Eighth Symphony: Report on the Sources

Neither Nowak nor Haas wrote a report on the sources for their editions of Bruckner’s 8th Symphony, so the ongoing controversy over these editions has taken place with only partial knowledge of the necessary evidence. For twelve years Professor Paul Hawkshaw has been working on the immense task of providing such a report. Almost incredibly, he has been dealing with over 10,000 folios of autograph, copy scores, score fragments, parts, etc., and he announced, to a round of applause at the Bruckner Journal Readers Conference in April 2013, that he had completed his report and it had just been sent to the printers.

The Conference was privileged to hear a summary of his main conclusions, along with some highly significant, indeed startling, revelations about the gestation of the symphony and the apparent necessity of the Schalk brothers’ extensive involvement in its revision, and about how Haas and Nowak dealt with the problems these manifold sources gave rise to. “I do not understand, and have no intention of trying to justify everything Haas did, but I urge everyone to take a step back and look at his work again very carefully,” cautioned Professor Hawkshaw. He cited the suggestion that Haas composed or worked up bars 609 - 615 in the Finale himself from a discarded sketch, but showed that in fact these bars exist in Bruckner’s hand, mislabelled by Bruckner himself as belonging to the Adagio and hence stored amongst the Adagio papers: “Haas didn’t compose these measures; he didn’t compose anything.”

This was one of many significant clarifications. Paul Hawkshaw’s paper will be published in the next issue of The Bruckner Journal, and his full report should also be published by MWV towards the end of the year. As a result the ground upon which the discussion of the editions of the Eighth takes place will have shifted, and we will need to make revisions of our own, to our understanding of the role of the Schalk brothers, of the work of Haas and Nowak, and to our estimation of Bruckner’s state of mind as he grappled with his immense symphony.

Our debt of gratitude to Professor Hawkshaw is immense. Some questions are answered, many new ones raised, but the quality of the evidence upon which we must base our arguments has been wonderfully enhanced.

kw
Letters to the Editor

from Peter Palmer, Nottingham
ANY GOOD fanzine should come with a whiff of controversy. Unfortunately the passions aroused by some recent discussion of the writings of Deryck Cooke and Robert Simpson seem to have more to do with tone than with substance. Important elements of their assiduous work on Bruckner have now been demonstrably superseded. But they both stimulated a serious interest in the composer when his music was largely neglected by English-speaking scholars. Prejudice, preconceptions and received opinion can be found in academic tomes as well as popular histories.

Two propositions: 1) Music history is bunk, 2) All music, at the moment of performance, is contemporary music.

from Warren Malach, Sacramento, California USA
WHILE I wouldn't get aggressive about it, and have my tongue somewhat in my cheek, I have to say that I sentimentally prefer the "village idiot" Bruckner which I grew up with by way of ANTON BRUCKNER: RUSTIC GENIUS and other early biographies which mined Göllerich/Auer for the most "interesting" anecdotes about Bruckner, including his showing up at the concert wearing "odd" boots, calling Brahms "Mr. President," and - perhaps best of all - greeting stark naked straight from the bath the mother of a student who had come to his apartment.

If one is looking for "sexual problems" in a composer, I would opine that Brahms, who was supposed to have been sexually abused as a child while playing the piano in the dockside brothels of Hamburg, makes a much better subject than Bruckner. I've always enjoyed the story of Bruckner reacting so violently when a waitress sat on his knee at the instigation of his students, or when he was enjoying being noticed by some women across the street from where he was until he was told that they were prostitutes.

From a religious point of view, I honor him for going to the Protestant church in Vienna to hear Bach performed, but not taking part in the service. I would do the same in a Roman Catholic service!

from Malcolm Hatfield, Usk, Monmouthshire
THERE IS a good deal of heated and conflicting comment about Deryck Cooke and Robert Simpson in the pages of the BJ. Maybe a consideration of the personality and motives of those involved from the perspective of the time may help. Firstly I would like to say that I am like Ken Ward and others of a certain age, in that much of our knowledge of Bruckner was gained in the 1960s and shortly after that from Simpson's and Cooke's writings, in my case probably more of the former. Still in some ways I look at the symphonies through the lens of Robert Simpson's analysis and as a personal view we are all indebted to Deryck Cooke for his completion of Mahler's 10 Symphony.

However the need to clarify, to find the one best correct answer to the supposed 'Bruckner problem', or to try and tease out Bruckner's real intentions seems, in the view of the author's analysis of Bruckner's personality, to be a false idea and says possibly as much about Messrs Cooke's and Simpson's needs, as it does about Bruckner himself. Their work does assume that his real intentions were somehow 'there' underneath the personality deficits. As Donald Macleod in the recent BBC R3 programme on Bruckner said, "Scholars still struggle to reconcile his personality [e.g. 'serial pathetically maladroit perusal of ladies'] and the grand and complex scale of his symphonies." The writer is of the view that this task, whilst not complete, is not as intractable as Donald Macleod implies, and indeed there is less to answer than some of these comments imply. For example, why is his lack of stable fulfilled relationships with women such an issue? Is there evidence that he would have been a better composer otherwise? And how can he be criticised for finding young women attractive in an age when Hello magazine carries a front cover of Ronnie Wood, [pension age drummer of the Rolling Stones] with his new wife less than half his age, flanked by the equally decrepit looking Paul McCartney and Rod Stewart?

The need to know where you stand, to avoid ambiguity, to reach a sense of 'closure', is in itself a personality characteristic and so the writers who seek to achieve this are quite likely to assume that Bruckner's underlying psychology and inability to reach closure may have distorted his judgement and therefore that his personality is the 'problem'. It is at least possible that Cooke and Simpson needed things to be clear-cut themselves and so projected their own needs upon the composer who was unable to explain himself. To be fair it also may be a reflection of the need at the time, given that Bruckner was not widely played. It would seem churlish to imply any other motivation to them other than that of finding a way of getting Bruckner's music presented in a way which would be more acceptable to what was at the time an less than appreciative public.

But virtuous motivation together with a certain personality type which seeks clarity and closure does not prevent you from being wrong. Bruckner's personality, as described in my recent paper, would suggest that Bruckner had a clear view about what he wanted; for example he considered Symphony One worth revision, he rejected Symphony '0', his craftsmanship style of composing means that he rarely thinks that anything is totally finished and so there is no 'real' or underlying intention on his part, to be discovered by others more clear thinking than himself. Rather the different versions only display the complexity of what he was trying to do and the fact
that in such a level of formal complexity, there will inevitably be many possible options and possible conclusions. So the writer sees the presence of different versions as a sign of humanity and the progression of a personality grappling with fundamental issues of expression rather than lack of skill or indecisiveness or some pathology of the mind. Whether or not, as may be the current view, that some of the earlier versions are ‘better’ does not affect the argument; Bruckner continues to struggle with complex formal structures; in some cases solving one set of problems may only reveal others.

To use an example from another artistic form, in the late 1880s when Bruckner was suffering from Levi’s rejection, Paul Cézanne painted many pictures of Mont Sainte Victoire in southern France. Apparently he painted many pictures of this mountain because he was struggling to get it exactly how he wanted. Now you might call this obsessive or indecisive behaviour, and perhaps it was. However the art world does not either see the need to agonise over which one of these is the best, nor does its suggest that in some way there should be some collective ‘Photoshop’ version of all of these paintings to in some way reveal what it was that Cezanne was ‘really’ struggling to portray. What we have is a number of paintings reflecting on how he saw the mountain at that time. So why can’t we live with multiple versions of different Bruckner symphonies, all of which were probably written by him? And in doing so we are not denigrating the efforts of earlier commentators because we may now see that they were important, but a product of the time. Now things are different; a number of assiduous Bruckner scholars are teasing out the compositional processes of the major works, many more well-known conductors are paying close attention to developing understanding of Bruckner’s music. If all of this seems to challenge the views of earlier writers, it does not of itself denigrate the importance of their contributions at the time they were written.

So why can’t we live with multiple versions of different Bruckner symphonies, all of which were probably written by him? And in doing so we are not denigrating the efforts of earlier commentators because we may now see that they were important, but a product of the time. Now things are different; a number of assiduous Bruckner scholars are teasing out the compositional processes of the major works, many more well-known conductors are paying close attention to developing understanding of Bruckner’s music. If all of this seems to challenge the views of earlier writers, it does not of itself denigrate the importance of their contributions at the time they were written.

from Horace Lau, Hong Kong

I'D LIKE to express my thanks to Prof. Carragan whose Timed Structure Tables published in your Journal have helped me greatly in the enjoyment and understanding of Bruckner's symphonies.

As for the Timed Structure Table for B7 in the latest issue of the TBJ, I’d like to raise two questions. On page 31 on the Finale, I wonder if there is one line apparently missing, and another point open to discussion. In the recapitulation, the recap of A should start at bar 275 with "Aa" (in Carragan's notation), and I'm afraid this line is missing.

For the part open to discussion, Prof. Carragan neatly divides the Exposition into A, B and C groups and they are followed immediately by the Development. In other analyses, e.g. by Timothy Jackson in Bruckner Studies pp 187-190, there is a "bridge" or "transition" after the C group, i.e. C group from bars 93-146, then a bridge from bars 147-162 before the Development starts at bar 163. Likewise in the recapitulation, the bridge (bars 247-274) is embedded, and thus not acknowledged as such, in the recap of the B group in Carragan's table. This part is a little more problematic as Ab and first part of Ac appear in the clarinets from bar 247 (rehearsal letter U) to bar 250, and also Ac from bar 257 (noted in Carragan's own table). This is in contrast to other analyses treating bars 247-274 as a "bridge" before the recap of A from bar 275.

I understand that structural analysis of B7's Finale is problematic, not least in its "tragic" reverse sonata form. Robert Simpson in The Essence of Bruckner having chosen to analyse this Finale tonally rather than "in conventional terms" (p.186, 1992 edition) is a case in point.

Thanks to Dr. Lau for correctly pointing out the missing line, for which we apologise. With respect to the other issue Dr. Lau raises, Prof. William Carragan writes:

(1) The development starts at measure 145, preceded by the double bar which decides the matter beyond discussion. The following material is related to the codetta, m. 129, and particularly m. 141. This is entirely consistent with Bruckner's methods elsewhere.
(2) At m. 163 the A theme appears inverted, developed in some detail.
(3) At 191 the C theme appears, sounding almost like a development of the A theme, but actually starting the reversed recapitulation.
(4) At 213 the B theme appears, confirming no. 3 above.
(5) At m. 247 there is an exciting, intricate deferred development of the A theme,
(6) but the real recapitulation, where the A theme appears unambiguously in the tonic, is not until m. 275.
(7) The brief but highly-effective coda begins at m. 315.

I do not like the term "bridge" applied to such long formal elements. It tends to downgrade their importance. In this movement, the odd form is made possible because of the resemblance in contour between A and C, and the great difference in texture and nuance of tempo (the ritardandos contrasting with the generally slower tempo of C) make for many interesting ideas of development and auditory punning. I will grant that the passage 247-274 is functionally anomalous, but the form is innovative anyway and the recapitulation at 175 would not be weighty enough without it. It is essential to the emotional arc of the movement and has its own very large climax. It should not be called a bridge.

The finale of the Sixth has something of the same arch-form feature, again enabled by the resemblance of C to A, that is, A2 in A major. There are also functionally anomalous passages. Some people find this mysterious, but the piece works just fine, especially if the tempos of the first publication are used.
Guy Richardson, in his Eastbourne review (see page 28), makes a valid point about the exact nature of the repeats in Bruckner's Scherzos, especially the longer ones, which may induce feelings of longuers some times. Exact repeats in such late-Romantic music can sound perhaps at odds with the nature of the works they are part of, maybe just slightly anachronistic. It's a matter that seems rarely aired. I suppose it was not in Bruckner's compositional nature to vary, or shorten, the repeats, (in contrast to Mahler, say, who hardly ever used exact repeats - the 6th Symphony is the main example of a direct repeat, of the first movement's exposition - and all his other repeats were changed in a number of very intriguing and often structurally satisfying ways.) Bruckner in his fashion maintained a more traditional, classical, approach but it makes one wonder if he considered the matter himself.

With regard to Jurowski liking the First Symphony as he has been playing it on other recent occasions, this may well be so (we hope and trust that he does). But there are other reasons. Conductors play the same works multiple times and take them on tour because it's convenient to play the same - or same few - works, being those they have spent time on with their orchestras in each current season. After all it's a pity to play them just once or twice.

"A remarkable event": The Bruckner Journal Readers Conference

About 30 people attended the Conference, including half a dozen from the USA, Dr Andrea Harrandt from the Austrian National Library in Vienna, and others from all over the UK. The Eighth Biennial Conference was generously hosted by Hertford College and Dr. Paul Coones, and was, by all accounts, a great success. Dr. Benjamin Korstvedt wrote, 'During my journey home yesterday I thought about how remarkable these events are. The true spirit of amateurism, with the emphasis on amare, is clearly the guiding force. For me, it is truly a pleasure and a privilege to be a part of it!', a view echoed by Malcolm Hatfield, 'I've also reflected on what unusual events these are. To host a meeting in which most of the major academics in a specialist field meet and discuss their very latest thinking and research in the presence of enthusiastic amateurs, is quite remarkable. For those of us in the latter group it is a bit like being in a kind of collective masterclass! ... So please treasure what you all have managed to create, it's no mean achievement. To be a small part of it, after 50 years of being inspired by Bruckner's music, is pleasure rare indeed.'

On the Friday evening two thought-provoking papers were presented about what sort of person Bruckner was, from two very different psychological perspectives, that of an occupational psychologist and that of a clinician, Malcolm Hatfield and Abram Chipman. Saturday began with 'a report from the trenches', Paul Coones talking about actually conducting a Bruckner symphony, the Ninth, with the Hertford Bruckner Orchestra. This was followed by some very detailed examination of scores - Louis Lohraseb's paper talking of 2000 differences between the manuscript and the first published edition of his Sixth symphony, (read by Ken Ward, as Louis had been grounded by an ice-storm at Toronto airport) and William Carragan had 42 pages of music examples to illustrate the evolution of Bruckner's methods of brass writing as shown in excerpts from his Third Symphony. (These examples are elegantly spiral-bound in a blue soft cover - some copies still available on application to The Bruckner Journal.) Thereafter Andrea Harrandt presented facts and documentary evidence about the relationship between Bruckner and Wagner, illustrated with photographs and other graphic material. Paul Hawkshaw was able to report that after some 12 years working with thousands of pages of manuscript and letters, his report on the sources of the Eighth Symphony was now with the printers. The Conference was privileged to hear a succinct summary of ten conclusions he felt able to draw from this gargantuan endeavour, some of which cast a new light on the work of the Schalk brothers, and on the Haas and Nowak editions. Geoffrey Hosking talked about the life and music of Egon Wellesz and made the case for Egon Wellesz's 2nd Symphony as part of Bruckner's legacy. The final paper was given by Benjamin Korstvedt outlining the long story of Bruckner's 4th symphony, from inception in 1874, to publication of the Gutmann edition corrected proofs in 1890.

Attending the Conference were three members of the board of directors of the Bruckner Society of America, John Berky, William Carragan and Benjamin Korstvedt, and they took the opportunity to present Crawford Howie with the Bruckner Society of America Kilenyi Medal of Honor, an honour that was warmly applauded and whose deservedness was richly confirmed when Crawford Howie joined with William Carragan in a performance of the 1874 version of the 4th Symphony, arranged for two pianos, four hands by William Carragan, in Hertford College Chapel, courtesy of the chaplain. This performance was the closing event of a thoroughly enjoyable and very rewarding conference.

[The Bruckner Journal is very grateful to John Berky who filmed the lectures, recorded the concert. DVDs of the Conference are available from www.abruckner.com - on that site go to the Webstore and look under Exclusives.]
Chorale as Texture in Symphonic Music

Brian Newbould

A slightly abbreviated version of this paper was first presented by Prof. Newbould to the Bruckner Journal Readers Conference, at Hertford College, Oxford, April 2011

LET ME BE clear about my intentions. This is not a paper conceived as a staging-post on the way to publication. It is rather, if I am not too hopeful, a thought-provoking and perhaps ear-opening study of a phenomenon which formed part of the European musical soil in which Bruckner’s music took root. It aims to provide a context, stretching from well before Bruckner to some way after him, against which we may place Bruckner’s use of chorale phenomena. I use the plural, phenomena, as I plan to separate out several features of the chorale genre, giving more attention to some than to others.

I emphasise that Bruckner’s context is my concern rather than Bruckner himself, and I wish to sketch in that context with abundant examples ringing in our ears. In fact, in sifting my material to bring it into line with the conference schedule, I have reluctantly shed a section on Bruckner’s Te Deum, with its wonderful para-symphonic chorale use, in order to avoid being sidetracked into overtly religious music and above all to allow more time for contextual, non-Bruckner illustrations. *

I am not concerned with Lutheran chorales in particular, nor with the religious/textual associations or connotations of chorales. It will be clear already that I am not attempting the thoroughgoing examination of Bruckner’s chorales already undertaken by William Carragan at a previous conference. My starting-point will be the term ‘chorale-like’, which has become a familiar epithet in descriptions and analyses of music of the nineteenth century and beyond.

So often are chorale characteristics evoked in symphonic music (symphonic in the widest sense to include all or any extended instrumental pieces) that we have to conclude that ‘chorale’ has become an absorbed technique where once it was an independent, stand-alone genre, in much the same way that fugue – commonly a self-contained entity for the Baroque composer – became a part of the technical reservoir of Viennese Classical composers in, for example, the development sections of multi-movement works.

The term ‘chorale’ has widened its meaning over the centuries. It first denoted a melody along with its text. Later it would also imply the melody in its fully-harmonised version (as made by Bach), with or without its text. ‘Chorale-like’ generally refers not to melody alone, but to a four-part harmonisation. It does not normally include reference to any text, nor indeed to voices. It is used in the context of instrumental music, though there may sometimes be the implication that a vocal ensemble is being imitated. The principal characteristics of the chorale, thus shorn of its text and its vocal performance, have to do with texture and musical phraseology, where ‘phraseology’ embraces both rhythmic and of course harmonic functions.

Before I define those features of chorale more closely, let’s witness Mozart in the course of the development in the finale of his E flat Symphony, leading his busily darting first theme through the keys, until it pauses for breath in near-exhaustion. After a short hiatus, we hear just the seven-note head of the theme, then a pacifying, smooth woodwind contribution which one would be tempted to call background, except that its plaintive strains in regular rhythm and marked-off phrase-lengths tend to steal our attention and become foreground, with the seven-note flurries almost a decorative filling-in at cadence-points. (Ex.1) With that, Mozart has engineered a link into his recapitulation, on the way to concluding his 39th Symphony. It is the texture of the woodwind contribution, and its ‘packaging’ as it were in bite-sized phrases, that leads us (or at least me) to call it chorale-like.

So we can now add some specifics to our definition of ‘chorale-like’. A chorale-like passage comprises a series of short segments in even rhythm and block harmony, each segment having a cadential ending. As for the scoring of them, the emphasis is on homogeneity – instruments of one type for the most part – that is, brass, or strings, or a woodwind choir as in that Mozart. In Lutheran church performance, the segmentation of a chorale is underlined by a pause at each cadence and an intake of breath. In symphonic instances, segmentation is effected by other means, commonly as in Mozart by the interspersing of something different without the pulse being arrested.

What was Mozart achieving in that instance? He was surely exploiting ‘chorale’, or whatever may be the appropriate word here, for its texture: that is, for its homophonic blocks to contrast with and ‘pull together’ the more fragmented cut-and-thrust of the foregoing dialectic; for its smooth sustained rhythmic flow to put a brake on the prevailing moto perpetuo tendency; and for its well-defined harmony calculated to engineer a return to the opening key for the recapitulation. Chorale-like manifestations in much symphonic music thereafter seem to share this textural purpose.

