and composer from his earliest days in Poland, surviving the extremes of Nazism and Stalinism, through his time in Paris where he worked with Nadia Boulanger and joined the avant-garde composer group Zodiaque, to his career as music director of the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra for nearly 20 years. Seven years with the Hallé in Manchester followed, and today he is the Conductor Laureate of the Minnesota Orchestra, Principal Guest Conductor of the Deutsche Radio Philharmonie, and Honorary Conductor Laureate of the Yomiuri Nippon Symphony Orchestra in Tokyo. Interesting biographies of conductors can be difficult to write because the life is so much in the music and its performance, and hence the story of it can easily degenerate into a mere list of dates, orchestras and performances. The best ones, such as Peter Heyworth’s biography of Otto Klemperer and Tanya Tintner’s biography of Georg Tintner, whilst fulfilling the requirement for the essentials of that mundane information, rise above it to present a vivid narrative of the maestro’s life, giving some insight into how his character and his times interact. The reader is given the option to conjecture how these might impinge on the interpretations, so enhancing the understanding of performances, giving an added dimension to their eloquence. *Seeking the Infinite* achieves this goal admirably. A well constructed and thoroughly readable account of Skrowaczewski’s musical life, the result of many years of painstaking research and 230 interviews, it gives intriguing insights into the composer/conductor’s personality, musical aspirations and working practices.

In Dr. Harris’ biography the musical life is nicely framed by two portraits of Lwów, then and now, seen through Skrowaczewski’s eyes. As a young boy he was very sensitive to the surreal images evoked in the autumnal mistiness of the city. “The streets were eerie during autumn: dead leaves underfoot, flooded streams, the fog and mist in the air dimly illuminated by gas lamps. … ‘[It was] very mysterious, vague, and impressive to me. All of these images, although realistic, were unrealistic to me, creating a surreal vision of the world. The atmosphere of Lwów, supported by fables I knew, created a special openness in me … building my sensitivity to art in general. Later these images connected music with its mystery, like I felt with Mozart’s Don Giovanni, for example: one world that is alive, another dead.’” In the final chapter Harris describes Skrowaczewski’s return to Lwów in 2008. Before boarding the plane Skrowaczewski turned for one last glimpse of Lwów. Clouds were gathering and it began to rain. “From his window seat, he saw that the sunny Lwów he … had experienced for two and a half days had been transformed. Pressing his face to the small oval window, Skrowaczewski smiled. His mysterious, veiled, and vaporous city had been restored to him.”

The description of the musical life that grew out of these images gives us a picture of an artist, courteous and gentlemanly, but rigorous in his efforts to recreate the mystery of music that had been revealed to him. The cellist Lynn Harrell says of working with him, “Most important to him was, no matter what, ‘we
are not as good as the music is”; therefore, we have to work particularly hard and afresh each and every single time.” Harris writes that Skrowaczewski’s “intense self-discipline brings a businesslike, task-oriented approach to rehearsals, a characteristic associated with past conducting titans,” but asserts categorically that “the idea of him having a tantrum on the podium is inconceivable.” This humility before the music and courtesy to his fellow musicians seem not, however, to be easily ‘marketable’ virtues, and Skrowaczewski himself has throughout been averse to the business of self-promotion. Clive Smart, general manager of the Hallé, observed that Skrowaczewski “felt that mainly the music should do the publicity. He’s a very reserved gentleman, a little shy, and does not communicate well with the crowd.” The benefit of his approach for the music, but its disadvantage for modern publicity, is summarised succinctly by Richard Dyer, critic for the Boston Globe: “These days it’s hard to make qualities like ‘honesty’ sound exciting, but Skrowaczewski’s honest, straightforward, experienced performance of the Eroica was very exciting indeed.”

“To me, Bruckner is one of the greatest composers,” says Skrowaczewski. “He is another Mozart: his music is magical. … Its message speaks about the infinite, transcendental cosmos, God, timelessness, love and tragedy.” Skrowaczewski’s devotion to Bruckner’s music is charted at every stage of his career. When in his twenties he became music director of the Silesian Philharmonic, Katowice, 1949-54, he programmed Bruckner every season. During his 19 years at Minneapolis some complained that there was too much Bruckner: “I dislike Bruckner symphonies, and there are many who share my opinion,” a patron stated. “If they must be played, one per season is quite enough.” Skrowaczewski conducted all nine symphonies in Minneapolis, and performed the 8th at his final concert. When he returned to Warsaw in 1981, during the anxious times of the rise of Solidarity, at his first concert he conducted Bruckner’s 3rd, and for the Warsaw Philharmonic’s 90th anniversary concert in 1992 he conducted Bruckner’s 7th. The 80th anniversary season of the Minnesota Orchestra saw him conduct Bruckner’s 9th. He took the Hallé to Linz and performed the 3rd Symphony in Bruckner’s home town, and in his last season with the Hallé he conducted the 7th and 8th symphonies. It was the much lauded recording of the 4th with the Hallé from 1993 that first demonstrated to the record-buying public his great prowess as a Bruckner conductor, and this recording has retained its high reputation to this day. Then came the cycle of eleven symphonies with the Saarbrücken Radio Symphony Orchestra, at ‘super-bargain’ price on Arte Nova (now on Oehms Classics). Re-visiting those performances now, they reveal themselves still as interpretable of great strength, especially notable for clarity of orchestral colour, with woodwind and brass subordinate voices always shining through. They are performances that remain memorable not because of any dramatic exaggeration or overt religiosity, but rather because of the honesty and cogency of their presentation. Today his recorded legacy of Bruckner performances is increasing with contributions from the Yomiuri Nippon Symphony Orchestra.

Readers of this biography will find much about Skrowaczewski’s wide repertory, which has always contained a strong input of modern works in addition to performances of Mozart, Beethoven, Brahms, Schumann, Shostakovich, Chopin piano concertos, Lutosławski and Penderecki whose works figure frequently in his programmes. Music lovers are probably less aware of his work as a composer. Over 70 compositions are listed at the back of Dr. Harris’ biography. Brucknerians might be especially interested in the recording of Skrowaczewski’s Concerto for Orchestra, 1985, available on CD, (Reference Recordings, RR 103CD), whose second movement is entitled, “Anton Bruckner’s Himmelfahrt” - (Anton Bruckner’s Journey to Heaven). More recently a CD “Skrowaczewski - The Composer” includes Music at Night, Fantasie for flute and orchestra, and his Symphony, 2003 (Oehms OC712). The music is often dissonant, even brutal, but at times moves with a Brucknerian slow patience and mastery of the extended span. There are atmospheric sounds that easily evoke the misty nights as one imagines them to have been in Lwów.

Lwów was annexed by the Soviet Union at the outbreak of World War II, invaded by the Nazis in 1941, returning to Soviet control in 1944. The story of Skrowaczewski’s survival during this period, and building a career in the Soviet era, is extraordinary and gripping to read in Frederick Harris’s narration. By twists and turns of good fortune and bad, his career developed via a scholarship to the Sorbonne and thereafter to the Warsaw National Orchestra, till he left Poland and began his career as Music Director of the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra. It’s a story well worth the reading, with much of interest about orchestras and their management, and about the long and active life of an extraordinary and courageous man - and his wife, Krystyna - devoted with high seriousness to the creation and performance of beautiful music, music whose soul, as Skrowaczewski wrote, “is revealed only to those who desire and are willing to go through certain stages of ceremony and mystery to reach it. A concert hall should be a temple where music leads us gradually from the secular life into the realm of the extraordinary, to the life that is innermost…” Ken Ward
ONE OF THE MOST striking of Bruckner's shorter works is *Abendzauber*, a beautiful work scored for male voice choir, tenor/baritone solo, four horns and three yodellers. It was written in 1878.

On 16th December 1877, the disastrous first performance of the third symphony took place with Bruckner himself conducting. It has been written that Bruckner was so discouraged that he stopped composing for a time (Doernberg, *The Life and Symphonies of Anton Bruckner*, 1960, London, page 78). Yet in January 1878 he wrote *Abendzauber* and later the same year he wrote one of his most original and lovely motets *Tota pulchra es* and at the end of the year he began the wonderful String Quintet.

*Abendzauber* starts with a soft horn call, and is followed with the soloist singing a beautiful melody accompanied by a humming chorus. A much more romantic sound than we usually get with Bruckner. This is a song of the mountains and forests. The text of *Abendzauber* comes from a poem by Heinrich von der Mattig, a pseudonym for Dr Heinrich Wallman, whose text Bruckner had also used for *Das hohe Lied*.

Translation by Ruth Thomas, p. 109

For most of the piece the text is delivered by the soloist, and the male voice choir is used as a humming chorus. Only in the last few lines (Empor zum Himmelsraum...) does the chorus actually sing the words.

Good performances of *Abendzauber* can be found on two discs. A particularly beautiful performance (with male yodellers) can be found on a recent disc *Serenade - Songs of the night and love, Romantic part songs for male choir*. This is a lovely disc and also contains 3 other Bruckner works for Male voice choir, *Um Mitternacht*, *Der Abendhimmel*, and *Mitternacht*. It also contains 8 works by Schubert, 3 works of Vaughan Williams, and works by Sjöberg and Hugo Alfven. (Camerata Musica Limburg / Jan Schumacher. Genuin CD GEN 12224). There's also a Koch Schwann CD, 3-1398-2, unfortunately no longer available, with Rolf Beck and the South German Vocal Ensemble. At the time of writing there's a second hand copy listed for sale on amazon.co.uk for nearly £75! This is another beautiful performance with female yodellers.

However, the easiest way to hear *Abendzauber* is on YouTube. If you Google “Abendzauber” you can find a a number of performances there. I particularly like the one conducted by J. Böck with J. Gisser as the baritone soloist. Here you see the performance, and the yodellers (3 sopranos) are singing away from the choir, high up in a box. If you want a tenor solo you will also find this on YouTube with Dritan Luca as the soloist. The conductor is J. Böck again and in both cases we hear the horns of the Vienna Symphony Orchestra, but in this second one the video is of still portraits of the singers only.
Prof Keith Kinder gives an account of this work in his book The wind and wind-chorus music of Anton Bruckner. (The book is available for purchase on-line, but the price varies immensely. But when I first looked for it on Amazon there was a copy for £140 for a 140 page book! On-line searches at the time of writing show copies available for under £30.)

This is probably the only English language book about Bruckner’s music where the symphonies are hardly discussed. In fact only 19 of Bruckner’s works are discussed and of these 4 are not recorded on disc or available on YouTube. Each work is discussed in some detail, with a description of what is known about the occasion and date of composition, the style of composition and its relation to tradition and to the text (where applicable). The texts are provided with adequate literal translations (as quoted above for Abendzauber) and Kinder gives a clear musical analysis with frequent music examples of significant themes.

A work is included in this book only if it contains a part for wind instruments without orchestra. For example there are 3 pages devoted to one of Bruckner’s first works, the Mass in C (Windhaager Mass) WAB 25 which is scored for solo alto, 2 horns and organ; four and a half pages are devoted to the rarely heard March in E flat for military band composed in Linz in 1865, even though this work lasts less than 3 minutes. The other only work in this book which is just for brass are the Zwei Aequalen for three trombones. All other works include choir. The only work here to be frequently performed is the Mass in E minor, a truly unique and great work for choir and brass. A whole chapter of twenty-eight pages is devoted to it along with thirty-six musical examples.

Only one of these works has several recordings and that is the E minor mass. A historical overview of these recordings is given by Hans Roelofs on his Bruckner Vocal and Instrumental Music Discography, www.bruicknerdiskografie.nl, a translation published in The Bruckner Journal of July 2010 and continued in the November issue. In the first article he lists 22 recordings beginning in 1930. In the second article he lists 31 performances from 1990 to 2008.

One disc that is particularly praised is that by Simon Halsey and the CBSO Chorus and Wind ensemble (Conifer CDCF 192). This contains three other important works that are described in some detail in Kinder’s book - the Zwei Aequalen, the motet Afferentur regi for four-part choir and three trombones (1861) and the ceremonial motet Ecce sacerdos magnus (1885) for three trombones organ and eight-part choir. Kinder describes this work as being of almost barbaric intensity, church music at its most dramatic. But the melodic writing, derived from plainchant, is of Brucknerian beauty.

Another disc of interest is the recording of the Requiem by Matthew Best which also contains Psalm 114 of 1852 for five-part choir and three trombones which Kinder describes as Bruckner’s first indisputable masterpiece for chorus and winds. (Hyperion CDA66245).

The very early C major mass can also be found on another disc of the E minor mass, again well received by Roelofs, this time by Valeri Polansky. (Chandos CHAN9863) The alto solo is Ludmilla Kuznetzova. I slightly prefer a performance sung by Ingeborg Rauss as the companion work to a good performance of the Symphony no. 0 in D minor conducted by Hortense van Gelmin (Klassic Haus KHCD 2012-007).

The well-known Naxos disc of Bruckner Motets conducted by Robert Jones with the choir of St.Bride’s Church contains a number of pieces discussed in this book (Naxos 8.550956). Besides Ecce sacerdos magnus and Afferentur Regi, it contains a beautiful piece that Bruckner wrote for the funeral of the Prelate of St. Florian, Michael Arneth: Libera Me in F minor, scored for mixed chorus, three trombones, cello, double bass and organ. Also on this disc is the motet Inveni David for four trombones and male voice choir. Another piece written for the funeral of Michael Arneth is Vor Arneth’s Grab, for male voice choir and three trombones. This can be found on the disc Männerchöre directed by Thomas Kerbl (LIVA 027 - available from Brucknerhaus, Linz, or via iTunes) The disc also includes the splendid festive Cantata Preiset den Herrn for large wind band and male voice choir written in 1862. This takes up ten pages of Kinder’s book. To hear the cheerful March in E flat, WAB 116, you will have to get the Chandos disc Experiments on a March with the Royal Northern College of Music Wind Orchestra conducted by Clark Rundell (CHAN 10367).

Thus even though many of the pieces discussed in the book are rarely played, it is possible to hear the majority of them. These works cover the whole of Bruckner’s life from the early Mass in C written in 1842 when Bruckner was 18 to Das Deutsche Lied written in 1892. They include several supreme masterpieces such as the E minor Mass, and other great works such as Abendzauber and Ecce sacerdos magnus.

This book is a valuable and unusual addition to the Bruckner literature and demonstrates that Bruckner wrote a lot of beautiful and interesting pieces in addition to the symphonies and large scale choral music.

David Singerman (d.singerman@soton.ac.uk.)
NEW & REISSUED RECORDINGS

Compiled by Howard Jones

November 2012 to February 2013

This substantial listing sees the completion of Blomstedt’s Leipzig Gewandhaus cycle for his 85th birthday, with the release of Symphonies #2 & 9, and the boxed set, but is otherwise dominated by reissues. These include clutches of Celibidache, Furtwängler, Harnoncourt, Jochum, Karajan, Kegel, Klemerer and Schuricht. One surprise from Music and Arts is the first issue of a 1953 live Symphony #3 from F Charles Adler and the Vienna SO, recorded the previous day to the studio recording on their venerable SPA LP set, which seems never to have been reissued. One novelty is the Czech Horn Chorus in the third and first movements, respectively, of Symphonies #8 & 9 from Cryston label.
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CD Reviews

Bruckner - Symphony 3 (1889 version, ed Nowak)
Orchestre de la Suisse Romande/Marek Janowski

Pentatone SACD PTC 5186 449 Total playing time: 53:20

THIS RECORDING of the Third Symphony is the latest release in Marek Janowski’s ongoing Bruckner cycle with the Orchestre de la Suisse Romande. I must admit to being disappointed by the earlier releases of the Fifth and Eight Symphonies, the former in particular failing to recapture the intellectual rigour and epic power of the performance of the Fifth I heard Janowski and the orchestra give in London in January 2008. And despite a number of positive features, I find this performance of the Third Symphony similarly lacking in inspiration and ambition.

Janowski has been Musical Director of the orchestra since 2005 and there is no doubting the refined and cultured playing he secures. Climaxes sound suitably majestic, solos are eloquently played, and there is an overall lucidity to texture that allows inner voices to be clearly heard. The chorale for horns at bar 215 in the finale, for instance, is absolutely sublime. Janowski also provides a clear-sighted view of the works architecture, favourite steady tempi for the most part, but cognizant of Bruckner’s markings where they occur, particularly in the finale.

What’s less impressive, however, is Janowski’s cautious approach to dynamics, which rarely sound softer than p or louder than ff. Not only does this lessen the impact of Bruckner’s sudden changes of dynamic level, it also robs quieter passages of mystery. Perhaps more importantly, there’s rarely the sense of an orchestra being pushed to give their all in climactic passages, a quality that makes Herbert von Karajan’s account with the Berliner Philharmoniker so memorable. Ultimately the result is rather safe and pedestrian. Some may favour such an approach for domestic listening, but ultimately I feel a more dynamic approach is required for a symphony, even in its 1889 version, conceived on such a grand scale.

Janowski’s approach is heard at its best in the Adagio, which is gently expressive at a flowing tempo, although even here he seems unwilling to seek truly hushed playing. A case in point is the normally arresting drop from p to ppp in the tremolando strings in bar 209, just before the coda, which sounds perfunctory here. The start of the finale communicates a high energy level, but unfortunately this is not sustained as the movement progresses.

The recording, made in Victoria Hall, Geneva, is clear and well balanced, although the hall’s generous reverberation (some three seconds) occasionally clouds detail. The hybrid SACD is both compatible with standard CD players and offers the choice of stereo and surround sound with SACD players. I found the surround sound option especially impressive, the additional channels helping to clarify and enhance the effect of the hall’s generous acoustic.

Christian Hoskins
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (arr. piano Four-Hands Mahler/Krzyzanowski)
Liszt - Les Préludes (Liszt’s arr. for piano duo)
Piano Duo: Marialena Fernandes, Ranko Marković
Gramola CD no. 98948

AS THOSE who have been to the last couple of Bruckner Journal Readers Conferences will attest, it is always intriguing to have the opportunity to hear Bruckner symphonies in versions for piano. It is not merely the historical fact that this is how the composer would have expected the majority of the audience to get to know the works in the first place, in the days before recordings were available, but it is also the revelations available from this unusual slant on the work. In many ways the structure of the melodic and harmonic texture is laid clear in a way that is often not so apparent in the full orchestral sound, and different voicings and events come to the fore which previously didn’t register so strongly, and which can then inform and enrich one’s listening to the orchestral performance.

One of the many difficult choices for the performers is whether to try and imitate the orchestra, or to try and make the best of it as a work for piano. The first recording of it, that by Evelinde Trenkner and Sontraud Speidel on MDG Gold from 1994 (MDG 330 0591-2), presents the work with considerable power, and plenty of pedal, in this way suggesting the strength available to the full orchestra. Marialena Fernandes and Ranko Marković in this present recording are generally lighter in touch with a more pianistic approach to the work. In the opening there is a livelier rhythmic sense and more purposeful progress. Trenkner and Speidel seem to ensure that they play together by keeping the rhythm firm, whereas Fernandes and Marković have a remarkable musical sympathy one with another which allows them to vary the tempi with great warmth and expressive effect.

The extraordinary performance of Deno Sequi and Gerhard Hofer (available from www.abruckner.com, BSVD-0110) is in a class of its own, a live event with plenty of audience noise and resonant acoustic, and at times they fail to come in together at all - but for all that it is an absolutely gripping performance, with much lyricism and plenty space for the music to breathe, and a palpable sense of occasion. You are with them all the way and it’s hard not to stand up and applaud with the recorded audience when they finish.

If one wished to choose between these three performances then this new one on Gramola label is unarguably the best recorded and the best played. Although Trenkner-Speidel have much dramatic power, at times their interpretation lacks interest and imagination, there’s not a lot of lift to the frequent dance-like passages, and their rushed presentation of the closing statement of the motto theme fails to reflect the large scale and aspiration of the work. Fernandes and Marković pace the final pages with the same sensitivity to small changes in tempo that informs their performance throughout, the last bars are very exciting indeed. Possibly the high incessantly repeated four rising quavers (on violins in the orchestral original) are too dominating at the expense of the middle and bass texture, but they progress indomitably to the final statement of the symphony’s main theme which is given with a grandeur worthy of its blazing inspiration.

In November 2006, Fernandes and Marković performed this work at a joint meeting of Bruckner Journal readers and the Gustav Mahler Society UK, which took place in the grand surroundings of the Austrian Ambassador’s residence in London. Those lucky enough to have attended need have no doubts that this recording lives up to the quality of the performance on that occasion: it’s been a long wait, but now they have a memento of very special event - with the added 15 min. bonus of a very stirring performance of Liszt’s own version of Les Préludes for piano duo.

Ken Ward

---

**Residential Study Weekend focuses on the 9th Symphonies of BRUCKNER and MAHLER**

with Terry Barfoot

**Friday 26th – Sunday 28th April 2013, The Wroxton House Hotel, Wroxton, Banbury, OX15 6QB**

Guests will arrive on Friday from 5pm, and depart after tea on Sunday. Arts in Residence and Wroxton House offer an excellent cuisine including dinner with wine, and a traditional Sunday lunch. The weekend is designed as an informal ‘house party’ and guests need only the ability to enjoy music; no technical knowledge is required.

**Price**: £275.00 per person (twin/double rooms), £299.00 (single rooms) to include all meals, wine, beverages, course fees and accommodation.

**Booking**: Arts in Residence, 25, Mulberry Lane, Cosham, Portsmouth, PO6 2QU. £50.00 per person deposit with booking. (Cheques payable to Arts in Residence Ltd.)

**Enquiries**: 02392 383356

**Email**: info@artsinresidence.co.uk

**Website**: www.artsinresidence.co.uk
Bruckner - Symphony 1 (1877 version, ed Nowak)
Querstand CD Number: VKJK 1115  Total playing time: 49:51
Bruckner - Symphony 2 (1872 version, ed Carragan)
Querstand CD Number: VKJK 1214  Total playing time: 62:02
Bruckner - Symphony 9 (1894 Original Version, ed Cohrs)
Querstand CD Number: VKJK 1215  Total playing time: 59:21

Gewandhausorchester Leipzig/Herbert Blomstedt

THESE THREE releases see the completion of Herbert Blomstedt’s cycle of the nine numbered Bruckner symphonies for the German label Querstand. Although Blomstedt previously recorded the Fourth and Seventh Symphonies for Denon in the 1980s and the Fourth, Sixth and Ninth for Decca in the 1990s, this is the first time he has set down a complete cycle.

In common with the rest of the series, the three new recordings were made at live concerts with the Gewandhausorchester Leipzig, of which Blomstedt is Conductor Laureate. The Gewandhausorchester has long had an association with Bruckner’s music, not only giving the premiere of the Seventh Symphony under Nikisch in 1884, but also performing the rest of the cycle during the conductor’s subsequent tenure as Music Director. The orchestra’s Bruckner tradition continued under many of its subsequent music directors, including Furtwängler, Walter, Abendroth, Konwitschny and Masur.

Earlier releases in Blomstedt’s cycle have offered a remarkable degree of consistency in both authority and execution, and these latest performances are no exception. Blomstedt’s interpretations are distinguished by a fidelity to the score and a general avoidance of interpretative idiosyncrasy, but also convey a deep understanding of the composer’s idiom and a ready communicative expressiveness.

For his performance of the First Symphony, Blomstedt uses the revision Bruckner made in Vienna in 1877. (Querstand follows general practice by referring to this as the 1866 Linz edition on the CD cover, although this designation is no longer appropriate given the increasing interest in Bruckner’s original 1865/66 version.) Blomstedt’s performance, whilst cognisant of the symphony’s vigour and impetuosity, is notable for its sensitivity to the score’s introspective side. The lyrical passages marked dolce (sweet) in the first and fourth movements are played with grace and eloquence, while performance of the Adagio has an improvisatory feel that conveys both profundity and the impression of fresh discovery. The outer movements and Scherzo are suitably imbued with a keen energy, although I’m not sure that the conclusion of the symphony delivers the emotional reward that the exciting start of the finale initially promises.

The recording of the Second Symphony uses Bruckner’s original 1872 score in the edition by William Carragan. With a duration 60’13” (not including applause), Blomstedt’s is easily the swiftest reading of the 1872 version on disc, shaving around five minutes off the running time of the recording by Marcus Bosch and some ten minutes off those by Georg Tinter, Simone Young and Gerhard Schaller. The performance never sounds rushed, however, and indeed Blomstedt’s tempo for the first movement is in keeping with Bruckner’s marking of Ziemlich schnell (quite fast). From the start, the reading has an irresistible forward momentum, propelled by a sense of rhythmic buoyancy and excitingly eruptive ff timpani rolls. A similar freshness and energy pervades the Scherzo, which also benefits from a beautifully prepared and expressively played account of the Trio.