* The omitted section has been reinstated in this published version. The music examples replace the recorded illustrations of the lecture, which was also illustrated by short live vocal extracts here and there, in the absence of a keyboard.
Ex.1  Mozart: Symphony No.39 in E flat: IV

Ex.2  Chopin: Scherzo No.3 in C sharp minor

Ex.3  Brahms: Rhapsody in E flat, Op.119, No.3
Clearly there are no formally religious overtones in what we might call a ‘textural chorale’. There is none, for example, when Chopin invents a chorale as second theme in his Scherzo in C sharp minor, separating its well-defined segments with cascades tumbling from the heights. (Ex.2)

Brahms likewise seeks a secular spirituality when he adopts Chopin’s formulation for a second theme in his E flat Rhapsody, chorale segments punctuated by cascades. (Ex.3) A by now classic example of the punctuated symphonic chorale occurs in the finale of the Third (‘Organ’) Symphony of Saint-Saëns, where the punctuation this time increases the decibel-level, rather than reducing it, or even matching it. There are no religious overtones here - despite the presence of an organ: but there is usually a sense of heightened spirituality in these chorale-like interventions. Mendelssohn’s case is not wholly typical. As Charles Rosen has observed, where Bach in his chorale-based pieces will underline some point of religious dogma, Mendelssohn’s use of chorale evokes “a sense of religion and piety which dispenses with the unnecessary and inconvenient trappings of dogma and ritual.” Mendelssohn’s use of chorale-like themes in symphonic music, he writes “conveys...the emotional satisfaction that religion can give”. We have recognisably the same pattern here in the finale of Mendelssohn’s C minor Piano Trio as in the Chopin and Brahms, except that cascades are replaced by fragments of the first theme, and the fourth segment is diverted, making a fifth segment obligatory. (Ex.4)

Ex.4 Mendelssohn: Piano Trio No.1 in C minor - IV

Typical of some later Romantic thinking is the urge to write long-limbed melodies, deferring their homecoming for as long as possible. Wagner coined the term ‘unendliche Melodie’ in 1860 for his particular kind of uninterrupted flow, a concept rooted in operatic thinking and philosophy and intended as a counterblast to the persisting sectionalisation of operas with their divisions into numbers. But before Wagner and alongside him outside of opera the seamless stream of melody held its attractions for others. Brahms, in 1873, encouraged the oboe, in his St Antony Variations, to obliterate the midway cadence separating the two five-bar limbs of the original melody (or chorale) so as to make a seamless ten-bar unit (Variation 3). But
Schumann, back in 1846, had created for the second trio of the scherzo of his Second Symphony a seamless melody which, if we artificially segment it, clearly reveals chorale characteristics. (Ex.5)

**Ex.5 Schumann: Putative chorale for Symphony No.2**

But those are harmonically weak cadences with which to end chorale segments: so when the segments are drawn together as they are by Schumann the seamlessness is supreme and sublime. (Ex.6)

**Ex.6 Schumann: Symphony No.2 in C - II**

While Bruckner was in symphonic mid-stream, another composer was writing a scherzo more obsessed by one theme than perhaps any other piece in the history of music. After the nth return of this theme, with its brittle bravura and feverish quickfire motion, the listener longs for respite. Henry Litolff, in the famous Scherzo of his Concerto Symphonique No. 4, eventually offers respite in the form of a Schumannesque long-breathed chorale, a chorale as defined by its even homophonic rhythm and its delivery by a single timbral group (clarinets and bassoons). The subdivision into chorale-size phrases is disguised, as in the Schumann, by the nonstop flow – the eight-beat segments running on without any marked subdivision. When the chorale is taken over by the strings, the piano projects the first theme against it, thus maximising the textural contrast which is the virtual raison d’etre of the chorale. (Ex.7)

**Ex.7 Litolff: Concerto Symphonique No.4 in C minor - II**

The ‘streamlined’ chorale was not Bruckner’s way. The more segmented type of chorale, with at least a longer note at the end of each segment, if not a marked caesura, typifies his usage, as it does Brahms’s – with well-known examples in his First and Third Symphonies. It also tends to characterise much later examples of symphonic chorales, of which I will take one example before returning to Bruckner. We have here the steady, even rhythmic tread, and the use of a single, uniform instrumental group (the brass). Bartók spaces out his four chorale segments by interpolating a thematic side-drum rhythm, in this example from the Concerto for Orchestra. (Ex.8)
These interpolations between the segments might have their ancestry in Bruckner: in the slow movement of the Fourth Symphony, horn rhythms punctuate the strings’ chorale. In his Seventh Symphony’s finale, the segmentation is effected merely by a short caesura in the upper parts while the plucked bass marches on. (Ex.9)

What Bruckner uniquely brings to his chorales is the use of post-Wagnerian harmony, with a true progressive purpose. That is, successive segments tend to reflect an upward shift in tonality, bringing with it a palpable sense of spiritual uplift, as in that last example. [“I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills”, Psalm 121] Even in the first example, there is broadly upward progress, though flecked by unexpected darker chords, bringing their momentary aura of awe and mystery. Spiritual uplift, awe and mystery are all phenomena associated with religious practice, though not exclusive to religious practice. If these symphonic chorales are a product of the devoutness of Bruckner they are not therefore lacking in powerful expressiveness for a secular ear.

Chorale-like ideas also offer, in more coolly analytical terms, a sense of measure, of focus, of stability, as well as solemnity and sometimes grandeur. But also, because chorale carries a deep historical association with community singing, it is suggestive of community, of brotherhood, of nationhood. We feel that connection when a chorale (wind) comes through in the finale of Mussorgsky’s Pictures, as we do to some extent in Sibelius’s Finlandia. Indeed, when the ‘Joy’ theme in Beethoven’s ‘brotherhood’ finale to his Ninth Symphony is given full orchestral treatment it acquires something of a chorale character, although Beethoven’s reliance on tonic and dominant harmonies doesn’t help to promote this.

All these resonances and redolences come together in Bruckner’s Fifth Symphony, where additionally we feel – as perhaps not since the wonderful slow movement of Schumann’s Rhenish Symphony – the scale and acoustical ambience of a cathedral.

I am tempted to quote you the words of Torsten Blaich in a pamphlet recently issued by the Berlin Philharmonic announcing a performance of the Bruckner’s Fifth under the heading ‘Contrapuntal Masterpiece’. He refers to a moment in the finale. “Suddenly it is there. Out of nowhere, not quite 200 bars into the Finale of Bruckner’s Fifth Symphony, a chorale resounds. The movement’s first climactic surges
have ebbed away, and even mightier developments lie ahead; but for now - like the holding of breath, like an island of inner contemplation after all of the music’s exertions and ruptures - there is simply this chorale. Radiant, unadorned, as though carved in stone, presented again and again by the brass, echoed by the strings. In the midst of the proverbial calm before a storm, we bear witness to one of those moments in Bruckner’s symphonies that can take the listener’s breath away. It is as if the music stepped out of itself on to another, higher plane, into another world.” (Transl. Richard Evidon.) (Ex.10)

**Ex.10**  **Bruckner: Symphony No.5 - IV**
![Image](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

If we now look back from this distance to the Mozart symphony with which I began, we might see Mozart there showing us that there was a function awaiting the chorale in symphonic music – a function as texture. To this regular textural role were added the expressive dimensions – emotional, spiritual or religious – which became dominant in Bruckner. The chorale could by now be a goal towards which a movement or work aspired. But also, for Bruckner, the contrapuntal potential of the chorale was paramount. In the finale of the Fifth, once the chorale has been announced, its contrapuntal treatment ensues, and it is then combined with the first theme to kick-start the recapitulation. The chorale then returns at the end of the movement in a more comprehensive combining of themes, a panoptic climax. In all this it has retained its distinctive textural role in that its construction for the most part in long notes enables it to act as a sustained central presence against which the other themes with their shorter note-values can be effectively played out.

Bruckner’s assumption of his chorale into the contrapuntal and thematic working out of his finale compares interestingly with what Brahms did in the symphony he completed the previous year, his First in C minor, where a mere two segments of chorale, planted in the slow introduction to the finale, are set aside until recalled once only to winch the coda up to its final climax. At the first hearing, a deep glow obtains, the contrabassoon seeming to suggest a 64-foot cathedral organ pipe. At the second, it shines forth in statuesque glory, never to be meshed in contrapuntally with other material, but one of a chain of discrete ingredients bringing the symphony to its crowning conclusion.

Bruckner’s closer integration of the chorale goes with a stronger sense of religious devotion and contemplation. The chorale, then, a genre of vocal and Christian origin, having served for a century or so as a secular component of symphonic texture, is reconnected to its Christian roots by one of the late Romantic masters of the symphonic tradition.

The most palpable link between the symphonic chorale and ecclesiastical chorale in Bruckner is to be found in the *Te Deum*. Indeed, to consider the role of chorale in his *Te Deum* we have to go back to the slow movement of the Seventh Symphony, completed shortly before he returned to his sketched *Te Deum* in September 1883. The *Adagio* of that symphony appears to have been associated in Bruckner’s mind with a premonition of Wagner’s death. Home from a visit to Wagner, he confided in Felix Mottl that he felt sad, that he “thought it impossible that the Master would live much longer, and the C sharp minor Adagio came to me.” The theme of that Adagio has two distinct limbs, the second following the *piano* first limb as a suddenly *mezzo-forte* solid chorale-like phrase rising through the first three notes of the major scale, from its tonic (1-2-3), denoting for J. Stephen Parkany “release from the initial gloom”.² It repeats those pitches one-and-a-half times, reaching a cadence possibly inspired by *Tristan*. (Ex.11)

**Ex.11**  **Bruckner: Symphony No. 7 - II**
![Image](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

This, suitably extended, later forms the climax of the movement. This three-note ascent, stoical rather than optimistic (given the biographical context), is to play a crucial part in the *Te Deum*. Indeed, the climactic section of the symphonic slow movement (from b.168, third beat) is recomposed to move the *Te Deum* towards its majestic close. The 1-2-3 ascent has, however, by now been assigned a new significance. It first emerges in a clear form in the ‘In te Domine speravi’ when the solo soprano leads off with it to the words ‘Non confundar in aeternum’ (Let me never be confounded) (Ex.12).
Ex.12 Bruckner: Te Deum

The chorus takes it up in B major, in pure homophony suggesting the corporate fervour of a chorale. But chorale texture is only one part of Bruckner’s scheme. A new texture immediately follows as the ‘chorale’ (reduced to nothing more than 1-2-3 for the most part) serves as one of the subjects of a double fugue. But textural functions apart, the chorale is all the time acquiring a symbolic force. There can be no more natural or powerful way of implying hope in music than by ascending through the first three notes of the major scale, to the mode-determinant third. For Bruckner it now aptly represents an earnestly impassioned plea for salvation. (It is surely no coincidence that the 1-2-3 opening occurs in more than 20 Lutheran chorales, sometimes with an anacrusis 1 or 5.)

The brevity of the 1-2-3 fugue subject allows it to be heard in quick succession (in a tonally-shifting environment) rising from one note after another, until one may wonder if there is any note of the scale that has not acted as its starting-point. Sometimes it takes the minor form and sometimes it is inverted – as though to deny certainty in the outcome of the prayer. An emotional crux is reached at figure X with the entry of the trombone quartet, ppp legato in F minor (Ex.13)

Ex.13 Bruckner: Te Deum

It is here that the 1-2-3 motif has grown and morphed into what is immediately identifiable as a ‘Bruckner chorale’. Over about 100 bars of Te Deum, the 1-2-3 motif will soon have been heard rising from all 12 possible starting-notes, with the fff C sharp major entry completing the tally. From there it is something of a wrench to the ultimate hard-won goal of C major, where the struggle of stepwise ascent is now superfluous and the tight ambit of 1-2-3 is opened out to a joyous 1-3-5-8 by the choral sopranos, woodwind and organ. If we share Arthur Hutchings’s view that Bruckner’s music “tells of glory and gazing at glory”, then we can hardly not hear these closing moments of the Te Deum as the locus classicus.³

The symphonic and ecclesiastical chorales are thus brought together in the Seventh Symphony and Te Deum through their shared chorale material, and especially the common head-motif, 1-2-3. Indeed that motif is more influential in the symphony than has so far been revealed, in that it launches every phrase of the chorale-like second subject in the finale, lending an aspirational quality thereby. It is particularly apt that this motif should take its place as a critical element in a Te Deum, as it may be viewed as music’s pithiest symbol of both primacy (the deity, creation’s dawn) and ascent (the lifting of eyes unto the Lord, Christ’s ascent to heaven). Both concepts would be precisely encapsulated in the opening words of the doxology - Gloria in excelsis Deo - which one may well imagine to be a subtext here.

NOTES
On the Circumstances Surrounding Loss of Bifolios from the Finale of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony

Dr. Edwin D. Banta, Kinnelon, NJ USA

Regular readers of this Journal likely know that, although Anton Bruckner did not live to complete the Finale for his Ninth symphony, significant material - sketches, partially worked-out pages, and fully scored pages complete with rests - belonging to the Ninth symphony’s Finale exists in various libraries and private hands; they are also likely know that additional material, which once existed, is now missing. Despite this, tedious scholarship has made it possible to recoup much of this lost material, as evidenced by the various Finale reconstructions and completions which now exist. On the other hand, very little is known about the hunters, two completely new bifolios The most common explanation for the loss of Finale bifolios - some variation of ‘stolen by souvenir hunters, or scattered, due to the negligence of Bruckner’s executor and some of his students’ reflects the general chaos surrounding Bruckner’s death, when contemporary sources note ‘important material was lost, among it certain bifolios of the well-advanced score, which lay scattered around his apartment’.

In assessing the credibility of this ‘stolen or scattered’ explanation, we interpret it to mean bifolios were lost or otherwise taken as the result of random action, without any particular regard for the music they contained; this permits our use of familiar tools from statistical analysis in obtaining a likelihood of randomness, which we similarly interpret as the ‘stolen or scattered’ explanation likelihood of correctness. Furthermore, since randomness also implies every bifolio was equally likely to be stolen or lost, we can establish the likelihood of Finale bifolios being lost through random action using any representative group of Surviving and Missing Finale bifolios.

Lastly, since our interpretation implies the bifolios were lost or otherwise taken without regard for the music they contained, we should similarly assess randomness without regard for the music existing Finale bifolios contain.

The most helpful statistical analysis tools for our purposes use the pattern of Heads or Tails in tosses of a coin in assessing their randomness. For our assessment of Finale bifolios being lost at random, we should ideally use the pattern of sequentially ordered Surviving and Missing Finale bifolios as they existed immediately prior to Bruckner’s death; however, Bruckner kept no document showing which Finale bifolios he had completed, from which we can determine which Finale bifolios are Missing. Furthermore, his habitual reuse of existing page numbers as he generated new replacement bifolios, without excising or otherwise cancelling page numbers of the replaced bifolio, makes it difficult to establish even which Surviving bifolios may have actually belonged to this last Finale version. Fortunately, through the happy confluence of Bruckner’s meticulous habit of counting and numbering things together with an editorial decision he made earlier upon completing a significant portion of the Finale, there does exist a particular, representative group of Finale bifolios, from whose Surviving bifolios we can recover that group’s pattern of Missing bifolios and likelihood of randomness.

Following his usual compositional pattern and having generated some thirty-plus sequentially numbered Finale bifolios, Bruckner paused and decided to expand the existing 2nd Finale bifolio and replace it with two completely new bifolios. More significantly for our purposes, he (more likely his secretary Meißner) then renumbered each subsequent bifolio by excising its existing page number and replacing it with a new page number one larger than its previous value. By associating gaps in the page sequence of the Surviving renumbered Finale bifolios with Missing renumbered Finale bifolios, we deduce the pattern of Surviving and

---

1 The reader is forewarned that we discuss only the question of how these Finale bifolios may originally have become lost without (as properly noted by John Phillips in a private communication) presenting any new information relating to their actual recovery.
4 While our confidence in the randomness assessment increases in proportion to the number of bifolios in the representative group, the critical issue is that group’s accuracy in describing exactly which bifolios are Surviving and which are Missing.
5 While it has been long believed that this renumbering occurred in the Spring of 1896, but, as noted by Phillips (private communication), this renumbering may have occurred earlier when having drafted the score at least as far as the last surviving bifolio 31’/’32’ or perhaps advanced further into the coda, … Bruckner may have paused to deliberate on the further course of the coda.
6 These renumbered Finale bifolios are unique; there is no evidence of Bruckner repeating this excision/renumbering process when he subsequently replaced one of these renumbered bifolios; instead, he simply copied that bifolio’s renumbered value.
Missing renumbered Finale bifolios\(^7\) (with an obvious notation) as

\[
\text{M S MM SSSSS M S M SSSS M SSSS M SS M SS M S .}
\]

We then assess the renumbered Finale Bifolios' likelihood of randomness from this pattern of their Surviving and Missing members using a simple, robust test\(^8\) requiring only the total number of renumbered Finale bifolios and the number of runs (blocks of consecutive identical descriptors, S or M) in this pattern; thus, with twenty Surviving and nine Missing bifolios partitioned into sixteen runs, we obtain the one-chance-in-six likelihood of randomness\(^9\) - a representative value for the likelihood of random action (the interpreted likelihood for the stolen or scattered explanation) causing all Finale bifolio loss.

More complicated statistical methods\(^10\), addressing the relatively regular occurrence of Missing bifolios previously noted by Carragan\(^11\) and the frequent large groupings of the Surviving bifolios\(^12\), give comparable likelihoods of randomness\(^13\). Although these results would appear to reject random action, in the arcane world of statistical analysis (where one-chance-in-twenty or less is commonly accepted as necessary to reject randomness) we should, instead, interpret them as a modest affirmation of random action - hence the 'stolen or scattered' explanation - being the cause of Missing Finale bifolio loss; the reader may, of course, choose a different interpretation of these results.

Those unconvinced of the 'stolen or scattered' explanation's correctness as the cause of Missing bifolios may find an interesting alternative within the remarkable correlation between the Missing bifolios and the optional vi-de cuts\(^14\), introduced by Bruckner prior to the re-numbering and documented on the Surviving bifolio pages, depicted here.

---

\(^7\) In generating this pattern of Missing and Surviving renumbered Finale bifolios, we have used the following conventions:

1. Because we are interested in the events causing the loss of Missing bifolios, rather than in reconstructing the music they contained, we identify a renumbered bifolio as Missing only if it corresponds to a gap in the sequence of Surviving renumbered bifolios; we furthermore count every existing renumbered bifolio as a Surviving (not lost) bifolio even if there is evidence Bruckner later replaced it with another (un-renumbered) bifolio.

2. We specifically exclude the existing bifolios numbered 2 and 3, even though they are likely those generated to replace the old bifolio number 2, because we cannot be certain that these (existing) bifolios do not replace the (now lost) bifolios actually generated at the time of renumbering.

3. We specifically exclude the existence of any Missing bifolio with a renumbered value greater than that of the last known Surviving renumbered bifolio.


\(^9\) Defined as the fraction of all possible arrangements containing nineteen Surviving and nine Missing renumbered Finale bifolios having at least the sixteen observed runs. This likelihood of randomness is modestly sensitive to changes in the definition of renumbered Finale bifolios; it would decrease to one-chance-in-nine if we were to include bifolios 2E and 3E as Surviving renumbered Finale bifolios while presuming the first to be Missing. On the other hand, the likelihood of randomness would increase slightly to one-chance-in-five were we to presume a single Missing renumbered Final bifolio following the last Surviving bifolio; however, it would again fall to one-chance-in-eight were we simultaneously to include 2E and 3E as Surviving bifolios and the first bifolio as Missing. Presuming the existence of two or more Missing bifolios following the last Surviving bifolio would increase the likelihood of randomness significantly.