The slow movement, placed third and designated Adagio in this version of the symphony, receives a profound and moving performance. The exposed writing for solo horn is rendered perfectly throughout, as are the solos for violin and flute in the coda. The finale is dynamic and powerful, Blomstedt maintaining a sure sense of line through Bruckner’s earlier and longer structure while ensuring a feeling of repose for the two quotations of the Kyrie from the Mass in F minor at bars 205 and 649. Among recordings of the 1872 score, this new version provides a strong rival to Schaller’s excellent new recording.

With so many outstanding recordings of the Ninth Symphony in the catalogue, it’s difficult for any newcomer to make a significant impact. Blomstedt’s interpretation of the three movement torso is nevertheless a superb performance. Tempi in all three movements are slightly faster than modern practice, although not as fast as was customary back in the 1950s, and the performance as a whole exerts tremendous grip. The entrance of the horns at the start of the first movement is deep and evocative, and the triple fff statement at bar 63 portends momentous things, which are subsequently delivered. The Scherzo is similarly impressive, Blomstedt combining unusual transparency of texture with an imposing sense of weight and ruggedness.
The orchestral contribution in the Adagio, as elsewhere in the symphony, is notably refined and expressive. The playing of the horns and Wagner tubas in the passage after letter B, for instance, is extremely moving, and the phrasing of the violins and violas in the following passage conveys ineffable sadness. As the movement progresses, Blomstedt conveys both the music’s essential spirituality as well as its nascent modernity, the remarkable passage after letter K projected with a suitably expressionistic intensity. After the spiritual crisis that forms the climax of the movement, Blomstedt provides a deeply affecting account of the coda, the concluding E major chord for brass beautifully and breathtakingly sustained.

Querstand have released the cycle as hybrid SACDs, offering both a stereo and multi channel playback options. All the recordings have a close focus feel to them, no doubt necessitated by the need to eliminate audience noise, but benefit from good balance and a reasonable degree of reverberation. A slight degree of cloudiness is noticeably in tutti passages, affecting the First and Second Symphonies slightly more than the Ninth. All three recordings retain the applause at the end. All of the SACDs have detailed essay in English, French and German by Renate Herklotz. Some of the information in the essays is distinctly questionable, although this might be a result of the quality of the translations, which are very poor.

In commemoration of Blomstedt’s 85th birthday last year, Querstand have assembled the nine symphonies into a boxed set as well as continuing to offer them individually. Among the recordings not already discussed, the Sixth Symphony receives an outstanding performance. That of the Third Symphony, using Bruckner’s original 1873 score, is also extremely good. Indeed, with no obvious weaknesses among the nine performances, this is one of the finest Bruckner cycles now available, the only regret being that Blomstedt did not record the early symphonies in F minor and D minor.

**Christian Hoskins**

**Bruckner - Symphony No. 7**

Staatskapelle Berlin / Daniel Barenboim
DG CD 479 0320  Total playing time: 66:05

BBC Scottish Symphony Orchestra / Donald Runnicles
Hyperion CDA67916  Total playing time: 60:02

Both these performances are very good and to choose between them would be very difficult. This is not because they are equal in the sense of being similar, but almost precisely the opposite: it would be hard to come by two more thoroughly different approaches to the work. Perhaps the difference can be evoked most clearly by reference to the opening of the Adagio. Here Barenboim and the Berlin orchestra are lugubrious, deeply felt, very slow and given to extremes of rapt quietness where the music almost halts, then rising to high points of searing intensity. It is a beautiful solemn sound, well recorded, and it is deeply moving. Runnicles and his Scottish orchestra are much quicker (Barenboim takes 4:14 to complete the Adagio first theme exposition; Runnicles 3:28) and the music floats as though it were a song, more like a lilting lullaby that a funereal meditation, even the most dramatic elements of the theme accommodated without distorting the overall line. It is a very ‘musical’ performance, with no blatant sense of extra-musical reference, no special case being made for Bruckner demanding an expressiveness outside the limits of traditional practice from Haydn through Schubert. It is neither monumental nor religioso, but it sings.

Barenboim builds up the Adagio climax with trenchant deliberation, with pointed gauging of dynamics, ever increasing power, the climactic cymbal clash preceded by an early crescendo on the timpani - presumably an added dramatic touch of Barenboim’s own invention - to overwhelming effect. Runnicles shapes the paragraph as a whole, the climax contained within the rising-falling curve, the cymbal lightly touched-in, the ultimate destination being the horns that cap the close of the Wagner-tuba dirge. One might expect Barenboim to overplay the mournfulness of those tubas, but so much having been expended on the climax their contribution is somewhat restrained; with Runnicles they have the last word, and usher in a coda that sings more beautifully that Barenboim manages: he has no more extra expressive gestures for this movement.
Similar observations can apply to the other movements. Where Runnicles at first sounds a little straight in comparison to Barenboim’s soaring opening arpeggio with its slight accelerando in the middle, the way the BBC Scottish play the whole theme, so alert, with a musical shaping of every phrase contributing to the contour of the whole paragraph, soon demonstrates that there’s more than one way to interpret this music. In support of Runnicles’ way is Bruckner’s tempo marking, *Allegro moderato* - something Barenboim only achieves at the stormy heart of the development. There are many fascinating and appealing details in what Barenboim’s players do. They have now been playing this music together for so long that he has obviously had time to add a whole repertoire of felicitous touches. The articulation of the rhythm of the string playing in the Scherzo on occasions leaps out at you, makes you wish to leap as well, at times the whole orchestra swings and rocks. Nothing like that happens with Runnicles: what we have from the BBC Scottish is a Scherzo, beautifully played, well proportioned and serving its structural function.

The crux for both approaches is how convincingly they interpret the finale. Barenboim having wrung such power and emotion from the early movements chooses to weight the finale quite heavily, partly by observing Bruckner's *ritards* and ensuring the chorale-like second theme is played with a degree of solemnity, but mainly by introducing a very slow tempo for the development where the main theme is presented inverted. Runnicles on the other hand has no truck with ritardandos, and plays the movement in a light, pointed, almost Haydn-esque manner, keeping the tempo flowing throughout, the second theme having the character more of a pastoral interlude than a hymn, and so sticking to his view that Bruckner's true place is as much Classical as Romantic.

I used to find Barenboim’s way with Bruckner disruptive and unconvincing, but having attended quite a number of his performances, including the one recorded on this disc, I have grown to love the man, his open-hearted generosity of spirit, unfailing energy and devotion to the music, and I feel that he has begun to weld his multifarious self-conscious interventions into something coherent and humane. Listening to the CD, I thought this was a tremendous performance. I have been unable to attend a Runnicles’ performance of the 7th, but this recording displays a fresh approach unlike any other I am familiar with. Although the tempos are flexible, it's nothing like Furtwängler or Jochum - there is a continuous flow and energy, and a wonderful sense of the unity of the whole. He gets his orchestra to play with intelligent and vibrant musicality, never an ugly bit of phrasing or an over-egged espressivo. It’s as though he were saying, ‘This is Bruckner: it’s beautiful music - that's all you need to know.’

**Ken Ward**

### Choruses for Male Voices and Orchestra

Sibelius - *The Captive Queen* Op.48  
Debussy - *Invocation*  
Strauss - *Mittagsruhe* Op 76/2 (from Tageszeiten)  
Bruckner - *Helgoland*  
Schubert - *Gesang der Geister über den Wassern*  
Grieg - *Land Sighting* Op.31  
Wagner - *Das Liebesmähl der Apostel* (finale)

Lund Student Singers - Malmö Opera Orchestra / Alberto Hold-Garrido  
Naxos CD - 8.572871

THE LUND STUDENT singers provide a male voice choir for this recording of fine quality, with robust attack and good intonation. The Naxos recording gives a wide stereo spread, the choir is quite forward but the balance between orchestra and choir is very well judged so that vocal parts and details of orchestration are clearly audible. The impressive sound is immediately apparent in Sibelius’s stirring cantata. Noble brass and expressive woodwind solos accompany the choir’s committed rendition in full-hearted music typical of Sibelius’s nationalist style.

Bruckner’s *Helgoland* and Grieg’s *Landkjenning* are similarly stirring, with a nationalist element to their language, but deal with events at sea. The orchestra and choir attack *Helgoland* with considerable vitality, though they avoid the jauntiness of Barenboim’s Chicago performance on DG, giving a stronger impression of the crisis facing the Saxon residents of the island as the Romans approach. They don’t match the image of black terror that comes in Wyn Morris’s famous recording with the Ambrosian Chorus and the Symphonica of London (available from Klassic Haus restorations) - but Morris’s tempi are very slow and his
performance is inclined to drag in the slower sections. Come the salvation of the Helgolanders and their praise to God, the heroism of Morris’s Ambrosian Chorus is put to the test - and a white-knuckle ride it is - but the recording hardly does justice to Bruckner’s orchestration and ensemble is a bit shaky. Barenboim’s Chicago performance (more characterful throughout than his later Berlin Philharmonic remake on Warner Classics) finally catches the requisite noble religious fervour in the closing bars. The Malmö Opera Orchestra and Lund Student Singers give a very creditable account of the cantata, the tenors heartfelt as they address their pleas for help to God, and the closing pages benefit from a recording in which trumpet fanfares, almost inaudible on the Symphonica of London recording, give triumphant embellishment to the heavenward aspiration of the climbing brass theme.

The heavy brass are particularly good on this recording and you hear them to good effect in the Grieg piece and Wagner’s Feast of Pentecost. But the Wagner performance excludes the opening long *a cappella* section, giving just the accompanied finale to the piece where, to a libretto written by Wagner himself, the apostles receive the spirit and stride out to convert the world for ever and ever. It’s a piece probably almost impossible to perform with utmost conviction.

There are two soloists, Mikael Stenback, tenor, and Daniel Hellström, baritone, and both are excellent. Stenback sings with warmth and passion on Debussy’s early *Invocation* (1883) and Hellström is similarly strong as the Norwegian king Olaf Trygvason who dedicates the newly sighted wild landscape to God in Grieg’s *Land Sighting*. The still heart of the selection in the programme presented on this recording is occupied by Richard Strauss’s *Mittagsruhe*. Attractive though the performance is, neither orchestra nor choir seem quite calm and untroubled enough. A contrast to the late-Romantic orchestration of all the other pieces is Schubert’s *Song of the Spirits over the Waters*, accompanied merely by violas, cellos and double-bass. The Lund Singers and strings from the Malmö Opera orchestra give a finely nuanced performance, though it perhaps lacks the degree of eloquence that some other ensembles achieve, such as Det Norske Solistkor on Bis.

The choruses are sung in their original languages. The CD insert booklet provides sketchy notes about the works, but no words. These have to be downloaded from the Naxos web-site where they are provided with good translations. In sum, this is a fine disc of unusual repertoire, in which the more stirring ‘nationalistic’ items, to my ears, receive more convincing performances than the more introverted pieces. Ken Ward

**Concert Reviews**

**Bruckner at the BBC Proms**

**LONDON**

| Symphony No. 8 | BBC Scottish Symphony Orchestra / Donald Runnicles | 3 Aug 2012 |
| Symphony No. 6 | BBC Philharmonic Orchestra / Juanjo Mena | 7 Aug 2012 |
| Symphony No. 9 | Wiener Philharmoniker / Bernard Haitink | 6 Sep 2012 |

Geoffrey Hosking reports:

We heard an unusually fine performance of Bruckner 8 on Friday. I’ve just been re-listening to parts of it on iPlayer to remind myself. Runnicles joins the not very large number of conductors who really know how to shape a Bruckner symphony. The opening theme had all the qualities it should have: mysterious, searching and slightly menacing, and he kept the music moving at a good but not exaggerated pace, so that its urgency and continuous forward development could be felt. The second movement was an exhilarating pagan outburst, also taken at a good speed. So the third movement really sounded like an oasis of timelessness with underlying tension, as it should. The last movement sounded good for the same reasons as the first. Interestingly, the last three notes of the symphony, nearly always played too slowly, were this time actually too fast, with the notes not clearly enough separated, almost the only blemish which could be attributed to the conductor.

Unfortunately the 6th was much less good. Mena enjoys lingering on beautiful phrases, and is inclined to treat each episode for what he can get out of it. Parts of the performance were very good, e.g. the very beginning of the slow movement, but that too soon went astray. Performed that way, Bruckner turns into stodgy Tchaikovsky. Mena joins the more numerous ranks of conductors who ought to leave Bruckner alone…

On the other hand, Dick Williams wrote of the Runnicles 8th:

I found it the most architecturally inept of any performance ever. In contrast I found Mena’s Bruckner 6 confirming my good impressions of a couple of months ago.
And Terry Barfoot wrote:
The Mena/BBCPO Sixth was interesting but not wonderful. He made a lot of extreme contrasts of dynamic which must have been a nightmare for the broadcast engineers, but I liked his tempi and the orchestra played well.

Ivan Hewett wrote in The Telegraph, 8 Aug. 2012:
Then came Bruckner’s Sixth Symphony. Rhythmically it is very hard to manage, particularly in the slow movement, but Juanjo Mena and the orchestra handled this superbly, revealing the long overarching line that made the grinding tempos seem right and natural. The trio of the Scherzo, with its high, dancing pizzicato strings answered by brass, was deliciously light. The Finale has a melody that is Schumann-like in its impetuousness, a quality that Mena brought out by shaping each bar differently. Never has a Bruckner symphony seemed less like a “cathedral in sound”, which was refreshing. Throughout, the orchestra was on terrific form.

Of the Vienna Philharmonic’s immensely beautiful performance of the Ninth under Haitink, Guy Richardson wrote:
I thought it started magically, though as the movement progressed I wasn’t completely gripped, despite wonderful playing by the VPO. But the closing section was tremendous. The daughter of one of my friends turned round after the end of the first movement and said ‘Wow!’

I enjoyed the scherzo though I thought the timpanist a bit lack lustre in the opening tutti, and his tremolo in bar 50, which is often under-played by timpanists but is thrilling when really brought out and brilliantly links the passage, was very half-hearted. But his quiet drum taps were suitably spooky. In that tutti I’ve never heard the trombones and tuba so well brought out (in bars 45-6) and I thought it sounded tremendous.

He started the trio very fast and then of course slowed down for the string theme which I thought was a real shame. Bruckner of course marks the trio Schnell which means the 3 quavers in a bar are fast, but as with Haitink and many conductors, they are played so fast they sound like triplets rather than 3 fast quaver beats. I also missed those marvellous swirling semiquavers in the flutes on the return of the string theme at bar 113.

But I thought the Adagio was wonderful and the great climax suitably shattering (though I wasn’t sure the full dissonance of ‘the chord’ came across) and the coda serene and very moving.

Faith – Bruckner at the Lucerne Festival 2012

WITH A total of 113 events between 8 August and 15 September, the Lucerne Festival once again presented a range of music that could hardly be surpassed in terms of quality and diversity. Claudio Abbado and his Festival Orchestra remain one of the festival’s pillars, and Pierre Boulez continues to promote new and recent music with the highly talented young musicians who make up his Academy. A receptive and open-minded public was offered more than half a dozen premieres as well as “classics” of our time.

As has now become the tradition, the concerts and ancillary events again had a linking theme into which most of the pieces performed could be fitted more or less convincingly. Whereas the previous year’s theme of Eros did not seem particularly fruitful in respect of Bruckner – or at least not at first glance, the 2012 theme of Faith readily lent itself to a fairly extensive coverage of Bruckner’s incomparable symphonic and sacred œuvre. He was in fact represented by four symphonies and his Te Deum; in addition Raphael Staubli gave a lecture with the (possibly faintly ironic) title “Bruckner and the dear Lord”. Looking at the overall programme, which made a couple of detours into the spiritual worlds of Buddhism and Islam, it struck me that of the two chief Protestant representatives of “Faith”, Bach was treated in a rather perfunctory manner and Handel left out altogether.

Claudio Abbado provided the first memorable experience when he conducted Bruckner’s First Symphony on 17 August. He previously gave the symphony in Lucerne with the Vienna Philharmonic in 1973, since when it has been performed only once – by the Concertgebouw Orchestra under Riccardo Chailly in 1992. Last time Abbado conducted the first version; this time he resorted to the seldom played revised version (edited by Günter Brosche) which Bruckner made on his own initiative in 1890/91. The piece seems to contain all the elements of Bruckner’s personal style, and I would rank the second movement as one of his most beautiful slow movements. Abbado and the Lucerne Festival Orchestra, comprising musicians of the highest calibre, brought off a performance that listeners should long remember. Earlier in the concert, Radu Lupu gave a marvellously nuanced and spiritualised interpretation of Beethoven’s Third Piano Concerto. Under Abbado the orchestra played far more than merely an accompanying role.

In the second concert featuring a work by Bruckner (23 August), Philippe Herreweghe, the Orchestre des Champs-Élysées and the Collegium Vocale Gent combined Bruckner’s Te Deum with choral pieces – a cappella and with orchestra – by Brahms. Special acclaim was rightly given to the outstanding Ghent choir,
whose virtues were realised very beautifully in pieces like Brahms’s Two Motets, which are a challenge with regard to intonation. Bruckner’s Te Deum of 1881–84 is surely one of his most heart-warming pieces, formally so concise as to preclude any thought of longueurs, either actual or imagined. With Hanna-Elisabeth Müller, Okka von der Damerau, Maximilian Schmitt and Tareq Nazmi as the soloists, the work enjoyed a lucid performance.

The Cleveland Orchestra appeared in the KKL Concert Hall under their chief conductor Franz Welser-Möst on 25 August. They played a premiere, Chute d’étoiles by Matthias Pintscher, and Bruckner’s Fourth in the 1888 version, edited by Benjamin M. Korstvedt. In an introductory talk Pintscher pointed out similarities between his roughly half-hour-long piece and Bruckner’s: in general the notion that music is an art of both time and space, in particular the fact that both works revolve around an E-flat tonal centre. Chute d’étoiles sought to portray an apocalyptic catastrophe and the possibility of a fresh start to follow, and embedded within it were Pintscher’s “reflections” on hitherto unused sonorous and acoustic capabilities of the trumpet, which the two soloists demonstrated with spectacular skill. The most pleasing aspects of Welser-Möst’s Bruckner performance were the subtle agogics and a smoothness of sound – even in the loudest sections – that was seemingly in keeping with the sub-title “Romantic”. On the other hand Welser-Möst’s impulsive conducting manner and sweeping gestures could not avert some unevenness in the orchestral ensemble, although the playing showed the orchestra’s dedication to the cause.

On 8 September the Munich Philharmonic Orchestra under Lorin Maazel served up Bruckner’s Third Symphony in the 1889 version. The symphony was preceded by Wagner’s Tannhäuser overture and Venusberg bacchanale as well as the Prelude and Liebestod from Tristan und Isolde. This is all splendid music, but linked with an operatic plot that – I suggest – makes it seem like an intruder in the concert hall. Lorin Maazel graced the Wagner extracts with uncommonly broad tempi, making the “breathing” of the music both audible and visible. The tempi for the symphony seemed to be more fluid, and both composers allowed the incomparable qualities of the orchestral strings and solo winds to shine forth most radiantly. The phenomenal Maazel need not be blamed for manifestly conducting partly for the audience’s benefit (and its delectation), especially in the final movement of the symphony. But it was not to his credit that he managed to eradicate the profound impression left by Bruckner within seconds by plunging straight into the Meistersinger overture, a piece deriving from a completely different spiritual background. A top-class orchestra like the Munich Philharmonic (to say nothing of Maazel himself) really has no need of such brazen showmanship.

The last concert (15 September) was reserved for Bernard Haitink and the Vienna Philharmonic. The previous evening Haitink conducted Richard Strauss’ An Alpine Symphony, a brilliant and opulent score with many subtle effects. Bruckner’s final Symphony burst boundaries in a totally different way and provided a meaningful conclusion to the festival – all the more so because after the extreme climaxes, the coda to the slow movement seems to afford a glimpse of the world of Faith. Once again Haitink’s economical, unshowy, almost inconspicuous conducting earned the highest admiration. The symphony followed Beethoven’s Fourth Piano Concerto, soloist Murray Perahia enthusing his listeners with his committed and nuanced reading.

And so the Lucerne summer festival rightly ended with a standing ovation: a reception that was prompted equally by a great conductor, one of the very finest orchestras and Bruckner’s Ninth Symphony.

Albert Bolliger (translation: Peter Palmer)
of utterance that might cause the earth to shake. But there were some very special moments. Unforgettable was the opening of the first movement development, solo horn above a barely audible violin tremolo, followed by a heart-rending echo on the oboe. The Scherzo was wonderfully fast, with rollicking stamping rhythms, the Trio also uncommonly quick, so there was no danger at all of it pre-empting the slow movement proper. Here Dohnanyi’s careful attention to balance meant that the brass fanfares remained part of the inner texture and didn’t disrupt the pastoral nature of the string melody. On the other hand, Bruckner calls for three harps “if possible”: it was good to see them there on the far right, but even better if we could have heard them, their contribution in the Trio and the descending chorale passage in the Adagio often hard to locate. Their big moment in the Haas edition is a totally exposed arpeggio as the tutti falls silent after the Adagio climax. Bruckner’s score has it covered by a sustained note on first violins, but Haas decided it should be bereft of cover. It can be bizarre, but was handled very tastefully on this occasion.

Kathryn Bryan played the several complex ornamental filigrees and other solos from the flute throughout the work these with exceptional virtuosity and expressiveness, her playing of the repeated falling fourths (including the extra ones in the Haas edition) just before the coda had just the right mix of fragility and tension. Also notable was the contribution of Andrew Smith on timpani. The detail of his part in the diminishing quiet which closes the first movement conscientiously observed, and Bruckner’s plain ff tremolos in the finale were sculpted with dramatic sforzando entries, sudden diminuendo, crescendo to another sforzando thwack! Similar nuances were applied to much of the score, Dohnanyi having the brass shape some of its massive statements in the finale with similar detail.

In the coda to the finale the trombones and basses rendition of the first movement theme came over loud and clear, the first trumpet Scherzo theme and detail of the horns Adagio theme tended to get submerged in the welter of sound. Dohnanyi’s observation of the ‘ritenuto’ on the final three falling unison notes was extreme, which had the effect of undermining the finality of the gesture, the rhythmic value of the last crotchet rendered indeterminate. Strangely, the opening of the symphony had had a similar vagueness about it, the introduction of the theme on low strings sounding generalised with weak rhythmic attack. Dohnanyi and the Philharmonia have in the past done absolutely first class Bruckner, witness their spellbinding performance of the Fourth Symphony in October 2008 (at long last now available on a Philharmonia CD and well worth hearing). This concert didn’t shine quite as brilliantly as that, but nevertheless it was a considered and cogent performance, magnificently played.

Ken Ward

MANCHESTER BRIDGEWATER HALL 18 OCTOBER 2012

Wagner - Prelude & Liebestod
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4

Hallé Orchestra / Markus Stenz

Markus Stenz chose to apply a decrescendo prior to the climax in Bruckner’s virtuosic hunting movement. If the effect intended was added emphasis on the resulting crescendo, it left me unmoved. On the repeat it returned, more exaggerated and even more unwelcome. This was a pity, because up to that moment Stenz was well on the way to convince me of his view of this symphony.

As it turned out this was only a minor glitch in an otherwise fine performance. His precise conducting technique and hitherto carefully executed tempo changes were especially successful when “attack” was required - at times thrilling and essential in Bruckner. The enjoyment of the fascinating interplay of separated violins was facilitated by my front row seat - I was determined to actually hear the opening tremolo! And what a wonderful sound those Hallé string players made. The horns were therefore heard but not seen, the principal horn unfazed at the outset by the eruption of a mobile telephone, his opening call floating mysteriously over the hovering strings and forthwith he and his colleagues played with indefatigable power when needed, not least at the end of the first movement but also at the very end of the symphony when they followed Bruckner’s instruction to play emphatically without inhibition. They were preceded, and no doubt encouraged by, just about the loudest trumpet fanfare I’ve ever heard at this point in the coda. In the final bars the whole orchestra engulfed the Bridgewater Hall in a perfectly balanced cacophony of counterpoint.

It was certainly a triumph for orchestra and conductor but also for Anton Bruckner- the good news spread to lots of young people availing themselves of the £3 student tickets for which the Hallé can only be congratulated.