\(^10\) These methods require knowing the probability of a Finale bifolio being lost at random, something we can only infer from the (limited size) observed pattern of Missing and Surviving renumbered Finale bifolios.

\(^11\) Private communication.

\(^12\) Especially the intact preservation of fully-scored bifolios related to the Chorale exposition, bifolios which Bruckner seems to have maintained almost untouched from their inception.

\(^13\) Presuming a one-chance-in-three probability of a particular Final bifolio being lost due to random action, we find (see M. Muselli – Simple Expressions for Success Runs Distributions in Bernoulli Trials – Instituto per I Circuiti Elettronici Consiglio Nazionale dell Ricerche via De Marini, 6 – 16149 Genova, Italy) a one-chance-in-five likelihood of observing three runs containing four or more Surviving bifolios and (see: W. Feller – An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications Vol.1 2nd Ed. John Wiley & Sons, New York, London, Sydney 1965 pg. 301) a two-chances-in-five likelihood of a run containing two, but not three, Missing bifolios in the pattern of twenty nine Surviving and Missing bifolios.

\(^14\) Bruckner's purpose in introducing these optional vi-de cuts is unclear. One possibility suggests a provisional plan for using a 'shortened' version of the Finale Development as a transition to a similarly 'shortened' Te Deum in the event he was unable to complete a fully instrumental Finale (see C. Howie et. al. (ed.) – Perspectives on Anton Bruckner Ashgate, Aldershot-Burlington USA-Singapore-Sydney (2001) pg. 276). Since these vi-de cuts would also have impacted the Development, Bruckner might have set bifolios containing these cuts aside, as a reminder to himself, in a separate pile where they remained until his death, whence 'perhaps under the assumption on Meißner's or even Kathi Kachelmeyer's part, that they had been discarded, and were therefore suitable material for 'souvenirage' (private communication from John Phillips).
Each box identifies a Finale Development bifolio using a standard notation: The first number identifies the original bifolio page, while the second is its renumbered value. Entries enclosed within brackets indicate Missing bifolios, while those including a letter indicating the paper type (unimportant for our analysis) indicate Surviving bifolios. The letters ‘s’ within the Surviving bifolios and ‘x’ within Missing bifolios identify individual measures; the letters ‘c’ shown below some boxes identify measures within Bruckner’s *vi-de* cuts, while ‘?’ denotes unknown.

The first Cut begins on a no longer existent Bifolio 13 and ends after measure 12 on Surviving bifolio 15D/’16’. The second Cut begins at measure 13 of Surviving bifolio 18D/’19’ and continues through measure 6 of Surviving bifolio 21D/’22’. The third Cut begins at measure 7 of Surviving bifolio 23D/’24’ and ends somewhere within Missing Bifolio [24/’25’] since there is no indication of an end anywhere in the Surviving bifolios prior to the next cut; however, an earlier version of this Cut (indicated by italic ‘c’), but later discarded by Bruckner, continues unambiguously through measure 8 of Surviving bifolio 25D/’26’. The fourth Cut begin at measure 13 of Surviving bifolio 26F/’27’ and likely ends somewhere within Missing bifolio [27/’28’]. Curiously, this tabulation also shows the Missing bifolios generally contain measures which should be unnecessary if Bruckner’s original (longer) *vi-de* cuts were observed, with none of the Surviving bifolios exclusively containing superfluous measures were these same *vi-de* cuts observed.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13E/’14’</th>
<th>[14/’15’]</th>
<th>15D/’16’</th>
<th>16C/’17’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sssssssssssssss</td>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
<td>sssssssssssssss</td>
<td>sssssssssssssss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ? -</td>
<td>ccccccccccccccccc</td>
<td>ccccccccccccccccc</td>
<td>ccccccccccccccccc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17D/’18’</th>
<th>18D/’19’</th>
<th>[19/’20’]</th>
<th>20F/’21’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sssssssssssssss</td>
<td>sssssssssssssss</td>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
<td>sssssssssssssss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ccccccccccccccccc</td>
<td>ccccccccccccccccc</td>
<td>ccccccccccccccccc</td>
<td>ccccccccccccccccc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21D/’22’</th>
<th>22D/’23’</th>
<th>23D/’24’</th>
<th>[24/’25’]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sssssssssssssss</td>
<td>sssssssssssssss</td>
<td>sssssssssssssss</td>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ccccccccccccccccc</td>
<td>ccccccccccccccccc</td>
<td>- ? -</td>
<td>ccccccccccccccccc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25D/’26’</th>
<th>26F/’27’</th>
<th>[27/’28’]</th>
<th>28E/’29’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sssssssssssssss</td>
<td>sssssssssssssss</td>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
<td>sssssssssssssss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ccccccccccccccccc</td>
<td>- ? -</td>
<td>ccccccccccccccccc</td>
<td>ccccccccccccccccc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>29E/’30’</th>
<th>[30/’31’]</th>
<th>31E/’32’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sssssssssssssss</td>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
<td>sssssssssssssss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

15 Following Phillips, this Table presumes each Missing bifolio to contain sixteen measures.
16 as noted by Bruckner on Surviving bifolio 15D/’16’.
17 Phillips postulates after measure 10.
18 Phillips postulates after measure 12.
19 There are two major exceptions: First, Cut-4 presumably ends within Missing bifolio [27/’28’]. Second, we can associate no Cut with Missing bifolio [30/’31’].
20 While Bifolio 20F/’21’ certainly contains music unnecessary were Cut-2 to be observed, this particular bifolio was apparently not among the Finale bifolios given to Josef Schalk shortly after Bruckner’s dearth and recovered from his estate in 1939; it was, instead, part of a collection sold by Löwe’s widow in 1927 (see J. A. Phillips Ref. 1 - pg. 139 for a further discussion of this curious situation).
21 Indeed, upon mimicking the plan used by Bruckner in the Adagio by repeating the first few measures of the Exposition to improvise a beginning for the Development and observing Bruckner’s original (longer) *vi-de* Cut-3, it is possible, with one minor discontinuity (a few missing measures between the unknown end of Cut-4 within Missing bifolio [27/’28’] and the beginning of Surviving bifolio 28E/’29’), to recover all of this ‘shortened’ Development through the reintroduction of the Chorale theme in Surviving bifolio 29E/’30’. The curious can explore this further by piecing together appropriate portions of the Surviving bifolios included as an addendum on Talmi’s 1985 Oslo Philharmonic (Chandos or Musical Heritage) recording of Carragan’s completion; e.g. after playing a few measures of the initial Exposition, continue with the four consecutive intervals containing (approximate) CD time-mark intervals (8:06 – 9:43), (10:33 – 11:30), (12:55 – 13:53), and (14:12 – 15:04).
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Reflections on the Reconstruction of the Coda for the Final Movement of Anton Bruckner’s 9th Symphony

Joan Schukking

1. Material from which to start the reconstruction

BRUCKNER was sadly unable to complete the finale of his 9th symphony. The reconstruction of the greater part of it - up to the coda - has proved to be fairly successful, using those parts of the score and sketches as they were left after Bruckner’s death. The coda itself poses a different problem, as very little material has come down to us. No score bifolio is extant and the sketches are scant (a bifolio comprises four pages, usually with 4 bars per page). This prompted me to delve deeper into the reconstructions of the coda that I have encountered. No more than three workable, though unconnected, sketches intended for this coda are currently extant, in the eyes of the experts; together, they total 64 bars, which may seem quite substantial, but the greater part of them provides minimal information only.

The first sketch contains 36 bars (ÖNB 3194/3r; F.-A. 6.), of which 28 at most (the first 24 and the last 41) seem suitable for use in the coda. Those first 24 bars contain two sequences of the opening motive of the finale, developed melodically and harmonically, but inverted and combined with a motive ending in chromatically descending semiquavers and related to the motive of the end of Symphony No. VIII/2-1 (see note 4) and the last 4 bars give harmonic information only in the shape of a third sequence, but the motives belonging to them can be added very well. Generally speaking, these 28 bars are assumed to form the beginning of the coda.

The second sketch contains no more than 4 bars of chord connections in minims with an upper part in ascending stepwise motion (ÖNB 6085/45r; F.-A. 45.).

The third sketch comprises 24 bars (ÖNB 6085/43r; F.-A. 47.). Most of the first 16 hold a single note per bar and an indication of the harmony, suggesting a cadence. The last 8 give the note D only and are probably meant as the beginning of the final organ-point. A comment by Bruckner shows that this material was to begin on bifolio 36 (later to be renumbered 37).

Besides that, Bruckner also (allegedly) told his doctor Richard Heller that he wanted to reintroduce the ‘Hallelujah from the second movement’ in the finale in full force, so that the symphony would end with a song of praise to God2. These words are a source of speculation, if only because no one knows with any certainty to which movement Bruckner refers by ‘the second movement’.

IT IS CLEAR that the result of a reconstruction of the coda with the help of such scant material must be highly speculative. It is therefore not surprising that the three best known reconstructions of the coda - those by William Carragan, by Samale, Phillips, Cohrs & Mazzuca (to be referred to as SPCM hereafter) and by Sébastien Letocart - include a large speculative component - so large in fact, that their reconstructions have resulted in three concepts that differ from each other sufficiently that it may safely be said that they are all thoroughly different compositions.

It seems to me that consulting the respective codas of the finales of the other symphonies would make it possible to reduce the speculative element in some measure. Without wanting to maintain that there is a striking similarity between the codas of these finales, they do show certain recurring characteristics that can be useful for a reconstruction. For this purpose I have listed a number of general characteristics of the codas of the finales that may be relevant for the reconstruction of the coda of the finale to the 9th. I have purposely confined this exercise to the codas of the finales, because the codas of the first movements show too many variant characteristics to be of any help in reconstructing a coda for a finale; for example, a first movement coda obviously cannot introduce a theme from a previous movement, whereas a coda of a finale can. On the basis of these characteristics, it is possible to ascertain to what degree the existing reconstructions are in line with the codas that Bruckner finished.

1 The 36 six bars of the first sketch can be divided into four linked segments. The first segment numbers 16 bars, the second and third 8 bars each and the last one 4. The third segment repeats the second, but a perfect fourth lower. Harmonically, the third segment does not follow the second very well, whereas the fourth follows the third well. The third may be a re-written version of the second. The first two segments alone give melodic information; the last two only give chords (see also notes 9 and 14).

2 As will be shown later, the Hallelujah mentioned here also determines the form of all codas that were completed (see § 6: The Reconstruction in the SPCM-version, Commentary and The Finale as reconstructed by Sébastien Letocart).
2. Characteristics of the Codas of the Finales.

1) The codas nearly always begin\(^3\) piano. Exceptions are the codas of symphonies nr “0”-4 and III-4, which start \(\text{fff}\).\(^4\)

2) The codas nearly always start in the tonic, usually that of the home key of the movement, often after a half cadence (ending on the dominant) at the end of the recapitulation (in symphonies II-4, IV-4, VI-4, VII-4 and VIII-4), the exception being once more the coda of symphony III-4, which begins on the lowered second degree.

3) At first the codas mark time harmonically for a while, i.e. they do not begin modulating immediately; examples are symphony I/1-4: 9 bars in E minor, then C minor, C major; III/2-4: 8 bars in D minor, then rising to G minor; IV/2-4: modulations only in the final crescendo after 40 bars in E flat minor; V-4: 32 bars in B flat major and B flat minor, etc.

4) The most important elements of the coda always come from the first theme group of the finale, in the first place the main theme of the finale itself, but also the more secondary motives of the first theme group and accompaniment motives qualify for development. Other themes from the finales are hardly ever used. Only in the codas of the relatively early symphonies “0”-4 and III/1-4 and III/2-4 does this occur. In “0”-4 this applies to the development of the second theme and III-4 develops the third theme. In V-4, the closing theme of the exposition (the chorale) is recapitulated towards the end of the coda.

Quotations from the first movement of the symphony very often occur prior to the final organ-point (see section 6) of the codas of the symphonies from 1873-1877 (III/1-4 and III/2-4, IV/1-4 and V-4); sometimes, quotations from the other movements also occur. In Symphony II/1-4 (1872), only the main theme of the first movement appears, and then only once. In III/1-4 (1873), the main theme of the first movement occurs a number of times and the second theme of the first movement, the first theme of the Adagio and the opening motive of the Scherzo each occur once. In III/2-4 (1877), the quotations from the Adagio and Scherzo are deleted.

In the coda of IV/1-4 (1874-76), the main theme of the first movement is quoted continuously and is combined with the main theme of the finale. In V-4, the main theme of the first movement is developed chiefly at the beginning of the coda and combined with the main theme of the finale. In the codas of the finales of the symphonies from the period after 1877, IV/2-4 (1878 and 1880), VI-4, VII-4 and VIII-4, no element from the first movement is quoted in the section up to the final organ-point; only in VIII/2-4 is the theme from the Scherzo quoted and in VIII/1-4 (1887) also the main theme of the Adagio.

5) The development of the main theme of the finale is brought to a climax which leads to a clearly distinguishable final cadence, preparing for a final tonic organ-point.

6) The final organ-point always starts with great vigour (\(\text{fff}\)) after that and, from Symphony III/1-4 onwards, always brings back the first theme of the first movement again and always in the form of the opening bars, adjusted to the harmonic circumstances\(^5\). It usually occurs in combination with the main theme of the Finale, which is simplified in a similar way (only in Symphony VIII-4 are the theme of the Scherzo and the main theme of the Adagio added to it). The themes are always in a major key.

The length of the quotation of the main theme of the first movement is nearly always 2 bars, (in V-4 also one bar), the sole exception being III-4, where the first 8 bars of the theme are quoted. The final organ-points of the finales from the period 1873-77 (symphonies III/1 and III/2, IV/1 and V) are, from the point where the main theme returns, each characterized by a different plan.

On the other hand, the final organ-point of the finales of the symphonies from the period 1880-90

---

\(^3\) I have found that opinions on the starting point of the codas vary. I have them beginning as follows: I/1-4: bar 338; “0”-4: bar 229; II (1877)-4: bar 563, at V; III/1-4 bar 637, at Bb; III/2-4: bar 515, at Bb; IV/1-4: bar 511, at Y; IV/2-4: bar 477, at V; V-4: bar 496, at W; VI-4: bar 371, at X; VII-4: bar 315, at Z; VIII/2-4: bar 647 at Uu. All bar numbers refer to edition Nowak, except where otherwise stated.

\(^4\) Symphonies are referred to as follows: III/1-4: 3rd Symphony/version no. 1-Finale.

\(^5\) I will assume that the quotation of the main theme of the first movement on the final organ-point of the finale is known to all readers from now on and will not mention it separately again.
(IV/2/3 (1878 and 1880), VI, VII and VIII) all show a similar fixed pattern from the point where the main theme of the first movement is quoted. In IV/2/3-4, VI-4 and VII-4, the quotation of the 2 bars of the main theme is played three times, unaltered. After that, 2 more bars follow in which the end is anticipated. In IV/2/3-4 and VII-4, the theme is reduced to a single note and in VI-4 to a short motive (triplet), followed by one final bar with only one final chord. Consequently, the total number of bars of this apotheosis is only 9 each time.

In VIII-4, the combination of the four main themes numbers 4 bars (the quotation of the themes of the first movement and of the Scherzo is 2 bars, that of the Adagio and the finale 4 bars and the shorter quotations are played twice against the longer ones). This combination of the four themes is repeated once, almost unaltered. After that, 4 concluding bars follow, bringing the themes in a reduced form. The single final bar with one note for all parts comes after that, the total number being 13.

The way in which the quotation of the main theme of the first movement manifests itself in the final organ-point is always derived from the motives that Bruckner uses on the final organ-point of the first movement, as they are borrowed from the same theme. It seems that Bruckner wanted to create a distinct analogy between the treatment of the motives of the first theme in the final bars of the first movement and those in the final bars of the finale. In IV (1878 and 1880), VI and VII, the similarities between the treatment of this “main theme” at the end of the finale and the end of the first movement are the most striking; it concerns the last 9 bars in IV-1 and VI-1 and the last 11 bars in VII-1 (see music examples 1a-3b).

Ex 1a IV-1, final bars, main theme

Ex 1b IV-4 final bars, main theme 1st movement

Ex 2a VI-1, final bars, 1st theme

Ex 2b VI-4, final bars, main theme 1st movement

The treatment of the first theme at the end of the first movement of these symphonies is practically the same (see also note 7 and the paragraph to which it belongs).

This analogy between the end of the first movement and that of the finale is to be found in III/2-1 from bar 645 onwards and III/2-4 from bar 629 (bass trombone); in IV/2-1 from bar 565 en IV/2-4 from bar 533 (horns 3 and 4); in V-1 from bar 491-501 and from bar 507 and in V-4 from bar 626; in VI-1 from bar 361 (trumpets) and in VI-4 from bar 407 (trombones); in VII-1 from bar 433 (Z) (horns) and in VII-4 from bar 331 (horns and trumpets); in VIII/2-1 from bar 405 (Z) and in VIII/2-4 from bar 705 (Zz).
In VIII/2-1, the ending differs strongly because it dies away. The similarity with the treatment of the motifs of the main theme at the end of VIII/2-4 is also less striking. The finale ends **fff**, but the way these motifs are shortened at the end again there is a resemblance between VIII/2-1 and VIII/2-4. In both instances, only the ending of the motif (with descending semiquavers) is left (see examples 4a, 4b).

The motives heard in the final organ-point in IX-1 are borrowed from the opening theme from bar 19 onwards with upbeat, but not from the theme’s opening bars themselves, as is indeed the case in the final organ-points of nearly all of Bruckner’s other first movements. The scheme of this organ-point differs from the schemes of IV/2-1, VI-1 and VII-1 in that this one has a length of 17 bars (from bar 551 to the upbeat to bar 567). The motif used is 2 bars long, introduced by the horns and, thereafter, answered a semitone higher by the trumpets. Together, these motifs form a unity of 4 bars and this is repeated once (bars 551-558). Thereafter, only the trumpets continue the melodic line to the end: first they play the motif shortened to 1 bar and repeated once (559-560) and, finally, they intone the motif once again, extended to 2 bars and followed by its continuation as in bar 21 where it is extended to 7 bars (561-567), the last 5 of which contain a melodic and rhythmic variant of the *unisono* theme that is derived from bar 63 and following. So, these 7 last bars contain a combination of both themes (see example 5:).
Perhaps Bruckner might also have realized a similarity between the treatment of the motives from the end of the first movement and those from the end of the finale.

7) The orchestration of the coda of the finale is generally distinguished from the rest of the movement by a characteristic division of tasks between the wind and string sections. Some exceptions notwithstanding, the wind instruments are always given the important melodic lines throughout the coda, usually accompanied by the low strings. The violins, on the other hand, continuously play accompanimental motives, usually in an ongoing quaver movement. The codas of I-4, IV/1-4, VI-4 and VIII-4 illustrate this very well.

The accompaniment motives may be derived from motives used in the first theme group, as in the codas of II-4 and VI-4, but they can also be newly found motives, as in VIII-4. They may be of the same pattern throughout the entire coda, as in IV/2-4, or be varied in the course of the coda, as in VIII-4\(^8\). At the beginning of the coda of V-4, the division of tasks between wind instruments and strings is less strict. The violins often play the main theme of the finale as well. Their purely accompanying task only starts at bar 69 of the coda (Z, bar 564).

3. The Existing Codas as Examples for the Reconstruction

I consider the codas of the finales from the period 1880-90 (IV/2-4, VI-4, VII-4 and VIII-4) as the obvious source of information for the reconstruction of the coda of symphony IX-4. They are the fruit of the last stage of development of Bruckner’s symphonic style before he tried his hand at IX. Striking in these codas is the relative textural simplicity – there is no contrapuntal complexity; this is especially the case in the coda of IV/2-4 where simplicity and expressiveness go hand in hand, but the coda of VIII-4 is also marked by this simplicity, in spite of the fact that Bruckner used many more motives than in the coda of IV/2-4.