Stephen Pearsall
AS A SEVEN year old boy in Lwów in 1930, Skrowaczewski was bowled over by Bruckner’s Seventh Symphony. 82 years later it was our privilege to hear the grown man conduct that symphony with such a wealth of experience that it fitted him like a favourite old overcoat. “To me, Bruckner is one of the greatest composers,” he says. “He is another Mozart: his music is magical... Its message speaks about the infinite, transcendental cosmos, God, timelessness, love and tragedy.” The score remained closed in front of him: he knew every twist and turn, every entry, every dynamic change and every change in tempo, every necessary cue. This was one of those performances that leave you feeling nourished, rather than exhausted. There was nothing flashy or over dramatised, no searching new interpretation, no revolutionary ‘new, improved’ approach. This was Bruckner with over half a century of experience behind it, that had travelled through eastern Europe under the Nazis, under Stalin, through 20 years in Minneapolis and seven with the Hallé.

The first movement began fairly slowly and in effect was a slow accelerando to the climax of the development where the LPO’s brass on top form blazed out the inversion of the main theme - then a sudden slowing and a wondrously sad calm in the recapitulation. It prepared for the grieving Adagio, with memorable and glorious playing from the quartet of Wagner tubas, a depth of expression in the main theme that is as valuable as it is rare, ‘love and tragedy’. And then a miracle: the second theme on violins played with such warmth and such heavenly lyricism, floating above the stepping quavers of the lower strings. An immense cymbal clash crowned the climax, followed by the dirge for Wagner tubas (embellished by all five horns towards its close) and the spare violin dialogue with the flute seeming to inhabit a mysterious other-world. Skrowaczewski, often conducting towards the upper strings, turned right and gave a cue to a deathly low pizzicato from the cellos and double basses. The soul shuddered.

The world of here and now stormed back with the brassy Scherzo, where precise observation of the score gave us a trumpet call with accents only on its first three notes and hence a tendency to fade away, giving an air of subtlety to the movement that is rarely applied. The beautifully played trio evoked a nostalgic sadness. The finale’s characterisation, quick, pointed and light, was a perfect foil to all that had gone before, the Wagner tuba chorales excellently played, the brass’s rhythmic articulation of the dotted third theme really sharp and pointed.

Throughout the performance the LPO played magnificently, wonderfully enhanced by Skrowaczewski’s concern to get the balance right, to let all the inner voices speak. The concert displayed the 89 year old conductor still at the height of his powers. The following night he and the LPO performed his arrangement for string orchestra of the Adagio from Bruckner’s String Quintet. The previous week he was in Minneapolis for Shostakovich’s 5th, giving his services free to support the ‘Locked Out Minnesota Orchestra’, whose musicians had refused to agree to wage cuts. It is his rigorous devotion to music and courtesy to his fellow musicians that has characterised his career, and it continues to deliver music-making of rare quality, an honesty and integrity of which these days we are in desperate need, with the power to shake and rejuvenate.

Ken Ward
Bach - Cantata Herz und Mund und Tat und Leben No. 147
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9

THE BBC Philharmonic has an eminent Bruckner tradition. Jascha Horenstein conducted celebrated performances of the earlier Bruckner symphonies followed by subsequent guest conductors, notably Bernhard Klee, Wilfrid Boettcher (who performed the 1874 Fourth) and Günther Herbig. Juanjo Mena however is the first principal conductor to throw down the gauntlet in favour of Bruckner - one of his very first Manchester engagements featured a tremendous performance of the Seventh and since then he has conducted the Sixth several times, showcasing it at the Albert Hall Proms.

Not for the first time Mena preceded his Bruckner with the composer’s musical soul-mate, JS Bach - Cantata No 147, ‘Herz und Mund und Tat und Leben’ (Heart and Mouth and Deed and Life) - a celebration of Mary in preparation for the celebration of God himself to follow in the Bruckner. But here the delightful tune of Jesu, Joy of Man’s Desiring, sits uneasily with the brutal dissonances, anguish and savagery of the Ninth Symphony. I can report however that Mena captured all three in this immense, expansive performance. The first movement spanned just short of half an hour perhaps because it was played, especially the second group of themes, at a Celibidachean tempo. This afforded the opportunity to savour as Bruckner, while still referencing traditional form, tears up the rulebook as if to question the elements of music itself, dissecting it, examining it, then reassembling it with shattering emotional impact. And of course there was no let-up in the scherzo, brutal and sinister yet thrilling. If this is in praise of God, then I am reduced to bewilderment. Wonderfully so.

Only at the commencement of the Adagio did Mena open his score, his cue to the first violins accompanied by a display of angst. Sat in the Side Circle overlooking the Wagner tubas, just the sight of the upright bells was spine-tingling, their entry early in the Adagio, glistening visually and audibly in the fabulous acoustic. But the real stars of this performance were the woodwinds. About two-thirds of the way through the Adagio they jabbed and jabbed and jabbed, followed by a perfectly judged momentary silence. It was quite intimidating. The concert was broadcast live on Radio 3 so is preserved for posterity, adding further to the archive of wonderful Bruckner performances by this orchestra.

Stephen Pearsall

LIVERPOOL PHILHARMONIC HALL 24 NOVEMBER 2012

Bruckner - Psalm 150
Saint-Saëns - Organ Symphony
Brahms - Variations on a Theme by Haydn
Dvořák - Te Deum

Royal Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra & Choir / Claus Peter Flor

YOU CAN only congratulate Claus Peter Flor for his imaginative programme affording a rare opportunity to hear Psalm 150, not to mention the Te Deum of Dvořák. I learned from Stephen Johnson’s programme note that this rare commission arose surprisingly from a recommendation from Brahms. Intended for the opening concert of Vienna’s International Exhibition of Music and Theatre of 1892, it was not ready and when actually performed in November of that year, it flopped.

The Liverpool audience however greeted the cantata with a short stunned silence. They had just heard something unusual - a Bruckner piece short enough to take the place of an overture - but no ordinary curtain-raiser - a shock to the system in 21st century secular Britain, in-your-face from the outset, an appeal to praise God transformed by this emphatic setting to not much short of a command. And many in the audience had quite innocently just turned up for Saint Saens’ delightful symphonic lollipop with organ……

We were implored to praise God with trumpets harps organs and stringed instruments. Certainly the instrument belonging to the Philharmonic’s leader James Clark, a gargantuan figure in the flesh, was played with pleading beauty and delicacy, blending in beautifully with soprano Katherine Broderick, choir and orchestra.

The real sensation in this piece is the fugue, setting the words “Alles, was Odem hat, lobe den Herrn, Halleluja” (Let every thing that hath breath praise the Lord) and this was done superbly with high drama, perfectly paced so that the climax given to the voices was moving and uplifting, the ensuing trumpet fanfare perhaps rendering the audience quite speechless, allowing pause for thought, then rapturous applause.

Stephen Pearsall
AT FIRST there is no question. Once before, years ago, you witnessed the Chorvereinigung St Augustin, now resident at the Jesuitenkirche, deliver the finest E minor Mass that you have heard sung live. To repeat that experience, in the Baroque cheerfulness of what has become your usual church, and follow it with a hearty breakfast amid the beer fumes of Vienna’s scruffiest Kaffeehaus around the corner, has long been your idea of the perfect Sunday morning. And there it is, in the calendar. End November.

Then you see. The very same day, across town, just half an hour later, the new choir and orchestra of the Augustinerkirche – formed after the Chorvereinigung walked out, citing disagreements with clergy – would be giving their first ever performance of the D minor Mass. Your favourite, and the one you have had the fewest opportunities to hear. Of course it is not a coincidence. The rivalry between the two choirs is intense. And presents you with a familiar dilemma. In this perennially divided city, almost anything can, at any moment, turn into a question of loyalty versus ambition.

You consider how to have it both ways. For a while you toy with the idea of stationing a fast motorcycle outside in the old Universitätsplatz – ready, once the last note of the first Agnus Dei has sounded and you have sprinted up the aisle, to ferry you at speed across the cobbles of the old town, to reach the Hofburg Palace in time at least for the second Sanctus. And were the order reversed – D minor before E – you might actually have done it. But this way round leaves no possibility of compromise. You have to choose. Some choice. As if you would ever turn down the chance to share in Bruckner’s dark celebration, no matter where.

Composed at a pivotal point right after the Nullte, it connects together those two career bookends, the Requiem and the Ninth Symphony, through more than key signature alone. Instantly familiar yet continually astonishing, the Mass in D minor is concentrated, original, authentic, eternal, essence of Bruckner, delivered direct in the mainline. Heady stuff.

And so 11am on that Sunday finds you hunkered down in the front pews of the unheated Augustinerkirche, collar turned up not just for camouflage but also against the icy wind that blows all the way from the Urals. The stark Gothic severity of your surroundings seems to lower the temperature even further, and the knowledge that behind the door on the right are preserved the excised hearts of past Habsburg rulers does nothing to dispel the sense of sitting in a Gormenghast meat locker. What madness, to have come out in only six layers of clothing.

Choir and orchestra are positioned above and behind you, out of sight on the broad gallery beside the organ. It is considered the height of bad manners to turn around and look, even were there a position within the nave from which the performers are visible (there isn’t.) So you stand, like Orpheus, facing fixedly forwards, feigning nonchalance, as over your shoulder the music starts. You imagine that back in the summer of 1872, when the F minor Mass received its first public performance in this same church with Bruckner himself conducting, there would have been another enthusiast standing where you are now, who also would not have seen a thing.

But the sound reaching your ear is surprisingly clear, given that most of it is reflected. You are in a space with similar dimensions to the chapel of King’s College Cambridge, and a similar acoustic that lifts and sustains the music without muddying it. And when, as now, the music is given a treatment that works with the decay times rather than fighting against them, the effect is to create a layering in the sound that reflects and complements the melodic layering written into the score. It rapidly becomes apparent that what you are hearing is an imaginative and well thought out performance, more than competently executed. Even your partisan bias can find nothing to fault in the crisp and accurate playing of the (mainly, young) orchestra, while the only identifiable weakness in the choir – a small but persistent tendency of the older female voices at times to soften and crumple when brought into hard contact with the solid edges of Bruckner’s vocal lines – is, you are aware, common to many amateur choirs (including the one in the Jesuitenkirche.) Just a few days earlier you were mentioning this fact of life to a stalwart of the Annakirche choir – who was not best pleased – but did not deny it.

As the service proceeds, two facts emerge. The first is that the Mass is, far and away, best experienced in its intended liturgical context, with space around and between the separate sections, that serve to pace and structure an act of worship in which you yourself are a participant. The second, perhaps more surprising,
discovery is that the indirectness in the presentation is by no means wholly negative in its effect. Solo voices are less dominant, hence more integrated into the fabric of the music, still coming across strongly while helping establish a natural balance and a unity in the sound. This leads you to speculate on the extent to which your residual dissatisfaction with the F minor Mass may derive from your experience of concert performances, with operatic vocalists hollering at you from the platform as if summoning livestock.

True, there is some elision of fine detail in quieter passages, lost in the roof vaulting up above, and the dramatic events at the end of the *Credo* lack the sheer visceral impact that comes from standing in front of massed speaker stacks fed with Best/Corydon turned up to 11. But against that, the very dislocation of performers from congregation evokes an almost tangible sense of a divinity reaching out through the music across a divide, from another, invisible world, to the one you inhabit, in order to touch you, in this moment, in this place. By the time the descending carillons in the *Agnus Dei* are cascading down the frozen cataracts of stone in the chapel’s high curtain walls, there are shivers up your spine that result not from the coldness of the air, nor the dense incense smoke – nor even the realisation that you have just emptied your wallet into the collection plate, and not much chance of retrieving any of it – but something else entirely.

You emerge into the sharp brightness of the Josefsplatz, where much of *The Third Man* was filmed, in the knowledge that you made the right choice. You may never come to love the austere Augustinerkirche; but as a place in which to hear a sung Bruckner Mass, it has to be one of the best. The D minor is now part of the repertoire here, so there will be more opportunities. And other favourite Masses also, perhaps. You think you might look out for them. Imagine hearing the F minor here. It is only after your footsteps in search of breakfast have brought you in short order to the Café Mozart, and you are thawing out with a warming *Topfensuppe*, that it strikes you: you are sitting exactly where Holly Martins, that other fictional hack writer doing the right thing, sat in wait for Harry Lime, the friend he had betrayed. *The Pink Cat*

---

**Forthcoming Bruckner performances in Austrian churches**

www.kirchenmusik-wien.at

**LINZ - MARIENDOM**
28. 4. Bruckner - Mass in D minor

**LINZ - ALTER DOM**
Bruckner’s birthday concert
4. 9. Bruckner - Symphony No.5 arr. piano 4 hands (Piano-duo Dino Sequi & Gerhard Hofer)

**SALZBURG - STIFTSKIRCHE ST. PETER**
28. 3. 18:30 Bruckner - Mass for Maundy Thursday

**SCHLÄGL - STIFT, OÖ.**
15. 8. Bruckner - Mass in D minor, motets "Ave Maria" and "Christus factus est".

**VIENNA I - UNIVERSITÄTSKIRCHE**
16. 6. Bruckner - Mass in F minor

**VIENNA I - HOFMUSIKKAPELLE**
30. 6. Bruckner - Mass in D minor

**VIENNA XIV - MARIABRUNN**
16. 6. Bruckner - Mass in D minor
Muffled up in a heavy coat, scarf and gloves, your intrepid reviewer travelled through the wild heart of the East End of London, from Whitechapel on the Overground, under the Thames to the equally rough and grubby realms of South East London, to Brockley, making his way up the hill in the wintry darkness to St Peter’s Church. What a contrast upon entering the church! All was brightness and clarity, beautiful architecture, and warmth – the very virtues that characterised the performance Lindsay Ryan elicited from Harmony Sinfonia in this very enjoyable concert. It’s always a risk, attending amateur performances. Anxious as one is to applaud their efforts, it can sometimes nevertheless be rapture modified by excruciating inadequacies of execution. But the Egmont Overture went well, and Elgar’s Serenade for Strings, although not without blemish, was very moving. The most impressive thing about the interpretation of the Bruckner was the clarity of Lindsay Ryan’s grasp of the overall form. This is not something one usually expects from amateur performances where the conductor has enough on his or her plate without taking ‘the long view’, so it was to her great credit that tempos were well-chosen and consistently maintained, with no concessions to what might be easier to play, the great symphonic structure built up with purposeful momentum. The symphony abounds with glorious melodies and none of them was short-changed, and Bruckner’s more folkish themes were played with an appropriate lilt – not always an easy thing for an amateur ensemble to achieve. The low brass were tremendous in the great chorale in the first movement development, and how splendidly the horns’ blistering annunciation of the symphony’s ‘motto’ horn call at the end of the first movement rang around the stone walls of this attractive church.

The cello and viola themes of the Andante were both very expressively handled – nothing sentimental but enough give and take for the music to speak – and the great brass climax was immensely powerful. The Scherzo with all its multi-layered hunting calls was played surprisingly fast and was very exciting, though the acoustic did no favours to the clarity of parts in the tutti; the woodwind’s playing of the fetching little melody of the trio was superb. If I had any argument against Lindsay Ryan’s tempo decisions, it would have been with the slowness of some parts of the second subject group in the Finale, though checking the score in the train on the way home I was reminded that it is peppered with ritardandos and instructions to go ‘noch langsamer’ - ‘even slower’, so she probably was right - and courageous. It was a risk, but the movement held together. The great octave-drop tuttis of the main theme were spine-tinglingly delivered, and the whole symphony brought to a blazing close.

Never in his wildest dreams could Bruckner have envisaged that one day in a small London church, 130 years after its composition, his symphony would receive such a committed performance under the accomplished direction by a young woman from Australia!
those in the Fourth Symphony. Although there is the fff ending to the first movement and a largely new Trio section (minus harps) in the Scherzo, and some rather drastically different passages in the first movement, the Adagio climax more elaborately structured, many of the other changes were of scoring and texture.

Young made an impressive case for this first score and one must take care not to let the somewhat weaker passages distract from any evaluation of a performance of this version. In many ways this was enjoyable and, indeed, exciting, whilst missing a certain spiritual element. We were presented with a very powerful and objective rendering, particularly manifest in the Scherzo which was swift and animated. The flow and pacing throughout the work were sure and solid, showing a firm and embracing hand at the tiller - notwithstanding the tricky opening of the Adagio. In this movement some tender passages were as memorable as the build-up to the climax, with the six - not just two - cymbal clashes, very dramatic indeed. The Finale, setting out on an earnest forward thrust, was rather stark and something more far-reaching would have been of benefit in this movement. The inspired arrival of the work’s opening theme, surely one of the greatest and most amazing moments in any symphony, was not given the significance it ought to have, and the coda was also missing a broader intention. Combined with some shortcomings of both the earlier score and the disparate elements in the movement a certain extra dimension was therefore compromised. In many ways this performance was enhanced however by the glorious playing, from individuals, from sections and from the whole orchestra, and comments on this point were unanimous. The cellos were especially memorable.

Our little group was discussing the reading when it was joined by a Roman Catholic priest who was overwhelmed with enthusiasm for both the playing and the reading!

Raymond Cox

PHILADELPHIA, USA VERIZON HALL, KIMMEL CENTER 24-25 JANUARY 2013

Wagner - Siegfried Idyll (Full-orchestra version) Bruckner - Symphony No. 7 (ed. Nowak)

Philadelphia Orchestra / Yannick Nézet-Séguin

THE PUBLICITY blurb for these concerts emphasized how well-suited the fabled Philadelphia Sound is for Bruckner’s symphonies. But Yannick Nézet-Séguin, in his first Bruckner performance as the Philadelphia Orchestra’s Music Director, conjured up something rather different – a special Philadelphia Brucker Sound of plush strings, supple woodwinds and rich, sonorous brass that could create an overwhelming effect but still allow the Orchestra's great principal players to stand out. Such playing might have threatened to overpower the music, but fortunately the conductor’s musicianship was equal to the orchestra’s virtuosity.

Typically for him, Nézet-Séguin took a broad view, especially in the first two movements. He started very slowly indeed to let the great opening theme soar to the heavens (and added special emphasis on that cello-bass chord in measure 34), but showed great sense of tempo relationships throughout to maintain the flow of the music. Indeed, my biggest objection came at the return of the main theme in the recapitulation, when the slowdown to the initial tempo seemed jarring - a brief speed bump on the way to the a satisfying, indeed ecstatic conclusion. Much the same with the Adagio: slow basic tempo, beautiful pacing and an enormous climax with the full percussion, and the timpanist going just a bit wild into the bargain. (Both movements clocked in at around 23 minutes, the performance as a whole at about 70.) The Scherzo and finale were brisker but as finely detailed as the rest of the symphony. The two performances were remarkably similar, though the second, a matinee, seemed just a bit tighter in execution and more free in expression – enough, in fact, that the energetic young maestro somehow managed to tear his jacket in action.

The audiences were deceptively large: beastly cold weather and a rampant stomach virus conspired to keep many regular patrons away, and large numbers of discounted seats were apparently sold on concert day. Those who did come rose to their feet at the end. After the first concert I overheard one university student remark, “That swept away every doubt I had about Bruckner.” That certainly trumps any review I could write.

Sol L. Siegel
World-wide Concert Selection
March - June, 2013

Every effort is made to ensure the information is correct, but it is wise to confirm date, time, location and programme with venue or orchestra.

Austria
2 Mar. 7.30 pm, Vienna: Musikverein +43(0)1586 83 83
4 Mar. 7.30 pm, St Pölten, Festspielhaus +43(0)1586 83 83
Wagner - Tannhäuser Overture
Bruckner - Symphony No.3 (1889)
Konzerthaus Vienna / Claus Peter Flor

8 Mar 3.30pm (Open rehearsal), 10 & 17 Mar. 11 am, 16 Mar. 3.30 pm
Vienna: Musikverein +43 1505 8190

Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Vienna Philharmonic / Zubin Mehta

14, 15 Mar. 8 pm, Innsbruck, Congress +43 512 59360
Mahler - Des Knaben Wunderhorn
Bruckner - Symphony No. 1 (Linz version)
Tirol Symphony Orchestra Innsbruck / Alexander Rumpf

22 Mar. 7.30 pm Vienna: Musikverein +43 1505 8190
Honegger - Symphony No.3 “Liturgique”
Bruckner - Mass in F minor
Vienna Symphony Orchestra, Singverein der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde / Ingo Metzmacher

26 Mar. 7.30 pm, Vienna: Konzerthaus +43 1242 002
Yabuta - Anima
Korngold - Violin Concerto
Bruckner - Symphony No.9
ORF Radio-Symphony Orchestra Vienna / Cornelius Meister

10 May 7.30 pm Vienna: Musikverein +43 1505 8190
Andree - Kleine Suite op 27
Mendelssohn - Psalm 42
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Swiss Youth Symphony Orchestra, Neue Wiener Stimmen / Kai Bumann

15 May 7.30 pm Vienna: Konzerthaus +43 1242 002
Mozart - Piano Concerto No.25
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1873)
New York Philharmonic / Alan Gilbert

3 June 7.30 pm Vienna: Konzerthaus +43 1242 002
Boulez - Notations - excerpts
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Berlin Philharmonic / Simon Rattle

15 June 7.30 pm, 16 June 7.45 pm Vienna: Musikverein +43 1505 8190
Schlee - Symphony No. 2
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Wiener Symphoniker / Manfred Honeck

17, 18 June 7.45 pm, Graz, Stefaniensaal, +43 31680 490
Strauss - Metamorphosen
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8 (1890)
Recreation · Grosser Orchester Graz / Sascha Goetzel

Belgium
11 Mar. 8 pm Brussels; Henry Le Boeufzaal BOZAR +32 (0)2 507 8200
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Vienna Philharmonic / Zubin Mehta

21 Apr. 3 pm, Brussels; Henry Le Boeufzaal BOZAR +32 (0)2 507 8200
Mozart - Bassoon Concerto
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Orchestre National de Belgique / Walter Weller

Canada
16, 17 Apr. 8 pm, Montréal, Maison symphonique +1 514 8422112
Rossini - Overture William Tell
Beethoven - Piano Concerto No. 3
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Orchestre Symphonique de Montréal / Kent Nagano

17 Apr. 8 pm Quebec, Grand Théatre +1 418 643 8131
Talmai - Fanfare d’inauguration (Fanfare Bruckner)
Mendelssohn - Piano Concerto No.1
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Orchestre Symphonique de Québec / Yoav Talmai

Croatia
7 Jun. 7.30 pm Zagreb, Koncertna dvorana Lisinski, +385 16121167
Mozart - Ave Verum Corpus
Honegger - Symphony No. 3
Bruckner - Te Deum
Zagreb Phil., Academic Choir “Ivan Goran Kovacic” / Mario Venzago

Czech Republic
19 Mar. 7.30 pm Prague, Rudolfinum +42 (0)227 059 352
Mozart - Concerto for 2 pianos, K365
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Radio Symphony Orchestra Pilsen / Koji Kawamoto

Finland
1 Mar. 7 pm, Helsinki Music Centre +358 600 900 900
Korngold - Cello Concerto
Bruckner - Symphony No.9 (with Finale, SPCM 2012)
Helsinki Philharmonic / John Storgards

France
12 Mar. 8 pm, Paris, Théâtre des Champs-Élysées +33 (0)1 4952 5050
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Vienna Philharmonic / Zubin Mehta

13, 14 March Lille, Le Nouveau Siècle +33 (0)3201 28240
Prokofiev - Cello Concerto No.2
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
National Orchestre of Lille / Eivind Gullberg Jensen

17 Mar. 8 pm Paris, Palais Garnier, Opéra +33 (0)1 7229 3535
Works by Wagner and Bruckner transcribed for brass instruments
Musiciens de L’Orchestre de L’Opéra National de Paris

23 Mar. 8 pm, Opéra +33 (0)1 7229 3535
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Orchestre de l’Opéra national de Paris / Semyon Bychkov

24 Mar. 8 pm Paris, Palais Garnier, Opéra +33 (0)1 7229 3535
Beethoven - String Quartet Op18/4
Bruckner - String Quintet
and 
Beethoven - Piano Concerto No.5
Bruckner - String Quartet Op18/4
Les Musiciens de L’Orchestre de L’Opéra National de Paris

29 Mar. 8.30 pm, Aix-en-Provence, Le Grand Théâtre +44 (0)442916970
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Gustav Mahler Jugendorchester / Herbert Blomstedt