The plan of these codas is also more concise compared to that of the codas from 1872-77. The coda of VIII-4 is possibly closest in character to the features of the coda of IX-4. Symphony VIII is the last one that Bruckner was able to complete and the plan of its finale shows the greatest similarity with the finale of IX. Moreover, the general characteristics as mentioned above are all to be found in this coda. The following concise description of the coda of VIII-4 might therefore be a useful illustration.

The Coda of the Finale of Symphony VIII/2

The first striking characteristic is the relatively short duration of this coda – 63 bars out of a total of 709 (edition Nowak) – very few indeed; compare this to the number of bars of the coda of V-4, which is about double, at 140 out of 653. The strict division of tasks between wind instruments and violins is another noticeable characteristic; the violins play accompanimental motives in a continuous quaver movement from

\(^8\) A somewhat comparable accompaniment of the first theme in an ongoing quaver movement is also to be found in the recapitulation of the first theme.
beginning to end, all of the melodic lines being allocated to the wind instruments. The treatment of the thematic material in the coda shows clearly how much Bruckner focussed on the finale’s main theme, to the exclusion of all other material from this movement. The first theme in fact lends itself admirably well for treatment, as it is conspicuously complex in structure, giving Bruckner the opportunity to split up the theme into a relatively large number of motives and to distribute them over the coda. As a result of this treatment, the coda assumes the aspect of a second development.

The finale’s main theme numbers 14 bars and is preceded by 2 introductory bars with accompanimental motives only. Bruckner divided the theme into six motives and treated them in the coda one after the other chronologically, distributed over 50 bars (the last 13 bars of the coda combine the main themes). The first motive is treated in 24 bars (bars 1-24 of the coda, starting at Uu in the score, ed. Nowak), the second in 8 bars (25-32, at Vv), the third in 7 (33-39, at Ww), the fourth in 2 (40-41, one bar before Xx), the fifth in 3 (42-44, one bar after Xx) and the sixth in 6 bars (45-50, at Yy).

All motives that are treated in the coda are supported by organ-points on which the entire coda is constructed. In the first 24 bars, the first motive is based upon three organ-points of 8 bars each, given in C, F, and B flat respectively. The second motive is treated on two organ-points of 4 bars each, in D and A and the third on one organ-point in F, 7 bars long. The fourth motive is played with a change of harmony: the first bar (with upbeat) has a D in the bass (bar 40), the second a C. This C marks the beginning of the organ-point over which the fifth and sixth motives and, finally, the combination of main themes, are played. The final organ-point numbers 23 bars.

4. The Coda of the Finale of Symphony VIII/2 and the Sketches for the Coda of the Finale of IX: Similarities and Differences

THE CODA OF VIII-4 and the first sketch of the coda of IX-4 are similar in that they are constructed on organ-points. This sketch can be divided into three segments, each containing eight organ-points. The first segment covers the first 16 bars in which the organ-points change every 2 bars with the harmonic development. The second segment contains the next 8 bars, which means that the organ-points change every bar, as does the harmony. The third segment is formed by the last 4 bars and, here, the organ-points and harmony change every half-bar. Thus, this series of three organ-points results in a regularly accelerating harmonic motion. Each series of eight organ-points can be sub-divided into four units of two organ-points; these pairs of organ-points form the elements of a fourfold ascending harmonic sequence. It may be noted that the intervallal relationship between the first and second of these pairs of organ-points is that of a tritone. In the first 16 bars, the relationship between the pairs is that of a minor third, after which they form an ascending diatonic series. All organ-points comprise the bass notes of a series of sixth chords of major triads. In the first 16 bars, these notes are D-G sharp, E sharp-B, G sharp-D and B-F, after that D-G sharp, E-A sharp, F sharp-C, G sharp-D, etc.

The first sketch is also similar to the first 24 bars of the coda of VIII-4 in that, in each case, the opening motive of the finale is treated sequentially. The first 16 bars of the third sketch - the final cadence - show a striking structural similarity to the 16 bars of the coda of VIII-4 that follow the first 24 (bars 25-40) which also have the character of a final cadence. Each segment consists of consecutive organ-points of equal length, viz. two of 4 bars and one of 7 bars followed by an eighth bar with a different bass note. In each case, these 16 bars are followed by the final organ-point. The harmonic progression, however, differs greatly in these two segments.

The first 4 bars of the final cadence of the coda of VIII-4 are in D minor (bar 25-28), the next 4 in A minor (bar 29-32) and the 7 bars in F major (bar 33-39) fit in harmonically with the ensuing C major without any difficulty, as does the chord of D-F-A in the upbeat of bar 16 of the final cadence. The first chord in bar 16 (coda bar 40) on the bass note D, i.e. D-F-A flat-B flat with the neighbouring note E in the upper part is a suspension chord for the second chord in this bar, D-F-G-B with an F in the upper part, the function of which is also completely clear.

In the third sketch for the coda of XI-4, the order is: 4 bars in C flat major (sixth chord), 4 bars in F major and 7 bars with an eleventh chord on A, followed by an eighth bar with G sharp in the bass, possibly.

---

9 I have taken the final concept of the first sketch, starting from the B flat Major sixth chord, as used in the last versions of the SPCM reading (see also note 14).
10 The harmonic functions of these chords are in C: II-VI-IV-II-V-I.
coming from the chord G sharp-B (or B flat)-D-E (or F). This G sharp in bar 16 of the final cadence of the third sketch has a comparable function as the D in the final cadence of the coda of VIII-4, viz. making the transition from the dominant A to the tonic D, resp. from the subdominant F to the tonic C.

The position of the second sketch in the coda is unknown. The organ-point technique is (temporarily) abandoned; the bass is more mobile, progressing in sequences in half-notes from subdominant to tonic.

5. The missing Bars in the Coda of the Finale of Symphony IX

THAT THE total number of bars of the coda of this finale was more than the number contained in the three sketches together is certain. The number of missing bars can be assessed fairly accurately. The highest reference number on a score bifolio that we know of is 32. If we assume that the third sketch was indeed meant for further treatment on the now lost bifolio 36/37, as a note of Bruckner’s tells us, the 4 pages that come in between seem to have disappeared for the time being. It is highly probable that the number of bars on these four missing bifolios is 4×16, i.e. 64. A small number of bars, presumably about 10, is used for the end of the recapitulation. A maximum of 28 of the remaining 54 bars is used for further treatment of the first sketch and 4 for that of the second sketch. A further 22 bars remain that form a “vacuum”. We do at least have 8 bars of the final organ-point of IX-4 and there must undoubtedly have been more. My estimate is that the number of bars of this final organ-point is about the same as that of VIII/2-4 i.e. 23, but not much more.

Having established some correspondences between the material of the first and third sketches for IX-4 on the one hand and that of the coda of VIII/2 on the other, it remains to be mentioned that the main theme groups of both finales are quite differently structured, which undoubtedly has consequences for the plan of the coda.

6. A short description and appreciation of the best known reconstructions of the coda of the finale of Symphony IX

DURING THE 1980s, two reconstructions of IX-4 were completed and performed: one by Prof. William Carragan, the other by Nicola Samale and Giuseppe Mazzuca. I will mention a few characteristics of them and comment upon them.

The Reconstruction by William Carragan

Carragan begins the coda with a gradual transition from the recapitulation with a few bars of his own that confirm the main key of D minor. Only then does he introduce a working-out of the first sketch. This fragment is followed by a relatively small number of bars that prepare for the return of the third, i.e. chorale, theme from the finale, to which have been added counterparts derived from the main themes of the Adagio and the finale. The chorale also dominates the final bars which also introduce the Hallelujah motives from Psalm 150. Moreover, it should be mentioned that the opening horn motives from the first movement return in the bass. Carragan does not use the second and third sketch, which means that the greater part of the material of the coda is exclusively his work.

Commentary

Did Carragan think that the first sketch was unsuitable for the beginning of the coda and did he choose to create a harmonic pause first, similar to the codas in previously written symphonies? This seems to be an acceptable hypothesis but it is contradicted by the fact that we will hear more of his own music. The quotations from the first movement at the beginning of this coda refer stylistically to the finales from 1873-77 (symphonies III/1-4 and III/2-4, IV/1-4 and V-4). Long before Bruckner wrote IX, he had abandoned the habit of quoting from the first movement in the coda of the finale. The reintroduction of the chorale, obviously in imitation of the coda of V-4, seems, to my mind, questionable. Bruckner left out the chorale in the recapitulation in V-4 and postponed, as it were, its return until the coda. But in IX-4 Bruckner treated the

---

12 As Bruckner progressed in the Finale, he tended more and more to keep to a standard 16 bars per bifolio.
13 See note 5
chorale extensively in the recapitulation, therefore the return in the coda is less necessary. Moreover, the chorale in the coda of V-4 is anticipated in a much broader and more impressive way than Carragan seems to have been able to write in his coda.

Quoting the opening motive of the first movement on the final organ-point of the finale is noteworthy: Carragan obviously preferred quoting this motive instead of the unison theme, which is the regular main theme of the first movement, starting at bar 63. But Carragan did not deviate from Bruckner’s usual procedure of quoting the first bars of the opening theme. The problem is that these motives do not correspond with the motives that Bruckner employs in the final organ-point of the first movement, since these do not derive from the beginning of the theme but from bar 19 et seq., with upbeat.

The Reconstruction in the SPCM-Version

The abbreviation SPCM stands, as mentioned earlier, for the reconstruction of the coda as begun by Italian composers Nicola Samale and Giuseppe Mazzuca who were later assisted by musicologists John Phillips and Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs.

This coda opens with the completed first sketch of 28 bars, starting with the sixth chord in B flat major, after which the first dynamic climax is reached in a combination of the four main themes of the four movements in their original form, i.e. in the minor key. The second and third sketches are also used. The length of the final organ-point is 21 bars and it starts with great vigour. At first the most striking is that the trumpets play the Hallelujah, i.e. the same melodic element as they play from bar 5 of the adagio, but twice augmented to a period of 4 bars and repeated once. A third time the first trumpet begins a fifth higher and extends the period to 8 bars. In the final 5 bars the trumpets play a variant of the Hallelujah in the rhythm of the accompaniment figure of the choral theme (from G in the score of SPCM). The trombones and contrabass tuba play a rhythmic variant of the unison main theme of the first movement. The remaining winds play the Te Deum motif in augmentation. Only the violins and violas play the Te Deum motif in the original quavers.

Commentary

At least two objections can be raised against the combination of themes:

1) The themes are of unequal length. That the first movement and that of the Finale are each 8 bars long and the Adagio theme is 12; this means that, when the themes are combined, 4 bars of the Adagio remain “empty” and are filled, in a laboured way, by means of motivic repetition.

2) The theme of the finale has taken the form of a fugue subject; the short value notes in this particular theme lend themselves with difficulty for rendering by the brass instruments. I note that it is problematic for the horns that have to play these short value notes (but not the motives in semiquavers) to make themselves sufficiently audible.

Listeners who have followed the work on the SPCM version for a long time, are familiar with a final organ-point of 37 bars, that begins pp, followed by a crescendo and preceded by a general pause. This final organ-point does not make use of the most important main themes of the symphony, as Bruckner inevitably did, but only of Te Deum and Hallelujah motives found by Cohrs. But a general pause and a final organ-point that starts pp are never used by Bruckner at such place and the organ-point contained at least always a quotation of the first theme of the first movement.

From the edition of 1992 to the revision of 2008 the final organ-point had this plan, but after 2008 something must have happened that has caused the radical change. The general pause has disappeared, also the pp beginning and the crescendo by deleting the first 16 (!) bars of the organ-point. So the organ-point has changed as previously described, but the quotation of the main theme of the first movement is, however, mainly rhythmically rendered, whereas Bruckner would almost certainly have preferred a melodic variant here, as he did in the codas of the previous finales. Strangely, the crotchet triplet of this quotation (from IX-1,
bar 66) is replaced by a quaver triplet, although the former can be performed perfectly well. It is not clear what is the thematic meaning of the motifs with the quaver triplet at the end. Bruckner always referred at the closing bars to the first theme of the first movement. The combination of the themes of the first movement and the adagio raises the question of the possibility of adding the themes of the scherzo and the main theme of the finale.

The Finale as Reconstructed by Sébastien Letocart

Recently a newly completed version of the finale by Belgian composer Sébastien Letocart was published. His reconstruction of the coda is no less than 159 bars, which makes it the longest coda of a last movement of a Bruckner symphony.

This coda can be divided into four segments. The first one contains the completed first 24 bars of the first sketch, followed by 12 bars in his own hand in which the motives of this sketch are further developed. The second segment, 28 bars, brings as a first dynamic climax the last appearance of the chorale in an arrangement of his own. The third segment opens with the completed 4 bars of the second sketch, followed by 16 bars of his own making that continue the melodically rising line and prepare for the first 16 bars of the completed third sketch that follow. The third sketch brings the second dynamic climax of the coda. Also, in this coda, the music is interrupted when it reaches its full f by a general pause at the end of bar 16 of the third sketch. The last segment is the final organ-point numbering an amazing 59 bars. It opens with a Hallelujah\(^{16}\) that Letocart has derived from what he considers the ‘second movement’ to which Bruckner had referred\(^{17}\), in this case the trio of the Scherzo (bar 53-60 and others) in a minor key\(^{18}\). This Hallelujah is combined with the accompanimental motive from the Te Deum in a melodic form and with motives derived from the (unison) main theme of the first movement. With these motives, a last dynamic climax is reached, leading to a conclusion of 17 bars, combining the main themes of the four movements, in a major key.

Commentary

This coda seems to combine the Carragan and SPCM versions with ample additions of Letocart. On the one hand, the chorale is repeated, comparable to Carragan’s ideas and thus open to the same objections. On the other hand, the treatment of the third sketch, together with the general pause and the following pp start of the final organ-point, closely resembles the older versions of SPCM. The disadvantages of reintroducing the chorale are even more obvious in this version than in Carragan’s. It is true that the majesty of the chorale makes it eminently suitable to crown the coda, but its early introduction in a coda (here too early), the greater part of which is still to come, leaves the chorale less convincing as the climax. Introducing the chorale in a later phase of the coda offers few favourable possibilities. Inserting it in the second and third sketch is not a workable possibility. A tentative conclusion might be that there is in fact no place for the chorale in the coda.

The general pause at the end of bar 16 of the third sketch seems out of place, as Bruckner never has usually employs a general pause to precede the final organ-point in any of his codas to a finale. Letocart gives no justification, speaks only of "‘parresia abruptio’, but this learned description is no argument.\(^{19}\) This general pause is also misplaced from a stylistic viewpoint. General pauses are to be found in the codas of II/1-4, and III/1-4 and III/2-4, relatively early symphonies whereas, in later ones, Bruckner never made use of a general pause in a coda of a finale.\(^{20}\)

The final organ-point begins pp, but such a sudden decrescendo in the dynamics at the beginning of the final organ-point after a shorter or longer preparation within the coda is not found in any of the earlier finales; moreover, the beginning of the final organ-point of the finale of IX marks the ultimate transition from minor to major. Bruckner, as a rule, accentuates this loudly and clearly. The idea of dividing the final organ-point into two parts and putting the Hallelujah before the combination of themes seems sensible, but the realization Létocart provides is less convincing. The 59-bar length of the final organ-point is far out of proportion when compared to the final organ-point of the finales of symphonies before IX, i.e. IV/2-4, VI-4,

---

16 S. Letocart: Ma réalisation du Finale de la 9ème symphonie d’Anton Bruckner: p. 92, last paragraph.
17 Here is reason to believe that Bruckner may have been uncertain as to the order of the inner movements of IX (cf. Mahler’s Sixth Symphony?!) and it could possibly be that his reference to a ‘second movement’ relates to the Adagio.
18 This motive from the trio is a quotation from his own work, taken from the middle part of the Benedictus, Mass in D minor; text: “Benedictus”.
19 See Sébastien Letocart’s Notes to the Recording of his Realization of the Finale of Bruckner’s Symphony No. 9, page 1, penultimate paragraph.
20 Bruckner later also deleted the general pauses from the codas of II/2-4 and III/3-4.
VII-4 and VIII/2-4. The Hallelujah is almost grotesque: so sad in the minor key(!), so sombre in the low registers of horns and Wagner tubas, that it sounds more like a funeral march than a song of praise. The following climax with its jarring dissonances (E flat against D, cf. the end of the first movement) suggests to me: First a hymn to God and then all Hell breaks loose.

Why revert so extensively to the beginning and the end of the coda of the first movement and why follow the Hallelujah with all those dissonances when the coda of the finale has nearly come to a close? The tension built up in the final cadence could release itself directly in the joyous apotheosis of the final organ-point. And why play the Hallelujah piano, where Bruckner clearly stated that he wanted it to be repeated “in full force”?

The combination of themes is an original find, but the Scherzo theme is not brought forward very well, owing to the weak orchestration (woodwind only). The quotation of the unison theme of the first movement does not refer to the motives with which the final organ-point of the first movement opens. The last 5 bars of this coda do show a strong analogy in the whole orchestra with the last 5 bars of the first movement, but a similar quotation of the final bars of the first movement in full and of suchlike length is not usually found at the end of Bruckner’s finales.

The fifth position in the upper parts, analogous to the first movement, gives the end of the Finale an explicit open end.

It remains to be noted that, in all three reconstructions, the main theme of the finale is of secondary importance, whereas it is a main prop for the composition in the other codas; furthermore, all three completions incorporate the suggested Hallelujah at the end, albeit a different musical realization has been chosen for each.

7. Conclusion

THE DEVELOPMENT of Bruckner’s symphonic style after 1878 leaves its distinct traces in the composition of the codas of the finales that he wrote since then – a composition characterized by succinctness and simplicity in the treatment of the material used and the strict plan of the final organ-point. I take the view that the influence of this stylistic development should also be found in the plan of the coda of IX-4. The common features of the codas of the finales from 1880-90 in general and those of the coda of VIII/2-4 in particular can therefore support a reconstruction of the coda of the Finale of IX-4 that would yield as faithful as possible a result; after all, these characteristics help to provide information about how to interpret and work with the available material and the preparation for and the composition of the final organ-point.

However, reviewing the fruits of my own investigations, I must conclude that the authors of the three reconstructions too often follow their own ideas when it comes to the important issues; they have taken too little account of the possibilities that the codas of the earlier finales offer as examples for the reconstruction of the coda to the finale of IX.

Consequently these omissions lead, for example, to the curious plan of the final organ-point of the version Letocart, which offers a kind of fantasy ending that Bruckner never wrote in any of his finales and hence would never have written for the finale of IX. I cannot accept that Bruckner suddenly conceived a totally different form for the final-organ point of his last symphony.

We must, of course, take into consideration that Bruckner wanted to realize details that would be utterly unique to the coda of the finale of IX and cannot be found in the codas of the other finales; however, the scant extant material and a single remark of the composer that have come down to us cannot themselves lead to a decisive answer.

June 2011/Revised January 2013
Amsterdam, Netherlands

With much gratitude to Mr. Huib Lammers, who was so kind to make the translation of the text from the Dutch. And also thanks to Mr. Gijs van der Meijden and Mr. Alistair Hinton for their useful contribution to the text.

21 These are 9, 17, 25 and 23 bars respectively. The relatively lengthy final organ-point of VII 4 originates in the coda being composed entirely on an organ-point; the actual concluding apotheosis with the return of the theme of the first movement is only 9 bars.

22 A minor key for a Hallelujah does not seem very plausible; Bruckner’s idea of a hymn to God is illustrated by the entrance of the choir in the Te Deum or Psalm 150.
ANTON BRUCKNER – Re-defining our image of the composer
By John F. Berky

For far too many years, we have been forming our image of this remarkable man based on propaganda and overly repeated anecdotes. Many simply do not mesh with what we know of his accomplishments. It's time to shake off these stories and take a fresh look at this gifted musician and composer.