13 Apr. 7 pm, Bordeaux, L’Auditorium +33 (0)55600 8595
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Paris, Opéra / Semyon Bychkov

Germant
1 Mar. 8 pm Freiburg im Breisgau, Konzerthaus +40 (0)761 38 81552
2 Mar. 7.30 pm Karlsruhe Kongresszentrum 0049 721 37200
Busoni - Nocturne Symphonique
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 20
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Sinfonieorchester Baden-Baden und Freiburg / Emilio Pómarico

8 Mar. 8 pm Koblenz, Rhein-Mosel-Halle +49 0261 1000 466
9 Mar. 7pm Trier, St Maxima +49 0261 1000 466
Bruckner - Psalm 150; Te Deum
Wagner - Parsifal: Prelude Act 3 and Finale
Rheinische Philharmonie Koblenz, Chor des Musik-Instituts Koblenz, Konzertchor Trier / Jochen Schaar
9 Mar. 8 pm, Kölner Philharmonie +49 (0)221 280 280

Bach & Hindemith - works for organ and orchestra

Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Musica Saecularum / Philip von Steinaceke

14 Mar. 8 pm, Essenes Alfrud Krupp, Philharmonie

Bruckner - Symphony No. 8 (1890)
Vienna Philharmonie / Zubin Mehta

14, 15 Mar. 8 pm Würzburg, Hochschule für Musik, +49 (0)931 3908 124
Wolf - Scherzo and Finale
Dvořák - Cello Concerto

Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Philharmonisches Orchester Würzburg / Walter E. Gaggerauer

15 Mar. 8 pm, Nürnberg, Meistersingerhalle +49 (0)911 2314000
Berg - Three Orchestral Pieces
Beethoven - Triple Concerto

Bruckner - Symphony No. 1 (Vienna version)
Nürnberg Philharmoniker / Pedro Halffter

16 Mar. 7 pm, Düsseldorf Tonhalle, +49 (0)211 8996123
Hérold - Overture Zampa
Stravinsky - Pulcinella Suite

Bruckner - Symphony in D minor “Die Nullte”
Sinfonieorchester der Philharmonischen Gesellschaft Düsseldorf / Thomas Schlerka

17 Mar. 6 pm, Frankfurt-am-Main, Orange Peel +49 (0)152-54085537
Mozart - String Quintet in C minor, K406

Bruckner - String Quintet
Musicians of the hr-Symphony Orchestra

21 Mar. 8 pm, Frankfurt am Main, Alter Oper +49 (0) 6913 40400
Mozart - String Quintet in G minor K516

Mendelssohn - String Quartet in D, op 44/1

Bruckner - String Quintet
Leipzig String Quartet with Barbara Buntrock, vla.

23 Mar. 7.30 pm, Aue, Kulturhaus, +49 3771 23761
25 Mar. 8 pm Annaberg-Buchholz, Winterstein Theater

Schumann - Piano Concerto
Bruckner - Symphony No. 2

Erzgebirgische Philharmonie Aue / Naoshi Takahashi

28 Mar. 8 pm Baden Baden, Festspielhaus +49(0)(07221) 30 13101
Brahms - Piano Concerto No. 1

Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
9 Berlin Philharmonic / Simon Rattle

31 Mar. 8 pm, Bayreuth, Ordenskirche St Georgen

Wagner - Symphonic suite from Parsifal
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3
SO of the International Youth Orchestra Academy 2013 / Matthias Foremny

6 Apr. 8 pm, Dresden, Frauenkirche +49 (0)351 65606701
Poulenc - Litanies à la vierge noire
Fauré - Cantique de Jean Racine

Bruckner - String Quartet (arr. string orchestra)
Dresdner Philharmonie / Michael Sanderling

10 Apr. 8 pm Bamberg, Joseph-Keilberth-Saal +49 95196 47145
13 Apr. 8 pm München, Herkulessaal, Residenz, +49 8959 004545

Harris - Bring us, O Lord God
Bruckner - Mass No. 3 in F minor
Bamberger Symphoniker

11 Apr. 8 pm Bonn, Beethovenhalle, + 49 (0) 228 5020 1313
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Staatkapelle Dresden / Christian Thielemann

12 Apr. 8 pm Koblenz, Rhein-Mosel-Halle +49 (0)(761)3808-35333
Busoni - Nocturne Symphonique
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 20

Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Sinfonieorchester Baden-Baden und Freiburg / Emilio Pómarico

13 Apr. 8 pm Nürnberg, Meistersingerhalle +49 (0)911 2314000
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9 (with finale, SPCM 2012)
Nürnberg Symphoniker / Johannes Wildner

14 Apr. 4 pm Berlin, Philharmonie +49 (0)30254 89999
Mozart - Sinfonia Concertante K364

Part - Tabula Rasa
Bruckner - Symphony No. 2
Berliner Symphoniker / Lior Shambadal

19, 22 Apr. 8 pm, 21 Apr. 11 am, Düsseldorf Tonhalle, +49 (0)211 8996123
Wagner - Overture Tannhäuser
Kissine - ‘Afersight’ Violin Concerto

Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Düsseldorfer Symphoniker / Andrey Boreyko

22 Apr. 8 pm Leipzig Gewandhaus +49(0)(341) 1270 280

Wagner - Overture Rienzi; Wesendonck Lieder

Bruckner - Symphony No. 3
Leipzig Academic Orchestra / Horst Förster

22 Apr. 6 pm, 23, 23 Apr. 7.30 pm Schwerin, Staatstheater

Rosetti - Salve Regina
Mozart - Symphony No. 36

Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1889)
Mecklenburgische Staatskapelle Schwerin / Anthony Bramall

28 Apr. 11 am 29, 30 Apr. 8 pm Kölner Philharmonie +49 (0)221 280 280

Berg - Violin Concerto

Bruckner - Symphony No. 2
Gürzenich Orchester Köln / James Gaffigan

8 May 8 pm Essen, Philharmonie +49 (0)2018122 8801

Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 25

Bruckner - Symphony No. 3
New York Philharmonic / Alan Gilbert

11, 13 May 7.30 pm, 12 May 6 pm, Rostok Volkstheater,

+49(0)381 381 4700

Wagner - Siegfried Idyll
Liszt - Totentanz for pno & orchestra

Bruckner - Symphony No. 3
Norddeutsche Philharmonie Rostock / Florian Krumpöck

12 May 11 am, 13, 14 May 8 pm, München National Theater
+49(0)8921 851920

Rihm - Piano Concerto

Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Bayerisches Staatsorchester / Kent Nagano

14 May, 8 pm, Hagen, Stadthalle +49 (0) 2331 3450

Egert - Puls

Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Philarmonisches Orchester Hagen / Florian Ludwig

14, 17 May 8 pm, Krefeld, Seidenweberhaus
15 May, Mönchengladbach, Theater +49 (0)(2166) 6151100
16 May, Mönchengladbach, Kaiser Friedrich Halle

Bernstei - Divertimento for Orchestra
Kornogol - Violin Concerto

Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Niederdeutsche Sinfoniker / Mihkel Kütson

15 May, 8 pm München, Herkulessaal, Residenz, +49 8959 004545

Mozart - Overture Don Giovanni, Piano Concerto No. 20

Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Orchester der KlangVerwaltung / Enoch zu Guttenberg

17,18 May 8 pm Berlin, Konzerthaus +49 (0)30 203902101

Mozart - Overture Don Giovanni

Nielsen - Flute Concerto

Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Konzertorchester Berlin / Thomas Dausgaard

17 May 7.30 pm, Frankfurt (Oder), Konzerthaus +49(0)(0) 335 4010 120
18 May 7.30 pm, Potsdam, Nicolaaisaal +49 (0)(33) 28 888 28

Brahms - Violin Concerto

Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Brandenburgisches Staatsorchester Frankfurt / Howard Griffiths

26 May 7 pm, Hamburg, Laeiszhalle, +49 (0)(40)34 4920

Britten - Nocturne
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6

Hamburger Symphoniker / Jeffrey Tate

28 May 8 pm, Berlin, Philharmonie +49 (0)30254 89999

Boulez - Dérive 1, Mémoriale, Éclat
Bruckner - String Quintet

Musicians of the Orchestral Academy of the Berlin Philharmonic
29, 30, 31 Berlin, Philharmonie +49 (0)30254 88999
Boulez - Notations (excerpts)  Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Berliner Philharmoniker / Simon Rattle

30 May 7.45 pm, Göttingen Stadthalle, +49 (0)551 4998031
Bartók - Violin Concerto  Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Göttinger Symphonie Orchester / Christoph-Mathias Mueller

1 June 8 pm, Weilburg, Schloss +49 (0)6471 9421011
2 June 4 pm Dortmund, Konzerthaus +49 231 22696 200
3 June 7.30 pm Aschaffenburg, Stadthalle
Weber - Overture Euryanthe  Bruch - Violin Concerto No.1
Bruckner - Symphony No. 1
hr-Sinfonieorchester / Paavo Järvi

2 June 5 pm Hameln, Marktkircht St. Nicolai
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8  Wagner - Prelude to Die Meistersinger
Nordwestdeutsche Philharmonie Herford / Hans Christoph Becker-Foss

6, 7 June 7.30 pm, Magdeburg, Theater, Opernhaus +49 (0)391 540 6555
9 June 7 pm, Lüneburg, Theater +49 04131 42100
Mozart - Concerto for Flute & Harp  Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Magdeburgische Philharmonie / Elvind Aaland
Urs-Michael Theus conducts at Lüneburg

8 June 8 pm Dresden, Frauenkirche +49 (0)351 65606701
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Dresdner Philharmonie / Ingo Metzmacher

9 June 7 pm, Heidelberg, Peterskirche +49 06221 5820 000
Bruckner - Mass No. 3
Bachchor & Philharmonisches Orchester Heidelberg / Yordan Kadoshav

8 June 5 pm, Suhl, Congress Centrum +49 (0)36 8178 8228
9 June 11 am, Leipzig Gewandhaus +49(0)341 1270 280
Ravel - Ma Mère l'Oye  McPhee - Tabuh-Tabuhan
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
DR Sinfonieorchester Leipzig / James Gaffigan

12, 13 June 8 pm, Chemnitz, Stadthalle +49 (0)371 4000 430
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Robert Schumann Philharmonie / Frank Beermann

14 June 8 pm Bonn, Beethovenhalle, + 49 (0)228 5020 1313
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 23  Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Beethoven Orchester Bonn / Stefan Blunier

18 June 8 pm, Freiburg im Breisgau, Konzerthaus +49 (0)761 38 81552
Khachaturian - Violin Concerto  Bruckner - Symphony No. 3
Philharmonisches Orchester Freiburg / Johannes Fritzsch

19, 20 June 8 pm, Heidelberg, Stadthalle +49 (0)6221 5820000
Wagner - Prelude & Liebestod
Wagner (arr. Henze) - Wesendonck Lieder
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1873)
Heidelberg Philharmonic Orchestra / Yordan Kamdzhalov

23 June 11 am, 24 June 8 pm, Hamburg, Laeiszhalle, +49(0)4034 6920
Britten - Serenade for Tenor, Horn & Strings
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Hamburg Philharmonic / Simone Young

23 June 8 pm, Hildesheim, Stadthaus 0049 (0)5121 33164
Wagner, S - Und wenn die Welt voll Teufel wär
Goldmark - Violin Concerto  Bruckner - Symphony No. 3
TIN Philharmonie / Werner Seitzer

23 June 11 am, Weimar Deutsches National Theater +49 (0)3643755 334
Bruckner - String Quintet
Strauss - Metamorphosen (arr. 7 solo strings)
Musicians of the Staatkapelle Weimar

30 June, 1 July 7.30 pm, Weimar, Weimarhalle 0049 (0)3643 755334
Rott - Prelude to Julius Caesar
Jolivet - Concerto for Bassoon, strings, harp & piano
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Staatskapelle Weimar / Sebastian Weigl

30 June 11 am, 1 July 8 pm, Darmstadt, Staatstheater +49 6151 2811600
Hovhaness - Symphony No. 2 “Mysterious Mountain”
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Orchester des Staatstheaters Darmstadt / Martin Lukas Meister

30 June 4 pm, Otterberg Ateikirche +352 76 00 29
Bruckner - Adagio from Symphony No. 2.  - Mass No. 1
Orchestre de Chambre du Luxembourg, Chôre der Dommusik Speyer / Markus Melchior