DURING A social gathering while attending the Bruckner Journal Readers Conference in Oxford, several attendees commented on their frustration with the old Bruckner orthodoxy where Bruckner has been described in various demeaning ways. Those thoughts resonated well because for those of us whose lives seem to revolve around Bruckner’s music, we all sense the dissonance with what we hear within his music and what we hear said about the man. It reminded me of a brief written portrait of the composer that referred to him as a man who wore loose fitting dusty clothes. How had it gotten this bad?! Why is there such a huge disconnect?

We have all read (or perhaps even written) about Bruckner in various iterations of this common theme. The normal thread is that Bruckner was some form of musical “country bumpkin” – a person with clear musical abilities – a genius to be sure, but someone who could not cut a path through life that did not make everyone who met him question his social, business, musical and even sexual abilities.

For those of us who live with Bruckner’s music on a daily basis, there is no doubt that Bruckner was far from being a simple man. The image of a “simple” person does not and cannot ring true. Yes, in some ways, given his rural and religious upbringing there may have been a degree of naïveté regarding his position in life. His childhood and early career show a person who was following a time-worn path of professional progression that was traditional for people in rural 19th century Austria. But Bruckner quickly realized that his skills as an organist and as a budding composer held more for him. Instead of following in his father’s footsteps – a time-honored rural tradition, Bruckner broke free and found his way to Linz and to a position of some stature.

Religion was an important factor for Bruckner. It was, in many ways, his spiritual center and it gave him the ability to move forward but, at the same time, it provided the stability he needed and it served as a guiding light for the mission in life he embraced. And yet, when he was fully prepared to compose, Bruckner moved away from overtly religious musical forms into the one form that offered him the most challenges and the form that would best hold his musical language – the symphony. While religion may have provided Bruckner with his spiritual center of gravity, it provided him with the stability to venture into a realm of creativity that moved him past many of his musical peers.

Bruckner’s humble demeanor served him well. Hardly the brazen opportunist, Bruckner took his time and made his moves slowly and carefully. He grounded himself in music theory when others would have been jumping forward into composition. His schooling served him well as it equipped the composer with the tools he would eventually need to move into areas of compositional structure that no one had ever attempted before. His religion and his humility were his anchors.

Much has been made of Bruckner’s tendency to revise his works. It is often viewed as a sign of weakness and his inability to hold to his original musical convictions. But what never seems to be brought up when these discussions take place is another factor in Bruckner’s musical life – his incredible abilities as an improviser on the organ. This remarkable ability was well documented. There was rarely a case where Bruckner did not amaze an audience with his technical ability. He was invited to perform throughout Europe and became an international musical celebrity. Yet Bruckner left us only a few small and relatively simple organ pieces. It would therefore seem obvious that Bruckner looked at music as a living thing that, while it may need to adhere to certain confines, could change from performance to performance and never needed to be cast into stone. Naturally, when dealing with hour-long highly orchestrated symphonies, Bruckner could not follow his improvisational practices, but why should the placement of a note on a printed page stop this musical mastermind from revisiting the score and trying a new approach to the same composition? Looked at in this light, Bruckner’s revisions take on the aura of creativity rather than insecurity.

Bruckner’s admiration of Richard Wagner and his appreciation for his music is often used as an example of Bruckner’s lack of political acumen. It is clear that during Bruckner’s Vienna years there was a heated – but rather absurd - controversy over the relative value of Wagner’s music and that of Johannes Brahms. By openly showing his appreciation for Wagner, Bruckner set himself up to be the target of Vienna’s more conservative and well established musical element. Yet given where Bruckner was heading with the symphony, it seems obvious that he would see a kindred creative force in Wagner’s musical dramas. It had more to do with Wagner’s breaking away from conventional forms that attracted Bruckner rather than Wagner’s
style of writing. But this subtly was lost on the warring Viennese musical camps. Bruckner may have been naïve in this respect, but his musical integrity would have given him little choice.

Another overused cliché is that of Bruckner’s “well meaning but misguided disciples.” Specifically, we are referring to Franz and Josef Schalk and Ferdinand Loewe. Recent research has shown that Bruckner’s disciples were of great help to him. In fact, during his Bruckner Journal Conference presentation, Yale professor Paul Hawkshaw went so far as to say that without their help, Bruckner may have never completed the Eighth Symphony. The composition had taken so many turns and so much material had been sketched out that it was becoming a project of overwhelming proportions. Some of the disciple’s suggestions were quickly accepted, some were roughly and threateningly rejected and a lot of them fell into that all too commonly known “grey area.” In most cases, we can now see where Bruckner accepted his disciple’s suggestions and where he did not and we know that Bruckner had a full hand in many of the first publications that went to press. Clark University professor Benjamin Korstvedt has reminded us that Bruckner sought the assistance that the disciples provided. It was a relationship that Bruckner initiated and controlled. While some recent research tends to vindicate Robert Haas’s editorial policies, it clearly refutes Haas’s biggest premise - that the work of Bruckner’s disciples needed to be completely repudiated. Those accusations should have been tossed out with all the other Nazi propaganda at the end of the World War II.

This brings up the final point - so much of what we have been fed about Bruckner comes from the convenient stories that germinated (interesting pun!) during the National Socialist regime. All the stories about Bruckner being buffeted by a facile, bourgeois and predominantly Jewish musical establishment and his misguided assistants were all cleverly twisted to weave into the regime’s appropriation of Bruckner’s music. And as much as we have repudiated so much of what the Nazis did during their time in power, we have let many of these warped explanations of Bruckner’s life persist.

So let’s shake off the stories of old. Yes, Bruckner was a strange character - deliciously so. But he was a gifted, inspired and determined composer, a world class organist and a professor of composition at one of the world’s greatest music schools. He was a man who gradually worked his way to these high positions - not by stumbling into them, but by following his muse and, by doing so, becoming one of the world’s greatest symphonic composers.

**Arts in Residence**

weekend course on Bruckner & Mahler 9th symphonies

TERRY BARFOOT’S *Arts in Residence* weekend in April was held at the Wroxton House Hotel in the picturesque village of Wroxton a few miles from Banbury. The hotel, once a manor house, is built of the vernacular and attractively mellow Cotswold stone, as is most of this quiet village.

The theme for the weekend was the pairing of the Ninth symphonies of Bruckner and Mahler. (There are more correspondences with these two works than one might at first think of.) Terry’s weekends are described as “Cultural Breaks in Beautiful Places”. They could also be described as relaxing breaks as they combine the ambience of an informal house party, where participants need no technical or academic knowledge of the music being focused upon, but yet with the opportunity to learn more of the works in a relaxed fashion. Each movement of the symphonies - Bruckner on the Saturday, Mahler on the Sunday - was discussed separately by Terry, and his fellow host Roy Westbrook, and then we heard each movement in turn, planned around the morning, lunch and afternoon breaks. For the first three movements of the Bruckner Terry used the DVD of Gunter Wand’s NDR SO performance in Lübeck and we heard the Finale from Simon Rattle and the BPO from their recording of the Samale/Mazzuca/Phillips/Cohrs completion. For Mahler's Ninth, extracts were heard from Benjamin Zander's recorded talk on the Ninth which accompanies his recording, but for the symphony itself there was the opportunity to see the very fine and very moving performance by Claudio Abbado and the Lucerne Festival Orchestra.

The substantial breaks allowed for discussion and camaraderie, and Saturday afternoon was given over as ‘free’ time, a good idea as this prevented the mental overload which can often be engendered at conferences. So this enabled some exercise around the village with pleasurable walks including the beautiful grounds of Wroxton Abbey, a 17th Century Jacobean house and now the home of Wroxton College, an overseas campus of the American Fairleigh Dickinson University.

Ultimately, though, the gathering was memorable for the fellowship of a group of people who could share a long-term love of two of music's greatest symphonies. And that was a sufficient reason for attendance in itself.

Raymond Cox

For future events see [www.artsinresidence.co.uk](http://www.artsinresidence.co.uk), or phone 02393 383356
Concert Reviews

BRIGHTON                                            ST PAUL’S CHURCH                                               8 DEMBER 2012

Bruckner - Motets: Locus iste, Christus factus est, Ecce sacerdos, Ave Maria, Tota pulchra
Bruckner - Mass in E minor
Vaughan Williams - Fantasia on Christmas Carols

Brighton Singers and St. Paul’s Wind and Brass Ensemble.

THE BRIGHTON Singers are a small group of about 30 voices. They started their concert with a serene performance of Locus iste, with clear consonants and a beautifully managed transition at the words irreprehensibilis est, a notoriously tricky passage. In Christus factus est the FFF climax was powerful and the beautiful closing bars were very moving. Ecce sacerdos was also surprisingly powerful for such a relatively small group and there was a good balance between the voices and the three trombones and organ. Ave Maria sounded lovely and very expressive and in Tota pulchra the tenor solo was excellent and the choirs intonation perfect with again a serene ending.

The E minor Mass didn’t fare quite so well unfortunately, partly due to one of the four horns being very weak with some wrong notes, especially in the Gloria and the Sanctus. But there was some lovely singing in the Kyrie and Credo, though the music slightly lost a sense of direction at Crucifixus. The Benedictus opened beautifully and the closing pages of the Agnus Dei were wonderfully and serenely sung.

This was an ambitious programme, especially as they also performed Vaughan Williams’ Fantasia on Christmas Carols, so the Mass was perhaps a victim of not quite enough rehearsal time. But great to hear this marvellous piece in my home town and it reminded me of how modern some of it sounds and wondering whether Stravinsky knew it and had it in mind when writing his own setting of the Mass?

EASTBOURNE                                         CONGRESS THEATRE                                   9 DECEMBER 2012

Brahms - Tragic Overture
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 17 in G K453
Bruckner - Symphony No. 1

London Philharmonic/ Vladimir Jurowski

AFTER A powerful performance of the Brahms and a subtle and very sensitive rendition of the Mozart, we were treated after the interval to a very exciting and dynamic Bruckner 1. Jurowski is obviously very keen on the First Symphony as he has given several performances in recent months, and this really comes over in his interpretation and his care over details in the score. It was also marvellous to see how involved the orchestra were throughout the performance.

The first movement’s rhythms were clearly articulated and the lyrical writing beautifully phrased with some lovely woodwind playing. The big trombone theme had just the right kind of trenchant power and the triplets on the flutes and trumpets in the coda were thrilling. The slow movement was very expressive with again some lovely woodwind playing and the final climax was intense and powerful, followed by the exquisite closing section with tremolo violins and staccato flute chords, one of Bruckner’s most magical codas. The scherzo was suitably pugnacious, though I must confess I’ve always found it the least successful of the scherzos, as I feel Bruckner never really develops the theme, which keeps recurring, sounds as if it’s about to go somewhere but never does! But there is a delightful Trio which was delicately and subtletly played, providing a lovely pastoral episode. The return of the scherzo was mercifully without repeats, which made it a very concentrated and far more effective section. (I often wish Bruckner had done this with his other scherzos, i.e. a concentration of the material or some kind of variation in the return of the scherzo after the trio, rather than a complete repeat as he does in the following symphonies. The 5th Symphony scherzo is particularly marred I feel by over repetition.) The coda was tremendous, and provided a thrilling ending.

The Finale was again played with real commitment and rhythmic drive, as well as capturing the grace and flow of the second theme on the strings. When the opening returns it was immensely powerful, and as the brass in the closing pages sounded exultant, and the final bars stunning and dynamic. The rather conservative and respectable looking lady sitting next to me, turned and said ‘That was stunning!’ The hall was packed and the audience had listened to the whole symphony in rapt silence, breaking out into enthusiastic applause and cheers at the end.

Guy Richardson
HUDDERSFIELD TOWN HALL 9 FEBRUARY 2013

Wagner - Overture, Flying Dutchman; Prelude and Liebestod (Cressida Sharp, sop.)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7

Huddersfield Philharmonic Orchestra / Nicholas Smith

LAST YEAR the Huddersfield Philharmonic Orchestra celebrated their 150 year anniversary - even older than the magnificent Huddersfield Town Hall completed in 1881. Of the Classic Italianate style, it incorporates a richly decorated concert hall complete with imposing ornate and functioning organ - a picture of Victorian splendour. A vision enhanced by the brass- positioned high in the choir area overlooking their colleagues and in full view of those of us in the front stalls.

The Bruckner was remarkable. The first movement is marked allegro moderato and this is how it was played throughout. No concessions. Indeed at times it was more allegro, but this made it sound exciting especially in the coda where the accelerando was observed and the trombones threw down their gauntlet like spears of sound, uninhibited but never over the top. The orchestra seeks to recruit further string players, including basses violins and cellos, and this would perhaps add body to the sound when playing this type of music. Having said that, you could actually hear the opening tremolo which makes a very pleasant change!

The adagio was a little faster than adagio but the approach was no-nonsense, completely free of affectation which is good, but perhaps lacking the raw emotion that this music can evoke with a more deliberate cultivation. A young lady waited patiently with the cymbals and came in perfectly on cue; unfortunately the triangle was in position but was not played.

Nicholas Smith preceded the symphony with a short humorous introduction, introducing the Wagner tubas who proudly raised their gleaming instruments high, and the trumpets all apparently mid nineteenth century "authentic" rotary valve instruments. The principal trumpet then proceeded to demonstrate with a rendition of the theme tune from a famous northern soap opera... Unsurprisingly these trumpets had to play the scherzo very fast as per Bruckner's instruction and demonstrated their skills admirably.

This was the kind of performance that underlines this piece as firmly founded in the Haydnesque classical view of the symphony. In the finale Bruckner gives the option of a pause of discretionary length part way through; Smith dispensed with this and so the unrelenting momentum established from that opening tremolo never wavered allowing the symphony to climax after just 56 minutes - a brave yet convincing and enjoyable performance, a triumph for Nicholas Smith and his orchestra.

Stephen Pearsall

LONDON BARBICAN CONCERT HALL 17 FEBRUARY 2013

Beethoven - Piano Concerto No. 2 (Maria João Pires)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9

London Symphony Orchestra / Bernard Haitink

IN AN interview printed in the BBC Proms programme, when Haitink conducted the Vienna Philharmonic in this same symphony last year, Haitink talks of the unfinished finale. He doesn't think it should be completed by other hands: “You have to respect life, but you also have to respect death,” is his view. Respect for death seemed to be at the heart of this performance. Haitink set a steady beat as though for some grand processional - so steady, in fact, that the symphony lasted nearly ten minutes longer than it did when he recorded it with the Concertgebouw Orchestra nearly half a century ago. Bruckner marks the first movement to be played 'feierlich' - solemn, grave, ceremonious - and Haitink ensured the work was laid out in front of us like a vast dark pageant, almost as a ritual death march. Bruckner's other marking is 'misterioso' - something very difficult to achieve in the Barbican acoustic. There were no moments of hushed, rapt pianissimo, no distant ecclesiastic echo, the tread was heavy throughout and the mystery that of mortality itself, clearly confronted, rather than the misty evasions of impressionistic tone-poetry.

Throughout the LSO played with total conviction, the brass overwhelming in their assault on the shattering climaxes of the first movement, the indomitable hammering of a steady-paced and brutal scherzo, and the final dissonant catastrophe that crowns the Adagio. Thereafter the Wagner tubas and horns gave powerful expression to the heart-rending, baleful sorrow of it all as they wound down to the final moments of calm. The woodwind
played their solos with a rigour consonant with Haitink's general approach - no Mahlerian expressive subjectivity, nor even did they dance in the little scherzo motive for oboe and then flute: it would have been inappropriate. At times the orchestral colour would have benefited from more forward woodwind, and the wild skirling of flute and clarinet in the trio was only just audible. The strings played their weird scampering trio theme quite heavily, ghoulish certainly, but nothing spectral here. Their opening gesture in the Adagio, where the violins leap a ninth, is often disfigured by much sliding but tonight there was absolute clarity, the briefest of separation between notes allowing the players to attack them cleanly and keep the rhythm steady. It was an approach that eschewed any sense that the music expressed the composer’s individual heartbreak, preferring to lay before us a more sober, objective human tragedy.

Maybe it takes some maturity to understand and present this extraordinary symphony this way and make it so overwhelming powerful as it was on this occasion. It was very moving - indeed, absolutely shattering. Haitink and the LSO had created an occasion, thoroughly secular, but potent enough to leave you with much to savour and important things to think about.

Ken Ward

NEW YORK       PETER J SHARP THEATER       24 FEBRUARY 2013

Bruckner - Symphony No. 8 (1887 version)

American Symphony Orchestra / Leon Botstein

ON THE afternoon of Sunday February 24, 2013 we had the rare opportunity to hear a performance of the 1887 version of the Bruckner 8th in New York City’s Upper West Side “Symphony Space.” American conductor Leon Botstein presided over a most interesting and rewarding experience. Prior to the performance, John Berky and William Carragan of the Anton Bruckner Society of America presented Dr. Botstein with the Julio Kilenyi Medal of Honor for his ongoing championing of the composer’s music. Botstein has specialized in presenting less-frequently-performed versions of the symphonies.

The event itself was most unusually and effectively organized. The first half saw Maestro Botstein and his orchestra delight and inform the near-capacity audience with an extended discussion comparing the 1887 and 1890 scores. The maestro led the orchestra in two or three passages from each movement, the 1890 version immediately following the 1887. What I had not previously fully grasped, but what became immediately obvious, was the completely different sound worlds occupied by the two versions. In the 1887 Bruckner audaciously spreads numerous distinct melodic lines throughout the orchestra, whereas in 1890 he consolidates, simplifies, and blends the sections. The effect is striking: to take just the 1st and 2nd violins, the familiar 1890 version typically has the violins supporting each other, giving the well-known and beautiful sonorities that we associate with this music. In dramatic contrast, the 1887 violin sections, very effectively divided across the stage for this event, frequently alternate their activity, even within the bar. Now I can imagine why Hermann Levi considered this music to be too difficult to perform: The first violins are left high and dry, so to speak - much of what they are asked to do is up at the highest end of the fingerboard, with no support from the rest of the orchestra. It is truly treacherous music, there is nowhere to hide, and it is a tribute to the excellence of this orchestra’s strings how well they made it sound.

Maestro Botstein’s performance was swift and direct - no grass growing under his feet. The dry acoustic of the hall (a converted motion picture theater) facilitated the clarity of his concept. The first movement was led briskly with only minor tempo variations in the transitional moments. The grand coda, present only in this version, was tremendously effective, almost as potent as Hans-Hubert Schönzeler’s in his classic, world-premiere performance. In the scherzo Mr. Botstein became more interventionist, with a very effective use of tempo variation. The trio was taken very briskly, in keeping with both its tempo marking and its dance-like character, lighter than the 1890 trio. Botstein’s adagio was marvelous, as he highlighted the remarkable activity in the secondary lines around the orchestra, rather than toning them down in what would have been a misguided effort to make this version sound more like the 1890. Rich sonority was brought out when it was actually in the score, but it was never imposed. The opening tempo of the finale of this symphony probably generates as much controversy as anything Bruckner wrote. Under Botstein’s concept it moved at a good pace, but not breathless, and not so fast as to obscure the articulation of the lines. Indeed, the astonishing passage work Bruckner inflicts on the violins has never been so clearly played in my experience. This opening tempo allowed Botstein to establish an all-too-rarely-heard continuity in pace upon moving into the second subject. It was extremely effective and satisfying. Other wonderful aspects included an exaggerated detaching of the notes in a number of places, again with clarity as a goal, and a strong acceleration at the martial third subject, again, very effective. Throughout, the orchestra simply covered itself with glory, from front to back.

I am familiar with most of the commercially available recordings of the 1887. Eliahu Inbal’s recording from 1982 is closest in spirit to Botstein’s, preserving much of the distinctly lighter texture of this version and quite
similar in choice of tempi, especially in the first two movements. Both present scherzos that spill over with a joyous musical chaos as the various sections of the orchestra vie for our attention. On balance, Inbal is more brassy while Botstein favors the strings—he wants us to hear what they are doing! He prefers the brass and timpani to remain in their place. He doesn’t suppress them, but he doesn’t let them overwhelm the other sections, either. Those of us who know the Schönzeler know the potency of his reading, with its powerful brass and thundering tympani. Indeed, re-listening to that performance made me realize that many conductors who have led the 1887, intentionally or not, seemingly have been influenced by their familiarity with the 1890 and thus molded the earlier score to sound like the later one. The sound world of Schönzeler’s 1887, recorded in 1973, is very similar to that of Jascha Horenstein’s 1970 Albert Hall performance of the Haas edition of (mostly) the 1890 version. (I suppose it’s quite possible that Schönzeler attended the Horenstein performance—they sound so alike.) Botstein made a very convincing case that the 1887 occupies its own unique sound world entirely and should not be treated as some pale precursor to the 1890. Bruckner meant what he wrote from 1884 to 1887, and under Botstein, for the first time in my experience, this score actually made complete sense. At the conclusion, it struck me that Bruckner in 1887 may really have been writing a 20th century symphony. Three years later he would revise it so that it would play better to 19th century audiences.

I’d never heard Maestro Botstein’s work before. Now I know what all the fuss has been about.

Neil Schore

A live recording of the American Symphony Orchestra under Botstein performing this symphony is available as an MP3 download from Amazon (.com or .co.uk). If you buy it from Amazon, you are encouraged to go online via www.abruckner.com, using the links to Amazon there, and so support that site.

Birmingham                          Adrian Boult Hall, Conservatoire                    24 February 2013

Beethoven - Egmont Overture
Bruch - Violin Concerto No.1
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4

Birmingham Philharmonic Orchestra / Michael Seal

The citizens of Birmingham were queueing up at the door when I arrived in good time for this concert, and the hall was nearly full when the concert began. All seats were unreserved and at the same price wherever you sat - an arrangement that has always appealed to me. Certainly it discriminates against those who can’t get there early, but at least it doesn’t discriminate against those not normally wealthy enough to sit in the centre stalls.

The Beethoven and Bruch in the first half were given performances appropriate to a genial Sunday afternoon. Bruckner’s Fourth Symphony makes a big second half - but the composer did show some restraint in the structure. The third theme of the Finale appears just once, Bruckner having decided that enough was enough and it need not reappear in the recapitulation. But this one appearance bursts in dramatically, fortissimo, for full orchestra, with the trumpets and horns jabbing sextuplets above a stentorian trombone theme. It showed one of the outstanding qualities of this orchestra and conductor: every time there was a full tutti entry, they came in snap-bang together with perfect ensemble. All the brassy climaxes were wonderfully effective and strongly executed and it made for a very powerful presentation of the score.

What was lacking was a little extra imagination, tone-poetry, atmosphere in the quieter moments. The opening horn call was clearly played - which is always an achievement to be applauded - but I thought without any special nuance. I wrote this in a review published on www.bachtrack.com, and received an email from the horn player, Tim Stidwill, asking exactly what ‘special nuance’ I had in mind. A short correspondence ensued in which he wrote, “When I first heard that we would be performing Symphony I started to think about the opening (naturally!). When I played it 20 years ago, I tried to play it quite quietly (as per 1874 and 1888 versions) - I had perceived the opening as being a horn call in the mountains in the distance (even though I was playing from the 1878/1880 Haas parts). So it surprised me a bit when I started to look at the Haas parts again and realised that it was marked mf. I decided this time to play it as written and my concept was that the horn was being played from a tower in a medieval town to signify the start of a really exciting day! So the conception of the meaning of the music makes quite a difference.” The quieter moments in the development passed without creating that deep tension in which one hardly dare breathe for fear of disturbing the magic. The strings in the Andante sounded a little as though they could have done with some more rehearsal time, but they improved as the movement progressed, the violas doing well with their second subject - and indeed the strings performed well in their responses to the tapestry of horn calls that forms the scherzo.

Michael Seal conducted with great clarity and attention to all sections of the orchestra. Indeed, at the opening
of the finale he seemed very anxious to ensure that the basses keep their insistent repeated crotchets firmly on the beat, which they did, and the mighty first theme exposition was a thing of glory. This movement comes in for a fair bit of criticism from commentators, but I have always loved its wealth of attractive thematic material and its ‘heavenly length’. The coda was masterfully paced, the dynamics well controlled, and the horns’ triplets going up and down the major triad above the repetition of the opening theme of the whole symphony gave added excitement to a glorious finish.

Ken Ward

OXFORD UNIVERSITY CHURCH OF ST MARY THE VIRGIN 2 MARCH 2013

Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Wagner - Prelude to Die Meistersinger

Hertford Bruckner Orchestra / Paul Coones

The refurbishment of the University Church of St Mary the Virgin, Oxford, has been completed and it is now, once again, a glorious concert venue, well suited to the performance of a Bruckner symphony. The audience sit in the nave, the orchestra in front of them with the substantial stone organ screen that separates the nave from the chancel as an evocative backdrop. The screen delivered one of the great dramatic moments of this performance when a stern, ghostly figure arose in the darkness of the arches beneath the organ and stepped slowly forward into the light, raised his arms aloft and delivered the mighty cymbal clash that crowns the climax of the Adagio, indeed the climax of the symphony, and then backed away into the dark never to be seen again.

One might think that Dr. Coones’s devotion to the music of Anton Bruckner had been well-enough served by founding, conducting and managing an orchestra bearing the composer’s name, with the principal aim of enabling many, who would never otherwise have the opportunity, to take part in the performance of Bruckner’s symphonies. But on display this evening for the first time was a brand new quartet of Wagner tubas that Dr. Coones had acquired to facilitate the performance of the Bruckner’s last three symphonies without the attendant problems of tuba hire. Following that spectral cymbal clash the Wagner tubas embark upon that most sonorous of dirges, that mourns the death of Wagner. The performers did full justice to their shining new instruments, glorious playing providing a paragraph of outstanding beauty and deeply-felt sorrow. In this they followed the earlier example of the strings whose contribution, as one might expect from an amateur orchestra with no formal auditions, was of uneven quality, but in this Adagio, in the continuation of the opening theme, played with such sweetness and fullness of tone that for a moment one quite forgot that one was not in the presence of top rank professional orchestra.

Dr. Coones took a slow tempo for the first movement, and indeed it began somewhat lugubriously, an air of oppressive melancholy hanging over the themes. But as the movement progressed it felt as if the quality of the Bruckner’s music began to heal the sorrow, and something brighter and more majestic came to life. The very slowly-played final paragraph of the first movement coda was majesty itself, the brass shining out above the sustained wood-wind and low strings and excited violin figurations, the Wagner tubas warming up in the midst of it all. Warmed-up they needed to be for they open the second movement for three bars of one of Bruckner’s most grief-stricken melodies, but then give way to passionate affirmation from the strings, the rising three note motive Bruckner also used in his Te Deum. As the movement rose to its great climax, the feverish violin semi-quaver scale and arpeggio accompaniment were led with passion and exactitude by the orchestra’s leader, Ben Cartlidge.

Once the brassy Scherzo got into its stride it was as bright and rumbustious as one could wish, and the strings gave a touching rendition of the Trio, creating tender and affectingly phrased music, an achievement they were to repeat with the Finale’s chorale-like second theme. In the notes Dr. Coones provided for the orchestra - and also published in the informative programme booklet - he writes: "Big slow coda ... and a long crescendo towards a triumphant return - at last - to the tonic key of E major." And it was a triumph: they'd made it!

A joyful and spirited performance of the Prelude to The Meistersingers of Nuremberg followed.

The Hertford Bruckner Orchestra has been going now since their performance of Bruckner’s Symphony No.3 in 2000. Since then they have performed symphonies Nos. 4, 5, 7, 8 & 9, some of those more than once, with works by other composers, including Wagner, Tchaikovsky and Mahler. As Dr. Coones writes in the programme note: “The ultimate objective of HBO is to produce a faithful performance of a musical masterpiece: one which does justice to the composer, fulfils its duty to the audience, and succeeds in giving the participants the enjoyment, thrill, and satisfaction that come from having given their all and played above themselves on the night.” I can report that the duty to the audience was fulfilled this evening: for us, it was a tremendous concert.  

Ken Ward
BROMLEY, UK    CENTRE FOR PERFORMING ARTS: LANGLEY PARK BOYS SCHOOL    16 MARCH 2013

Bruckner - Symphony No. 8 (ed. Haas)

Bromley Symphony Orchestra / Adrian Brown

BROMLEY Symphony orchestra has been going since 1918, and many famous soloists and conductors have worked with the orchestra, including Sir Adrian Boult and Norman del Mar, and soloists Paul Tortelier, Kathleen Ferrier and Emma Johnson. A few years ago the orchestra performed Bruckner 7th to much acclaim. Now in their new home, a purpose-built concert hall in Langley Park Boys School, the BSO’s massed ranks of players, 90 in total, were quite a sight, with players drafted in from the locality with six trombones, six trumpets, three Wagner horns, extra timps, woodwind and strings.

Conductor Adrian Brown gave an introduction - "cathedrals of sound" - with the added touch of comparing specific symphonies to particular cathedrals, Lichfield, Rochester, Durham and so on, so that was a bit novel. I suppose we all have our own mental images of what the music of Bruckner conveys. Mine are of mountains, and walking in the high places of the world, particularly the Atlas Mountains of North Africa. This imagery has stuck with me ever since I heard the 2nd with the VSO conducted by Volkmar Andreae on an old Phillips LP. You reach one summit - thinking you are at the top, when there is another one behind it - and then another; the very top only reached after a magnificent coda to round off the experience, exhausted and elated. And as this performance unfolded I was enveloped in a sense of wonder, for this was no ordinary run through with scratch players. It was the real McCoy.

I thought the opening bars were a little on the fast side and lacking in mystery, but as the orchestra got into their stride, the reading started to come together. The strings worried me at times, sounding a bit thin and exposed in the higher registers. The brass and woodwind showed early what they could do however and so it would prove later on - they were in superlative form and the climaxes left the hall quite stunned. My feelings about the pacing of the movement were that it appeared right in comparison with the last recording of Karajan’s with the VPO, which I listened to the day before this performance. The timings for all four movements were roughly comparable.

The scherzo went with a great swing and the horns produced moments of great beauty and power. The strings still worried me, but the reading was close to Karajan’s of 16.25 and the conductor perhaps had got over early nerves and was more confident of how things were going.

Come the Adagio the band were well into their stride and I felt the whole thing cohere into a much more confident reading and performance. The great climax was a magnificently done, the lone harp winding down to the end of the movement in a reflective ethereal glow. Perhaps the transitions between sections were a little hurried, as if the conductor felt that if he didn’t keep moving things on quickly he might lose the audience. He need not have worried. The packed hall was rapt in its attention, and absolutely silent throughout.

The Finale opening bars were done with great aplomb and visceral excitement. The conductor kept the pulse going as per score, with no speedings up/slowings down and crescendos/decrescendos to increase the drama. This was a reading of great authority and perspicacity. At the quiet start of the coda, I am always on edge when listening to this symphony live. After all the hard work, could the conductor bring it off successfully? I need not have worried. There was a measured approach to this astounding coda where the main themes blend in to produce a finale of magnificent sonority, culminating in the final four chords. Just right.

A stunned silence greeted the end and then the hall was bathed in a tremendous ovation and cheers. Hats off to all! A momentous, staggering achievement, well executed, particularly the brass, shining with burnished brilliance. They looked as though they could do it all again - straight away. No need to make allowances. Adrian Brown said at the outset Bruckner was one of his loves - and it showed. As the applause ended, my (unknown) neighbour turned to ask me what I was writing. I learnt that he was a professional oboist, and he was astounded at what he had just heard. He couldn’t quite believe an orchestra like this could be capable of such power and beauty, and bringing it all to a triumphant conclusion.

---

BIRMINGHAM     SYMPHONY HALL     26 MARCH 2013

Beethoven - Piano Concerto No. 4 (Leif Ove Andsnes)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4

Gustav Mahler Jugendorchester / Herbert Blomstedt

CELIT'S Munich performance (EMI) was one of the best of all his Bruckner, as you may feel, (the other was the 6th), especially for his Finale, which he could make as seamless as possible. That's a clue to the success of last night's Finale. What didn't happen - but not really to be expected as they are unique to their performers - were two
elements: the great elevated Coda which Celibidache realised, and, at the very start of the symphony, the quiet, spine-tingling mystical horn call over the shimmering strings as if emerging through a forest mist, which set a course for so earthy a reading - by Karl Böhm (VPO).

So what did we have last night? In addition to absolutely wonderful playing by the Gustav Mahler Jugend Orchester, the understanding which years of experience with the work by Herbert Blomstedt produced: a seamless wonder, a feeling for the architecture of the work, a firm and powerful but steady control which was never compromised by the intrusion of something more flamboyant by the conductor. It was something more than merely magisterial - it was the something a magic wand seemed to produce.

And there was something else - at least from where I was sitting - a realisation of balance... In those tutti I could hear equally the brass, the woodwind and the strings! - to a degree not heard before as far as I can recall. It was all so clear.

Unfortunately Bruckner was let down again, as is often the case: the concert, on posters, tickets, brochures and elsewhere was announced as "Beethoven's 4th Piano Concerto". No mention of Bruckner, or even the artists. It ought to have been described either as both or as Bruckner's 4th - or better still, "Blomstedt conducts Bruckner". The policy didn't work though, as the hall was only half full.

LONDON
ROYAL FESTIVAL HALL
11 APRIL 2013

Beethoven - Piano Concerto No. 3
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1889)

Philharmonia Orchestra / Thomas Dausgaard

THIS WAS a splendid performance of the Third Symphony. It was scheduled to have been conducted by Kurt Masur but, sadly, due to an accident and complications following a hip replacement in February, the 85 year old maestro was unable to conduct. (On his web-site he writes that he is on the mend: “I am very hopeful and will do everything in my power to stand again on the podium for Beethoven’s 9th symphony on June 22nd in Cologne.” We wish him well.)

The interpretation provided by Thomas Dausgaard was very different indeed to that which might have been expected from Masur. Although this was the 1889 version of the symphony, it came across with a lightness and brightness appropriate to the composer of the ‘early’ D minor and the Second symphonies, rather than prefiguring the monumental sweep of the Eighth and Ninth. Some of this was achieved by always convincing but nevertheless fairly quick overall tempos; there was nothing of the massive slowness by which some interpretations seek to build their power. (The performance took a good five minutes less that its advertised 58 mins). Add to this that the rhythmic articulation was always tight, even at the grand tutti unisons, so that there was never any risk that grand statements would undermine the momentum of the whole. But most of all, the Philharmonia responded to Dausgaard’s direction wonderfully, with playing of immense beauty and intelligence, the expressive qualities of the solos in full accord with the underlying vitality and splendour of the conductor’s vision. They were all good, but special praise needs to be heaped upon Kate Woolley’s horn playing which was outstanding, from her first response to the open trumpet theme, through all the many solos she was called upon to provide in the first two movements, she was absolutely spell-binding. And Andrew Smith’s characteristic forthright work on the timpani ensured the big moments were possessed of their full dramatic potential.

Dausgaard and the orchestra were especially effective in the handling of the flexibility of tempo within the overall scheme. The first movement second theme and the Ländlers in the third movement had a beguiling lilt to them; excited accelerandos towards climaxes worked well giving the performance a communicative spontaneity, balanced by moments of very slow and atmospheric prayerful quiet, as in the opening of the first movement development, or the closing bars of the Andante. Those moments where the orchestra at full tilt stops suddenly, to allow a pause and a prayerful cadence to remind us of the quiet at the heart of the symphony before it resumes its impassioned course, were perfectly handled. Dausgaard’s great achievement here was to hold these varied expressive approaches within the unity of the whole.

But the real test of a performance of this version of the symphony is whether the Finale works. Partly as a result of a firm grip on the tempo, and the infectious quality of the strings’ playing of the polka, with glorious playing of the chorale by horns and trombones, there was never a moment where the movement seemed to founder. The great, climactic D major statement of the symphony’s opening theme blazed with triumphant heroism, bringing this well thought-out and magnificently played performance to a wonderfully affirmative close.

Ken Ward
NEW & REISSUED RECORDINGS March to June 2013

Compiled by Howard Jones

Although this listing is (again) dominated by reissues, including Bruckner-containing multidisc compendia from DG, EMI, Profil, Supraphon, Membran Artone, Sony International and Orfeo etc., first issues of every Symphony (except #00) in the cycle also feature. DVD and Blu-ray listings include a St Florian performance of Symphony No. 4 (1888+) from Welser-Möst and the Cleveland Orchestra and a second instalment of Barenboim’s 2010 Berlin partial cycle with the Berlin Staatskapelle (Symphony No. 5).

[Full details of Proffii’s 20 CD Bruckner Collection, and Proffii’s new CD of Symphony No.8, including the ‘Intermediate Adagio’, ed Gault/Kawasaki, and movements 1.2 & 4 ed. Carragan, with Otto Kitzler’s ‘In Memoriam Anton Bruckner’, by Philharmonie Festiva / Gerd Schaller, arrived too late for Howard Jones to list in this issue - but some information is given advertisement boxes on pp 36 & 42.]

CDs, LPs and Downloads

SYMPHONIES

No. 0 *Young/Hamburg PO (/12) OEHMS CLASSICS SACD OC 685 (49:41)

Nos. 0 to 9 Jochum, E / Dresden SK (Dresden 11/76 to 7/80) BRILLIANT CLASSICS 10 CD set 94707 (with Saarbrucken RSO/Skrowaczewski in No. 0, 3/99) (559 + 45 mins).

No.1(Vienna v.) *Abبدو/Lucerne Fest. Orch. (/12) DG 40 CD set 4791046 ’Abبدو Symphony Edition’ (also Nos. 4,5,7,9 with VPO, 10/90, 10/93, 3&6/92 & 4/96 with Beethoven etc.)

Nos. 1 to 9 Jochum, E / Dresden SK (Dresden 11/76 to 7/80) EMI 20 CD set 4640042 (with Beethoven, Brahms & Mozart) (559 mins).

Nos. 1,2,3,8 Karajan/ Berlin & Vienna POs (Berlin 1980/1 & Vienna 11/88) UNIVERSAL MUSIC SHM-CDs UCCG 47769/70/72/37 (51,61,57 & 83 mins).

Nos. 1 to 9 Mandeal/Cluj Napoca PO (Cluj Napoca 10/84 to 7/88) ELECTRECORD CD set ERT 1013 (50,64, 63, 81, 65, 68, 85 & 72 mins).

No. 2(1877 ed Carragan) *Janowski/Orch. Suisse Romande (Geneva 10/12) PENTATONE CLASSICS SACD 5134648 (54:55).

No.2(ed. Haas) Jochum, G /Linz Bruckner SO (Vienna 9/44) KLASIS HAUS RESTORATIONS CD GSC 013 (60 mins).

No. 3 Hindemith/Mannheim Theatre Orch. (Mannheim 3/56) ARCHIPEL CD 041 (54:00) with Hindemith’s Concert Music for Brass & Strings.

No. 3 (1889) *Maazel/Munich PO (Munich 9/12) SONY CLASSICAL SICC 88883709292 & SICC 1628 (58:34).

Nos. 3,8,9 Schuricht/Vienna PO (Vienna,12/65, 12/63 & 11/61) EMI ICON 8 CD set 6233792 (51, 71 & 56 mins) with Beethoven Symphonies 1 to 9.