Hungary
8 Mar. 7 pm, Budapest, Tetényi Müvélödesi Központ,
Bernstein - Overture Candide  Orban - Violin Concerto
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Budafoki Dohnányi Zenekar / Gabor Hollerung

27, 28 June 7.45 pm, 29 June 3.30 pm, Budapest, Arts Palace
Tchaikovsky - Piano Concerto No. 1  Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Budapest Festival Orchestra / Gábor Takacs-Nagy

Ireland
12 Apr. 8 pm, Dublin, National Concert Hall +353 (0)1417 0000
Kinsella - Symphony No.10  Bruckner - Symphony No.4
RTÉ National SO / Gavin Maloney

Italy
7 March 7 pm, Osaka, Symphony Hall +81 (0)6 64536000
Walton - Viola Concerto  Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Japan Century Orchestra / Kazuhiro Koizumi

7 Mar. 7 pm, Tokyo Suntory Hall +81 3 3584 9999
10 Mar. 2 pm, Yokohama Minatomirai Hall +81 (0)45682 2000
12 Mar. 7 pm, Osaka, Symphony Hall +81 (0)6 64536000
7 March 7 pm, Tokyo Suntory Hall

15, 16, 17 Mar. 3 pm, Nishinomiya, Hyogo Performing Arts Centre
+81 (0)79888 0255
Vaughan Williams - Oboe Concerto  Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Hyogo Performing Arts Centre Orchestra / Tatsuya Shimono

15 Mar. 7 pm, Osaka, Symphony Hall +81 (0)6 64536000
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 24  Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1873)
Kansai Philharmonic Orchestra / Yasujiro Iimori

22 Mar. 6.45 pm, Hiroshima, Bunka Koryu Kaikan +81 (0)82 532 3080
Takeuchi - Family Tree  Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1873)
Hiroshima Symphony Orchestra / Kazuki Yamada

11 Apr. 7.15 pm, Tokyo Suntory Hall +81 3 3584 9999
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
New Japan Philharmonic / Christian Arming

16 Apr. 7 pm Osaka, Festival Hall +81(0)6 6231 2221
18 Apr. 7 pm Tokyo Suntory Hall +81 3 3584 9999
Wagner - Tannhäuser Overture & Venusberg Music
Wagner - Prelude & Liebestost  Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1889)
Munich Philharmonic / Lorin Maazel

19 Apr. 7 pm, Tokyo Opera City +81 3 5353 9999
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 21  Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Tokyo City Philharmonic / Taijiro Iimori
Russia
23 May 7pm, Moscow, Tchaikovsky Concert Hall +7 495 232 04 00
Haydn - Symphony No.83  Bruckner - Symphony No.7
State Academic Symphony Orchestra Tchaikovsky / Ignat Solzhenitsyn

Serbia
17 May 8, Belgrade, Kolarac Foundation Hall, 00381 (0)11 2623 184
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Belgrade Philharmonic Orchestra / Muhai Tang

Singapore
29 Mar. 7.30 pm Singapore, Esplanade Concert Hall +65 6348 5555
Schumann - Cello Concerto  Bruckner - Symphony No.3
Singapore Symphony Orchestra / Lan Shui

Slovakia
9 May, 7 pm, Bratislava, Slovenska Filharmonia +421 22 5517111
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Bruckner Symphony Orchestra / Bernhard Haas - organ.

Spain
14, 15 Mar 8 pm, Valladolid, Auditorio Miguel Delibes, +34 983 385 604
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 21  Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Swiss Youth Symphony Orchestra, Neue Wiener Stimmen / Kai Bumann

Switzerland
3, 4 Apr 7pm, Basel, Opera / Frank Schuster +41 26 322 52 97
Plainsong - Mass No.5
Swiss Radio Symphony Orchestra / Christoph von Dohnanyi

Sweden
24, 25 May 7.30 pm, 26 May 11.30 am, Stockholm, Berwaldhallen +46 (0)8784 1800
Straw - Four Last Songs  Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
National Orchestra of Spain / David Afkham

Switzerland
10, 11, 12 Apr. 7.30 pm Zürich Tonhalle +41 44 206 34 34
Sibelius - Violin Concerto (10, 11 Apr.)  Berg - Violin Concerto ( 12 Apr.)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Tonhalle Orchestra Zürich / Christoph von Dohnanyi

9 May 7 pm, Tokyo Bunka Kaikan +81 3 38220727
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 9  Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Tokyo Metropolitan Symphony Orchestra / Eliahu Inbal

17 May 7 pm, 18 May 3 pm, Sapporo Concert Hall, +81 11 520 1234
Tharichen - Timpani Concerto  Bruckner - Symphony No. 7 (Haas)
Sapporo Symphony Orchestra / Tadaaki Otaka

24 May 7 pm, Kyoto, Concert Hall 0081 (0)7571 3090
Beethoven - Coriolan Overture  Bruckner - Symphony No. 8 (1890 Nowak)
Kyoto Symphony Orchestra / Michiyoshi Inoue

Lithuania
26 Apr. Vilnius Congress Hall +370 5 261 8828
Beethoven - Piano Concerto No. 3  Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Lithuanian State Symphony Orchestra / Amos Talian

Malaysia
25 May 8.30 pm, 26 May 3 pm, Kuala Lumpur
Dewan Filharmonik Peranak +603 2051 7007
Britten - Violin Concerto  Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Malaysian Philharmonic Orchestra / Claus Peter Flor

Netherlands
1 Mar. 8.30 pm, Breda, Chassé Theater +31 (0)76 530 3100
2 Mar. 8.15, Eindhoven, Frits Philips Concert Hall, +31 (0)40 244 2020
Sibelius - Valse Triste  Britten - Serenade for Tenor Horn & Strings
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3
Het Brabant Orkest / Kees Bakels

Norway
9 Mar. 7 pm, Oslo, Cathedral +47 815 33 133
Mendelssohn - Symphony No. 5  Bruckner - Mass No.3
Oslo Philharmonic Choir & Orchestra / Simon Gaudenz

Poland
21 Mar. 7.30 Warsaw, Filharmonie, Sale Koncertowa +48 22 5517111
Bruckner - Te Deum  - Symphony No. 4
Sinfonia Varsovia, Choir of the Podlasie Opera and Philharmonic in Bialystok/ Hubert Soudant

Portugal
17 Mar. 6 pm, Lisbon, Gulbenkian Foundation +351 21 782 3030
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Gustav Mahler Jugendorchester / Herbert Blomstedt
USA
1 Mar. 8 pm New York, Carnegie Hall +1 212227 7800
Berg - Violin Concerto   Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Vienna Philharmonic / Franz Welser-Möst

8 pm Oxford, University Church of St Mary the Virgin
Wagner - Prelude Die Meistersinger   Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Hertford Bruckner Orchestra / Paul Coones

US
1 Mar. Houston, Moores Opera House +1 713743 3313
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Moores School of Music SO / Franz Anton Krager

1 Mar. 6.30 pm, 28 Feb, 2 Mar. 8 pm, San Francisco,
Davies Symphony Hall +1 415 864 6000
Mozart - Zaide - excerpts
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
San Francisco SO / Michael Tilson Thomas

3 Mar. 2 pm New York, Carnegie Hall, +1 212227 7800
Berg - Violin Concerto   Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Vienna Philharmonic / Franz Welser-Möst

10 Mar. 4 pm, Toledo, Rosary Cathedral +1 419246 8000
Bruckner - Symphony No. 2
Toledo Symphony Orchestra / Stefan Sanderling

14, 16 Mar. 8 pm, 15 Mar. 2 pm, Philadelphia,
Verizon Hall, Kimmel Center +1 215893 1999
Schubert - Symphony No. 8 (Unfinished)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Philadelphia Orchestra / Christoph von Dohnanyi

11 Apr. 7.30 pm, 12 Apr. 12 midnight, 13 Apr. 8 pm, Seattle Symphony,
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 9   Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Seattle Symphony Orchestra / Gerard Schwarz

19 Apr. 8 pm New York, Carnegie Hall, +1 212227 7800
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Staatskapelle Dresden / Christian Thielemann

24, 25 Apr. 7.30 pm, 27 Apr. 8 pm, New York, Lincoln Center
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 25   Bruckner - Symphony No. 3
New York Philharmonic / Alan Gilbert

25 Apr. 1.30 pm, 28 Apr. 3 pm, Newark, Prudential Hall +1 888 4665722
27 Apr. 8 pm, New Brunswick, State Theatre +1 732 246 7469
Wagner - Parsifal, Good Friday music   Bruch - Violin Concerto
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
New Jersey Symphony Orchestra / Jacques Lacombe

26, 27 April 7.30 pm, Houston, Grace Presbyterian Church
Bruckner - Mass No. 3   Houston Symphony Chorus,
Moores School of Music SO / Franz Anton Krager

27 May, 8 pm, New York, St John the Divine
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3
New York Philharmonic / Alan Gilbert

13, 15 June, 8 pm, 14 June 1.30 pm, Chicago, Symphony Center
Wagner - Siegfried’s Rhine Journey   Bruckner - Symphony No. 1
Chicago Symphony Orchestra / Riccardo Muti

------

Bruckner**Tage 2013 at St Florian**
18-24th August, highlights are:
Bruckner Mass in E minor, sung by Hard-Chor (Mon 19th)
Bruckner Symphony No. 3, two pianos (Tues 20th)
Angelika Kirchschlager sings Wesendonck Lieder (Thurs 22nd)
Bruckner Symphony No. 3 (first version) cond. Rémy Ballot (Fri 23rd)
A Jazz tour through the Monastery (Sat. 24th)

www.brucknertage.at
**Orchestral Parts Performance Edition**

**A New Supplementary Offer from the Anton Bruckner Complete Edition**

The *Anton Bruckner Complete Edition*, a ground-breaking project published since the 1930s by the Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag Wien, is a fundamental pillar of Bruckner reception. From the start, the goal of the complete edition has been not only to present Bruckner’s original text as faithfully as possible in score form, but also to supply the basis for an authentic Bruckner interpretation by producing the corresponding orchestral part materials. The volumes in print today have been published from the 1950s onwards; this long publication period of more than half a century has necessarily resulted in the performance parts following the notational conventions of their respective publication times, thus being sometimes inconsistent both in layout and guidelines. A frequent problem is Bruckner’s sometimes very sparse use of performance marks in the score; this can result in the individual parts becoming unclear as to the intended execution, the context visible in the score here being absent.

This is why the Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag has decided to offer its customers entirely newly produced part materials that aim to standardize appearance and improve readability and practical usability while continuing to conform to the historical-critical standards of the complete edition.

Some of the issues, often also raised in many individual interviews conducted with practical musicians, taken into account are:

++ Contrary to the prior practice of numbering the bars in units of ten, the bar numbers now appear exclusively at the beginning of each staff. This results in a more readily intelligible usage of multi-bar rests which now can be more intuitively notated according to the musical phrases involved. Repeated bars are now numbered more sequentially than before.

++ Cue notes now generally appear in the transposition of the written part, and - if feasible - in the same clef, thus relieving musicians from tedious, sometimes even multiple, transpositions.

++ A characteristic of Bruckner is his inconsistent notation of trumpet and horn parts, which are sometimes written with and sometimes without key signatures at the start of the staff. Here the decision was made to follow the unambiguous traditional practice, the parts using no key signature, all accidentals appearing before the note in question. Bruckner’s original Wagner tuba notation, however, has been retained out of consideration for the many generations of players who are used to it; but the frequent ambiguities concerning the intended octave are clarified by additional markings.

++ Finally, the written instructions in the parts now exactly match those given in the scores. Ambiguous or missing markings have been clarified and missing markings added.

We wish to explicitly point out that this new practical version of the orchestral parts is a supplementary offer to the hitherto existing materials and, as a matter of course, exactly conforms to the text of the Bruckner complete edition in all particulars. Any customers who prefer the accustomed look can continue to obtain the earlier orchestra parts on loan.

The practical edition will appear over a period of about five years, beginning in 2013. 

Angela Pachovsky

**MUSIKWISSENSCHAFTLICHER VERLAG WIEN**

[www.mwv.at](http://www.mwv.at)

---

With gratitude to Mr. Tatsuro Ouchi whose web-site<br>[www.bekkoame.ne.jp/~hippo/musik/konzertvorschau/bruckner.html](http://www.bekkoame.ne.jp/~hippo/musik/konzertvorschau/bruckner.html) <br>is the source for much of the concert listing information