Nos. 4,5,7,8,9 *Abdo/Bruckner SO (Vienna 9/44) KLASSIC HAUS RESTORATIONS CD GSC 013 (60 mins).

No. 4 Cellibidache/Munich PO (Vienna, 5-6/2/89) SONY CLASSICAL SICC 88883709292 & SICC 1628 (58:34).


No. 6 *Nezet-Seguin/Orch. Metropolitan (Montreal, 12/12) ATMA CLASSIQUE ACD2 2639 ATC (53:56).

No. 7 Ahrnovich/Gürzenich Orch. (Cologne, 6/9/79) PROFIL 8 CD set PH 12042 (67:25) with Mozart Symphonies 1-5.

No. 7 Karajan/Vienna PO (London, 6/4/62) ICA CLASSICS 2 CD set ICA 5102 (63:07) with Schubert #4 & Mozart #41 etc.

No. 7 Oue/Osaka PO (Osaka, 16/2/06) FONTEC Hybrid SACD FOCD-9581 (64:40).

No. 7 Pešek/Czech PO (Prague 1 & 11/86) SUPRAPHON 4 CD set SU 4132-2 (60 mins) with works by 5 other composers.

No. 8 Furtwängler/Vienna PO (17/10/44 & 10/4/54) ORFEO 18 CD set C 834118Y (77 & 80 mins) with Te Deum, NYPO, from 3/53 (30 mins).


No. 8 No. (1890/Nowak) *Milton/Innsbruckler SO (Ried im Kreis, 8 & 9/2012) AVI MUSIC 2 CD set or MP3 4 260085 532797 (77:57) with Mozart Clarinet Concerto.

No. 8 (ed. Haas) Wand/Gürzenich Orch. (Cologne,3/10/71) ANTIQUA 2 CD set 233703 (80 mins) with Brahms #2 & 4.

No. 9 Adler/VIENNA SO (Vienna, 5/52) CRQ EDITIONS CD 80 with Overture in G minor (65 & 13 mins).

No. 9 Schuricht/Berlin Municipal Orch. (Berlin, 7/43) MEMBRAN ARTONE 4CD set 222341 (58 mins) with works by 5 other composers.

No. 9 Schuricht/Vienna PO (Vienna, 11/61) GRAND SLAM CD GS 2092 (56 mins).

VOCAL & INSTRUMENTAL


Te Deum   Karajan/Soloists/Vienna PO & Singverein (Vienna, 22/9/84) UNIVERSAL MUSIC CD UCCG 4737 (25:58).
Te Deum   Rilling/Soloists/Stuttgart Bach Collegium & Gachinger Kantorei Sindelfingen,9/96) HÄNSSLER CLASSICS 10 CD set HREN 98008 (25:18) with music by 7 other composers.

DVD & BLU-RAY
Sym. 4 & 7  Thielemann/Munich PO (Baden-Baden, 9/5/08 & 14/11/08) CMAJOR BLURAY 712304 (73:09 & 72:04).
Sym. 5  *Barenboim/Dresden SK (Berlin, 21/6/2010) ACCENTUS MUSIC DVD ACC 202175 & BLURAY (76:49).
Symph. 7  *Thielemann/Dresden SK (Dresden, 9/2012) OPUS ARTE DVD OA 1115D & BLURAY OARB 7127D with Wolf/ 5 Lieder/Renée Fleming.
Sym. 8 (ed.Haas) *Oue/ Osaka PO (Osaka, 31/3/2012) FONTEC DVD FOVD-102 (89:20).

Profil ‘Bruckner Collection’
This 20 CD collection consists of the following recordings (as listed on www.abruckner.com)

Volume 1 (2 CD) Symphony No. 0 in F minor Study Symphony Symphony No. 0 in D minor Die Nullte Royal Scottish National Orchestra National Symphony Orchestra of Ireland Georg Tintner
Volume 2 (1 CD) Symphony No. 1 in C minor Philharmonie Festiva Gerd Schaller
Volume 3 (1 CD) Symphony No. 2 in C minor Philharmonie Festiva Gerd Schaller
Volume 4 (1 CD) Symphony No. 3 in D minor Symphonieorchester des Bayerischen Rundfunks Klaus Tennstedt
Volume 5 (1 CD) Symphony No. 4 in E flat major Symphonieorchester des Bayerischen Rundfunks Kurt Sanderling
Volume 6 (1 CD) Symphony No. 5 in B flat major Deutsches Symphonie-Orchester Berlin Günter Wand
Volume 7 (1 CD) Symphony No. 6 in A major Staatskapelle Dresden Bernard Haitink
Volume 8 (1 CD) Symphony No. 7 in E major Gürzenich-Orchester Köln Yuri Ahronovitch
Volume 9 (2 CD) Symphony No. 8 in C minor Staatskapelle Dresden Christian Thielemann
Volume 10 (1 CD) Symphony No. 9 in D minor Radio-Sinfonieorchester Stuttgart des SWR Günter Wand
Volume 11 (1 CD) Latin Motets Philharmonia Vocalensemble Stuttgart Hans Zanotelli
Volume 12 (1 CD) String Quintet in F major String Quartet in C minor Fine Arts Quartet with Gil Sharon, viola
Volume 15 (1 CD) Tantum Ergo, Ave Maria, Helgoland, Mass in C major (Windhaager Messe) - Martin Haselböck, Johannes Skudlik, organ Dresdner Kreuzchor, Martin Flämig Mikael Stenbäck, tenor, Daniel Hellström, baritone, Lund Singers, Malmö Opera Orchestra, Albert Hold-Garrido Comelia Wulkopf, alt, Manfred Neukirchner, Ulrich Kölb, horn
Volume 16 (1 CD) Works for Piano Wolfgang Brunner, piano Michael Schopper, piano
Volume 17 (2 CD) Missa solemnis Psalm 112 March D minor WAB 96 Three Pieces WAB 97 Requiem - Christiane Oelze, soprano, Claudia Schubert, alt, Jörg Dürmüller, tenor Reinhard Hagen, bass, Chor der Bamberger Symphoniker Bamberger Symphoniker Karl Anton Rickenbacher Beethovenorchester Bonn, Stefan Blunier Elke Janssens, soprano, Penelope Turner, mezzo, Roel Willems, tenor, Arnout Mafliet, bass, Laudantes Consort, Guy Janssens
ON THIS occasion it was possible to compare the DVD and Blu-ray versions, although the majority of viewing and listening was to the Blu-ray. To begin with, there are some differences between the disc menus. The Blu-ray has nothing except the options to play the disc or watch the trailers of other Arthaus issues. The only way to select the DTS MA surround track was via the player remote. The DVD has not only menu selections for sound but also for the four movements of the symphony, making the DVD version much easier to use. However, while the DVD is perfectly acceptable in all respects, the picture and sound were noticeably superior on the Blu-ray version. Given the excellent camera work and sound recording provided by director Brian Large and his team, the Blu-ray must therefore be the choice if circumstances permit. The sound is not absolutely perfect, since pp often sounds clearer than ff, but given the difficulty of reproducing the huge dynamic range of a Bruckner symphony in a domestic context this is hardly surprising.

Not at all acceptable on either format is the presence of the bleeding chunks of Bruckner that are heard over the disc menus. Arthaus (and other companies) ought to realise that the music should begin with the performance and not before. In this sublime symphony it is a particularly egregious assault on the ears to have arbitrary fragments of music thrust upon one before even settling to listen. Use audience noise if it is necessary to show that the sound is there.

The edition used here is clearly stated, along with a useful note in the booklet. This is just as well, because Frans Welser-Möst has opted for the recently published 1888 version edited by Benjamin Korstvedt. Bruckner editions can be among the more tiresome issues in music, because on the one hand they can seem remote and academic, yet on the other, they do have considerable impact for the listener. For example, for anyone who has come to know the symphony in either of the ‘standard’ editions, Haas from 1936 or Nowak from 1953, the versions performed and recorded by such as Klempere, Jochum, Böhm, Wand and Karajan, then this is likely to be a disturbing performance. Particularly in the Scherzo and Finale, things keep happening that one is not expecting: phrase shapings, tempos, even entire chunks of score, are different and sometimes missing. This is intriguing and makes one listen closely, but because this score has caused such division among scholars and editors, there is the uneasy feeling that something is not just different but actually ‘wrong’. Korstvedt wrote in *The Bruckner Journal*, Vol. 10 no.1, ‘...many Brucknerians now know this version only by its common reputation as a “falsification of Bruckner’s intentions” that “should be rejected altogether,” to borrow Deryck Cooke’s influential words.’ But of this version on which the composer worked with the brothers Schalk and Ferdinand Löwe, Korstvedt asserts categorically, ‘Recent research into the manuscript sources and genealogy of this version clearly shows, however, that the 1888 version is far from a corruption of the composer’s wishes. It was first heard in performance under Richter in January 1888. Bruckner revised the text carefully after that performance and had this version published. Any text that was prepared, performed, revised, and published with the composer’s full participation and approval has a strong claim to legitimacy.’

As an example of the issues raised for the listener, this version might be said to wreck the Scherzo, cutting the horn fanfares first time around in a most damaging way, and foreshortening the reprise. Then there are cymbal clashes at two places in the finale, one fortissimo and one softer (a practice that lived on in performances of the more familiar 1880 finale by Jochum and others). The finale features (suffers?) both reorganisation and a changed line of development. There is some doubling of woodwinds for tuttis, turning the instrumentation to a quadrupling. It’s not something Bruckner ever calls for, but Franz Welser-Möst also did this in his recorded performance of the Fifth at St Florian, so he presumably feels the acoustic of St Florian requires it.

There can be no question that the Cleveland Orchestra play superbly throughout, and that Welser-Möst is every inch the maestro. He directs a suitably noble view of Bruckner’s great work. Special mention must be made of the wonderful viola section, but all the musicians play their hearts out, such that the conductor is visibly moved at
several points. The audience is mostly quiet save for a few ill-timed coughs in the finale, and they remain silent for a satisfying few seconds at the end, before giving the performers a well deserved standing ovation. However, I wonder whether Bruckner would have approved of such effusiveness in his beloved St. Florian.

While the booklet notes give some insight into the edition used, and how it relates to the history of the symphony and its general nature, the disc itself carries no interviews or other supporting material, which must be regarded as something of a disappointment. While this is a fine performance, the edition does matter and my recommendation for those who want only a single version remains the good High Definition alternatives from Christian Thielemann (Nowak) and Daniel Barenboim (Haas). For the enthusiastic Brucknerian who like me has donned his anorak and acquired numerous alternative performances, this challenging version, conscientiously edited by Benjamin Korstvedt, makes for intriguing, if occasionally irritating, listening that is enhanced by the wonderful visual images of St Florian.

Terry Barfoot

Bruckner – Mass No.3 in F minor (1867 – 1893)

Lenneke Ruiten (soprano)
Iris Vermillion (mezzo-soprano)
Shawn Mathey (tenor)
Franz-Josef Selig (bass)
Rundfunkchor Berlin, Orchestre de la Suisse Romande / Marek Janowski

Recorded June 2012, Victoria Hall, Geneva
Pentatone Classics PTC 5186 501 Hybrid Multichannel SACD DDD [62:13]

THE TASTE for Bruckner’s symphonies is by and large considerably more widespread and easier to acquire than for his Masses, which do not attract the same number of concert performances or recordings. Indeed, a preference for the masses over the symphonies might by some be accounted eccentric; nonetheless, there are over sixty recordings in the discography of this, the biggest and greatest of Bruckner’s Mass settings. Those generally accounted most successful and popular are by Jochum, Barenboim and – for variety and of course individuality – Celibidache and it is with these three recordings that this new release is compared. (I have also heard Helmuth Rilling’s 1992 account, but cannot in all honesty consider it a worthy contender as it is so dull, small scale and poorly sung.)*

As the Mass may have been devised primarily for concert performance, the emphasis is upon musical and religious rather than liturgical considerations with several major consequences: the opening lines of the “Gloria” and “Credo” are set to music sung by the whole choir rather than being intoned by the tenor in the manner of a priest; the role of the soloists is more prominent; and, finally, the musical idiom in general is more symphonic - although the thematic material is still rooted in Gregorian chant. Both the “Gloria” and the “Credo” conclude with double fugues, their intricacy reflecting Bruckner’s confidence in that form as he neared the end of his six years’ correspondence course in harmony and counterpoint with Simon Sechter. Indeed, the Mass was begun shortly after news reached Bruckner of Sechter’s death in September 1867 but also marked Bruckner’s return to health following his extended stay in the sanatorium at Bad Kreuzen, before his permanent move to Vienna.

In this recording, Janowski uses Paul Hawkshaw’s 2005 edition of the 1893 revision. His tempi are moderate and thus, at 61’35”, the duration of the performance lies somewhere in between the extremes of Jochum (57’24”) and Celibidache (76’16”), obviously somewhat nearer to the sprightlier than the monumental – although there are recordings by such as Herreweghe which take as little as 52 minutes.

I cannot say that I find much which is remarkable or arresting about Janowski’s interpretation, insofar as it is generally moderate and unhurried, in well-balanced sound with adequate soloists. At no point do I find the vertical sense of mystery and transcendence which I am sure Bruckner intended and which, in the right hands such as those of Barenboim and Celibidache, emerges so strikingly.

This is glorious, large-scale music and right from the start of the “Kyrie”, both those conductors find a nobility in the phrasing of the descending four-note figure in fourths passed from the strings to the choir to the bass and finally the soprano soloists. The singers in both recordings are superior to Janowski’s rather acidic soprano; Margaret Price, Heather Harper and also Maria Stader for Jochum all soar angelically, and there is a special, imposing distinction of timbre to the voices of basses Marius Rinzler and Kim Borg which the rather lumpen Franz-Josef Selig cannot match.
The hallmark of Janowski’s style is essentially innocuous placidity; even Jochum’s nervous, lively sensibility of the same kind which characterises his accounts of Bruckner’s symphonies is a distinct asset in comparison with Janowski’s steadiness. A typically effective Jochum touch is the \textit{accelerando} seven minutes into the “Kyrie”; he finds a momentum here which eludes Janowski, although the latter builds to an impressive climax and is greatly served by impeccable recorded sound, whereas Celibidache’s live recording is good but plagued by coughs and Jochum’s elderly DG version has been poorly remastered, suffering from hiss, a distant choir and a generally muddy and muffled acoustic. Celibidache’s tempi should drag but don’t, owing to his mastery of the long line and nuanced control of dynamics; what he and Barenboim do with the “Gloria” makes Janowski sound almost turgid.

The clarity of the recorded sound given to Janowski certainly constitutes one of the greatest attractions of this new disc so it is a pity that his flutes are recorded too prominently throughout, especially in the “Sanctus”. Otherwise, Celibidache conjures an ethereal quality here, his flutes spiralling upward, while Barenboim is warmer and impassioned; Janowski simply plays it straight.

The “Benedictus” is among the most beautiful and Romantic of Bruckner’s conceits such as would not sound out of place in a work by Mahler; just as we may with some certainty hear a link between the solo violin in the “Kyrie” and the “Benedictus” in Beethoven’s “Missa solemnis”, there is an unmistakable connection between the second melody, introduced by the bass soloist, with that that Mahler was to use in the Adagio of his Fourth Symphony – and perhaps the final movement of his Third, too. It is in this movement that we most clearly hear the relative inadequacy of Janowski’s soloists when the mezzo-soprano enters unsteadily, the soprano responds shrilly, the bass wobbles, the tenor bleats and all four singers fail to integrate their tone homogeneously; the quartets for Jochum, Barenboim and Celibidache are markedly superior, although the playing and singing of Janowski’s Rundfunkchor and Orchestre de la Suisse Romande are distinctly impressive.

The final movement, the “Agnus Dei”, carries over the mood of the “Benedictus”. The opening descending octave phrases require affectionate moulding and delicately shaded dynamics of the kind Janowski eschews; similarly he allows the semi-quavers three and a half minutes in to plod and misses the effect of grandeur Bruckner was aiming for. However, the final tonic major two bar phrase for the oboe over pianissimo strings and a gurgling kettledrum is very effectively managed.

Ultimately, other conductors have found more inspiration in their working out of Bruckner’s classical forms and more variety in their phrasing of his frequent quadruple rhythms; for me, Janowski’s more cautious, non-interventionist approach fails to generate the requisite fervour and intensity this music demands.  

\textit{Ralph Moore}

* [Ralph “Moore’s view of the 1992 Rilling performance is not one universally held: Hans Roelof, in his overview of performances of Mass no.3 in his discography of Bruckner’s non-symphonic works, www.brucknerdiskografie.nl, rates Rilling’s performance very highly, ‘Insgesamt ist dies eine sehr befriedigende Aufnahme.’ (Overall this is a very satisfying recording.) Ed.]

**Bruckner - Symphony 4 (1878/80 version, ed Nowak)**

**ORF Radio-Symphonieorchester Wien / Cornelius Meister**

**Recorded in ORF Radiokulturehaus, September 2012**    **Total playing time: 66:01**

\textbf{Capriccio C5150}

\textbf{THIS IS} the first recording of a Bruckner symphony by the young German conductor Cornelius Meister. Born in 1980, Meister studied piano and conducting in Hannover and then at the Salzburg Mozarteum, where his teachers included the noted Brucknerian Dennis Russell Davies. In 2010, he was appointed Principal Conductor of the Vienna Radio Symphony Orchestra in succession to Bertrand de Billy.

Meister’s account of the Fourth Symphony is direct and unaffected, benefiting from a good grasp of the work’s architecture and careful attention to dynamics and sonority. The Andante is particularly successful, with delicately shaded playing from the orchestra and a sense of mystery and enchantment. Elsewhere, however, the performance really needs a greater degree of strength and power. This is partly a result of the playing, which lacks a sense of corporate purpose in the symphony’s more energetic passages, and partly a result of the recording quality, which loses transparency and becomes more congested as the volume level increases. Tutti passages in particular tend to be dominated by the horns and trumpets, eclipsing in other parts of the orchestra, notably the
woodwinds, and undermining the effect of Bruckner’s scoring.

As so often with Bruckner’s music, the information provided about the version of the symphony being performed is less than ideal. In this case, the front of the CD provides no information at all, while the rear of the CD offers the date 1874 in parenthesis, suggesting that this is Bruckner’s original version of the symphony. Only on page three of the booklet is it made clear that this is in fact the Nowak edition of the 1878-1880 version of the symphony (based on the revision Bruckner made in 1886). Capriccio’s presentation is further undermined by the poor quality of the translation into English of the booklet essay by Dr Johannes Leopold Mayer.

On this evidence of this recording, Cornelius Meister shows considerable promise as a Bruckner conductor, and I would be interested to hear him in concert. However, this is not a recording of the Fourth Symphony that poses much of a challenge to the existing competition.

* * * * *

“Bruckner has the last laugh over spiteful sniggerers”

UK JOURNALIST Damian Thompson, (b.1962), one time editor-in-chief of The Catholic Herald, author of a controversial book about addiction, The Fix, has recently published several short pieces lauding the music of Anton Bruckner. Writing in The Telegraph, 8 March 2013, he had the following short snippet:

When Bruckner was Brahms and Liszt

I love riffling through the CDs in Gramex, just behind Waterloo Station, which is the world’s best classical record shop (and in danger of becoming the only one). My latest purchase is Barenboim’s Bruckner cycle with the Berlin Phil - rich, lush, histrionic performances with informative liner notes. I didn’t know, for example, that in 1873 Bruckner met his idol, Wagner, to ask him to accept the dedication of one of two symphonies. Wagner said yes - but then got Bruckner so plastered that he woke up unable to remember which symphony Wagner had chosen. Poor old Bruckner: boring but sweet in his cups, I imagine. A drunk Wagner, on the other hand, doesn’t bear thinking about

In The Spectator, 16 March 2013, writing an appreciation of a book by Gervase Hughes, Fifty Famous Composers (an expanded edition of The Pan Book of Great Composers, 1964), he remarks:

The gentle defence of composers such as Franck, who were dismissed by the musical sophisticates in the middle of the 20th century, is one of the delights of Fifty Famous Composers. In the case of Bruckner, the defence is more than gentle - it’s magnificent:

“Ill-wishers chose to make out that this most worthy fellow was little better than a village idiot, but village idiots do not write symphonies which posterity acclaims as masterpieces, and so the unworldly Bruckner has the last laugh over spiteful sniggerers.”

Before I read that, I’d been got at by a music teacher who was definitely a sniggerer. Hughes persuaded me to listen with open ears - and, since Bruckner is now my favourite symphonist, changed my life.

This was followed on 27 April by a piece in The Spectator under the title, Are today’s composers up to the challenge of writing sublime music?, of which this is an edited extract:

Is it possible to write sublime music without belonging to the front rank of composers? My answer - and, again, this is all a matter of opinion - is that it’s possible to write the most transcendentally beautiful and philosophically noble symphonies in the history of the medium, but still be relegated to secondary status by musical prejudice.

Anton Bruckner (1824–96) was 52 years old when he finally completed a symphony, his Fifth, in which everything - the exquisite fragments of melody, the ground plan of modulating keys, the use of fugue to drive forward argument - fitted together perfectly. I’ve just been listening to his underrated Sixth, following the score (with difficulty) and marvelling at the way, in the first-movement coda, he passes through the entire spectrum of tonality. In the words of the composer Robert Simpson, ‘the main theme rises and falls like some great ship, the water illuminated in superb hues as the sun rises, at last bursting clear in the sky’.

This sublime effect is possible only because Bruckner sweated away for 30 years, writing and rewriting one gigantic movement after another until he perfected his art. He was a saintly Catholic and we may interpret his later Adagios as prayer in musical form. On the other hand, as the Bruckner scholar Philip Barford argues, the mighty resolution of conflict in the final four symphonies reflects a selfless attempt to create order out of chaos that is as compatible with Buddhism as it is with Christianity. Bruckner ‘can free the mind from self-preoccupation in the struggle to wrest form from the gross matter of life’.

And that, surely, is what all sublime music has in common. Whether today’s composers are up to the challenge of writing it is another question.

Thanks to David Woodhead and Michael Felmingham for drawing our attention to these items
Timed Structure Tables for Bruckner Symphonies
Professor William Carragan

This is the ninth of Prof. Carragan’s series of analytic charts to be published in The Bruckner Journal. To use them you need only the specified recording, and either the display of elapsed time on your CD player or some other method of marking the time in minutes and seconds. Of course, other recordings can be used; the timings will be approximate but the structural events should not be too difficult to locate.

**Bruckner: Symphony no. 8 in C minor**

THIS ISSUE we cover the established versions of the Eighth using a recent performance of the 1887 version by the American Symphony under Leon Botstein, recorded at Bard College, for the 1890 the classic (and uncut) Klemperer Cologne Radio performance of 1957, and for the first publication of 1892, the Steinberg performance with the Boston Symphony available in their Symphony Hall Centennial Celebration set. I have also included Benjamin Zander’s 2010 performance of the Haas version with the Boston Philharmonic, and the intermediate adagio (nominally of 1888) performed at the Ebrach Festival in 2012 by the Philharmonie Festiva conducted by Gerd Schaller. These are all outstanding performances, two of great historical importance and three showing the best that can be offered of modern thought on the performance of this symphony. I have avoided the many performances, old and new, in which the finale is begun very quickly (at MM = 84 and far above) and the second theme is played much slower (at 48 or lower), in open defiance of the composer’s own markings of 69 and 60 which are in all versions ever published. People wonder why the finale doesn’t hang together, but it is those conductors’ fault, not the composer’s.

Especially your attention is called to the curious events in the scherzo at letter K (1887 measure 103, 1890 measure 95), and the exciting rubatos in the finale at measures 497-508 (469-480 in 1890), particularly with Steinberg and Zander. The intermediate adagio, edited by Dermot Gault and Takanobu Kawasaki 2004, is strongly recommended to your interest in the Schaller recording. It contains what might be the greatest horn moment in all of Bruckner at measure 251. The other three movements of the Schaller performance, edited by me, were not included in the tables for lack of space, but if you buy the set you will have no trouble finding your way while hearing some very interesting music you have never heard before. The Botstein performance is available as a download from the American Symphony web site, and the Zander performance can be obtained from John Berky at abruckner.com. The Klemperer has been reissued on several labels including Medici Masters MMO21-2 (be sure you get the Cologne Radio!), the Steinberg comes in the BSO set but I believe is also available individually, and the Schaller is about to be issued on Hänssler Profil.

In the analysis I have placed the recapitulation in the first movement at 1887 measure 233, 1890 measure 225. This is a huge deliberately-prepared event, in the same harmonic progression as in the first statement at the beginning, and is followed by further development of that theme until the recurrence of the later phases of the theme starting at 301 (291). The obligatory reference to the B theme near the end of the development is also present. Even though the formal development is rather short, there can be no doubt that this is the correct analysis. The first movement of the Ninth is proportioned rather similarly. Remember that Bruckner thought of his form as Part 1 (ABC) and Part 2 (ABC), even while retaining many aspects of standard sonata form as shown in the tables.

It is quite remarkable that metronome markings are given in the finale in every published edition of this symphony, but that they are far from being in general use. The explicit markings in the exposition are A = half note 69, and B = half note 60; in the recapitulation, the A theme is marked “Erstes Zeitmaß”, that is, initial tempo, and at the B theme the metronome marking of 60 is repeated. Then, in the first publication at the C theme in the exposition the indication is also “Erstes Zeitmaß”, and at the C theme in the recapitulation; in the Nowak edition of the 1890 version the indication is “viel langsamer” (much slower) even though there is a tempo in the B theme before already marked to be slower than 60. From these markings it would seem that C = 69 in the exposition, and perhaps about 52 in the recapitulation, with of course a substantial acceleration to follow. Despite the differences among them, these tempos would present a much more unified tempo structure and a much more integrated representation of this giant movement than we hear in nearly every interpretation today. Here are the results from the performances in these tables, which you will instantly see are very interesting:

| Botstein:     | A = 79, B = 63, C = 66 in the exposition; | A = 76, B = 62, C = 68 in the recapitulation. |
| Schaller:    | A = 77, B = 52, C = 58 in the exposition; | A = 78, B = 53, C = 58 in the recapitulation. |
| Klemperer:   | A = 74, B = 50, C = 51 in the exposition; | A = 78, B = 51, C = 56 in the recapitulation. |
| Steinberg:   | A = 81, B = 52, C = 73 in the exposition; | A = 86, B = 52, C = 65 in the recapitulation. |
| Zander:      | A = 75, B = 53, C = 72 in the exposition; | A = 79, B = 54, C = 65 in the recapitulation. |

These measurements were made from musical durations of at least 24 seconds timed with a stopwatch to 0.01 second, not reduced from the timings in the table which would be much less accurate. These performances were chosen not only to represent the various versions, but also because they are all about as good as one can find with respect to the finale tempos; most are far worse. Finally, the tempo of 69 for the A theme, though it seems quite slow, is almost exactly that of galloping horses, recalling Bruckner’s own statement that the scene is that of the Dreikaiserbund meeting in 1884. And the trumpet fanfares can actually be rendered at that speed! Something to think about.
### Anton Bruckner

**Symphony No. 8 in C minor, Kopfsatz**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1887</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1892 Haas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Botstein mm.</td>
<td>Kemperer mm.</td>
<td>Steinberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Exposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a [F]</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0:01</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0:01</th>
<th>0:03</th>
<th>0:00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A to C minor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0:04</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0:06</td>
<td>0:08</td>
<td>0:06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0:17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0:29</td>
<td>0:27</td>
<td>0:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0:28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0:47</td>
<td>0:44</td>
<td>0:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a [F]</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0:40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0:58</td>
<td>0:54</td>
<td>0:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A to C minor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0:43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1:02</td>
<td>0:59</td>
<td>0:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0:57</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>1:16</td>
<td>1:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1:09</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1:35</td>
<td>1:32</td>
<td>1:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ax</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1:19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1:46</td>
<td>1:42</td>
<td>1:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1:33</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2:02</td>
<td>1:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bx</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3:03</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3:28</td>
<td>3:16</td>
<td>3:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>E flat minor</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3:20</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3:45</td>
<td>3:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (A) E flat major</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4:23</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4:53</td>
<td>4:28</td>
<td>5:05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Development

| induction E flat major | 157 | 5:15 | 153 | 5:44 | 5:20 | 6:02 |
| chorale to F major | 169 | 5:35 | 165 | 6:02 | 5:42 | 6:30 |
| B inverted G flat major | 197 | 6:24 | 193 | 6:50 | 6:27 | 7:21 |
| retransition [F] | 225 | 7:18 | 221 | 7:28 | 7:05 | 8:15 |

#### Recapitulation

| A to C minor | 233 | 7:32 | 225 | 7:40 | 7:18 | 8:31 |
| A to E flat major | 243 | 7:51 | 235 | 7:57 | 7:36 | 8:55 |
| A to C minor (6/4) | 253 | 8:08 | 245 | 8:14 | 7:54 | 9:17 |
| (A) | 263 | 8:27 | 249 | 8:33 | 8:12 | 9:41 |
| (A) 1887 diminution | 285 | 9:05 | 271 | 9:02 | 8:42 | 10:17 |
| (A) | 293 | 9:19 | 283 | 9:28 | 9:03 | 10:41 |
| (Ab) | 301 | 9:33 | 291 | 9:38 | 9:16 | 10:55 |
| Ac | 309 | 9:47 | 299 | 9:48 | 9:29 | 11:10 |
| (Ax) | 317 | 10:01 | 307 | 10:02 | 9:44 | 11:28 |
| B | E flat major | 321 | 10:16 | 311 | 10:17 | 9:57 | 11:46 |
| C | C minor | 351 | 11:35 | 341 | 11:26 | 11:10 | 13:19 |
| scale to C minor (6/4) | 379 | 12:29 | 369 | 12:20 | 12:00 | 14:13 |

#### Coda

| A inverted | 403 | 13:11 | 393 | 13:04 | 12:43 | 14:59 |
| 1890 end | C minor | — | — | 417 | 14:06 | 13:43 | 16:05 |
| A to C | 425 | 13:50 | — | — | — | — |
| peroration C major | 437 | 14:12 | — | — | — | — |
| 1887 end | C major | 453 | 14:41 | — | — | — | — |

---
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### Anton Bruckner
#### Symphony no. 8 in C minor, Scherzo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scherzo pt. 1</th>
<th>1887</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1892</th>
<th>Haas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0:03</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C flat major</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0:25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1 (A)</td>
<td>E flat major; 1890: C flat</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0:31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A flat minor</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0:36</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0:47</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>E major</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0:53</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1 (A)</td>
<td>E flat major</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0:58</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2 (A)</td>
<td>E flat major</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1:27</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1:23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scherzo pt. 2</th>
<th>1887</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1892</th>
<th>Haas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td>Letter K</td>
<td>woodwinds</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1 (A)</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>4:37</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>5:11</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>4:44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trio pt. 1</th>
<th>1887</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1892</th>
<th>Haas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A flat major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5:16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>E major</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>E major (1890: harp)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6:20</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence</td>
<td>E major</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6:37</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trio pt. 2</th>
<th>1887</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1892</th>
<th>Haas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A flat major</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7:11</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7:49</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>E major (1890: harp)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7:56</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>A flat major</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8:02</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence</td>
<td>A flat major</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>8:23</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scherzo pt. 1</th>
<th>1887</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1892</th>
<th>Haas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8:26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8:29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1 (A)</td>
<td>E flat major</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9:24</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2 (A)</td>
<td>E flat major</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9:41</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9:53</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10:52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scherzo pt. 2</th>
<th>1887</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1892</th>
<th>Haas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td>Letter K</td>
<td>woodwinds</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>10:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1 (A)</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>13:05</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2 (A)</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>13:21</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>13:39</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Anton Bruckner
Symphony no. 8 in C minor, Adagio

Part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1887</th>
<th>1888</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1892</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>mm.</td>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>D flat major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>D flat major</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>C# minor 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climax (A2)</td>
<td>A major 6-3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chorale</td>
<td>G flat major</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harp</td>
<td>to F major</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>D flat major</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climax (A2)</td>
<td>B major 6-3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chorale</td>
<td>A flat major</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harp</td>
<td>to G major</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3:16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1887</th>
<th>1888</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1892</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>mm.</td>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>E major</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climax</td>
<td>C flat major</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bn (3/4)</td>
<td>[B flat]</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6:03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bn</td>
<td>B flat minor</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6:10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1887</th>
<th>1888</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1892</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>mm.</td>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 (4/4)</td>
<td>D flat major</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marcato</td>
<td>F major 6-4</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>8:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climax</td>
<td>A flat major</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>9:06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ak (A2)</td>
<td>A flat min.</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>9:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chorale</td>
<td>G flat major</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>10:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harp</td>
<td>to B flat</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>10:28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1887</th>
<th>1888</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1892</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>mm.</td>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>E flat major</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>10:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climax</td>
<td>B flat major</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>12:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk (B1)</td>
<td>[F in bass]</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>13:06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1887</th>
<th>1888</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1892</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>mm.</td>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>E major 6-3</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>14:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siegfried</td>
<td>E flat dimin.</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>15:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>E major 6-3</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>15:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siegfried</td>
<td>G dimin.</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>15:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B flat minor</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>15:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>E flat minor</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>15:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A flat major</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>16:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A2)</td>
<td>E major</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>16:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 bewegter</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>18:07</td>
<td>A2 bewegter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 cymbals</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>18:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siegfried</td>
<td>E flat dimin.</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>22:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 bewegter</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>20:17</td>
<td>harp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 (end)</td>
<td>D flat major</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>20:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>D flat major</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>20:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>D flat major</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>21:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>D flat major</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>22:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end</td>
<td>D flat major</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>23:34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Siegfried E flat dimin.
Siegfried E flat dimin.
Siegfried G dimin.
Siegfried G dimin.
A1 B flat minor
A2 E flat minor
A2 A flat major
A2 A flat major
A2 E major
A2 E major
A2 B flat minor
A2 B flat minor
A2 B flat minor
### Anton Bruckner

**Symphony no. 8 in C minor, Finale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1887</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1892</th>
<th>Haas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>Botstein</td>
<td>Klemperer</td>
<td>Steinberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm.</td>
<td>mm.</td>
<td>mm.</td>
<td>mm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Exposition

**a** [F sharp]
- A1 to D flat major
  - mm. 1 0:00
  - mm. 2 0:25
- A2 C minor
  - mm. 31 0:46
- Ak C major
  - mm. 57 1:26
- B1 A flat major
  - mm. 69 1:44
- B1 A flat major
  - mm. 79 2:03
- B2 A flat major
  - mm. 89 2:22
- B3 C flat major
  - mm. 99 2:42
- B1 A flat major
  - mm. 111 3:07
- B2 A flat major
  - mm. 121 3:27
- Bk G flat major
  - mm. 131 3:47
- C1 E flat minor
  - mm. 147 4:18
- C1 E flat minor
  - mm. 163 4:47
- C2 E major
  - mm. 171 5:04
- C3 B flat major
  - mm. 195 5:53
- C4 E flat minor
  - mm. 223 6:44
- K1 E flat major
  - mm. 243 7:21
- K2 (C2) E flat major
  - mm. 259 7:51
- K3 (A1) E flat major
  - mm. 271 8:15
- C1 inv. E flat minor
  - mm. 285 8:40
- C2 inv. E flat major
  - mm. 307 9:27
- C1/A2 E flat minor
  - mm. 313 9:41
- A2 F minor
  - mm. 317 9:37
- A1 E flat major
  - mm. 349 11:21
- (A1) G flat major
  - mm. 397 12:06
- (A1) C major
  - mm. 415 12:38
- (A1) A major 6-3
  - mm. 441 13:19
- (A1) [E]
  - mm. 457 13:45

#### Development

**C2 inv.** E flat major
- mm. 285 8:40
- Isolde A major
  - mm. 307 9:27
- C1 inv. E flat minor
  - mm. 313 9:41
- C1/A2 E flat minor
  - mm. 329 10:11
- C1 E flat minor
  - mm. 337 10:23
- A2 F minor
  - mm. 351 10:49
- A1 E flat major
  - mm. 373 11:21
- (A1) G flat major
  - mm. 397 12:06
- (A1) C major
  - mm. 415 12:38
- (A1) A major 6-3
  - mm. 441 13:19
- (A1) [E]
  - mm. 457 13:45

#### Recapitulation

**a** [F sharp]
- A1 to G flat major
  - mm. 467 14:01
- A1 to C flat 7
  - mm. 475 14:14
- A1 to A flat major
  - mm. 483 14:27
- A1 to C major
  - mm. 497 14:50
- A1 C dimin.
  - mm. 509 15:10
- union F minor 6-4
  - mm. 533 15:48
- (unison) C major 6-3
  - mm. 551 16:17
- climax [C flat]
  - mm. 571 16:47
- homs
  - mm. 575 16:53
- B1 A flat major
  - mm. 583 17:06
- B1 A flat major
  - mm. 593 17:26
- B2 A flat major
  - mm. 603 17:46
- B3 C flat major
  - mm. 615 18:11
- Bk
  - mm. 627 18:37
- C1 C minor
  - mm. 633 18:47
- climax [G in bass]
  - mm. 667 19:48
- m. 1: A to major
  - mm. 669 19:51
- Ck dominant of C
  - mm. 677 20:08
- (A1) C minor
  - mm. 703 20:58
- (A1) D minor
  - mm. 727 21:43
- m. 2: A F major
  - mm. 735 21:58
- A2 C major
  - mm. 743 22:12
- peroration C major
  - mm. 759 23:30
- end C major
  - mm. 771 23:02
If I were to play trombone in a Bruckner symphony...

I don’t play trombone, but

If I were to play trombone in a Bruckner symphony, I would...

Bathe in yak’s blood for a month
Shave with an axe
Tattoo a picture of Thor’s hammer on my forehead

If I were to play trombone in a Bruckner symphony, I would...

Practice starting a lonnnnnng note REALLY -----ing* pianissimo, then make a lonnnnnnnnnnnnnng diminuendo to nothing
And practice the silence that follows that note, and the breath that precedes it.

If I were to play trombone in a Bruckner symphony, I would

Practice Ride of the Valkyries on the prow of a Viking attack ship
Use the severed head of a conquered Gaul for a mute
Clean my horn with the swaddling clothes of a new-born prince

If I were to play trombone in a Bruckner symphony, I would...

Take a lesson from James Brown
And another lesson from James Bond

If I were to play trombone in a Bruckner symphony, I would...

Imagine that when I play the last quarter note of the piece, the entire room would be engulfed in white fire, then go totally black on the cut off
Imagine the first soft chord of “that” chorale is so in tune that the entire universe hums and the mountains sink contentedly, just a little, into the earth beneath them every time my section plays it.
Find a sound made of stone, and another made of glass, and another made of water, and one more, made of blood

If I were to play trombone in a Bruckner symphony, I would...

Spend a month watching the loneliest man in the world, and trying to imagine my sound was his voice when at last God chose to listen to him
And I would also imagine my sound was the voice of God when he answered the loneliest man in the world with an implacable “No.”
And I would imagine my sound was the disinterested emptiness of Nature, when God had again left that man alone again

If I were to play trombone in a Bruckner symphony, I would...

Shine my shoes with Donald Trump’s hairpiece
Brush my teeth with steel wool
Wear a suit that would make Armani himself weep with jealousy, and a pocket silk of royal blue
Fill my handmade alligator-skin shoes with tiny, sharp stones, so I never feel too comfortable
And, underneath, I would wear a loin cloth made from the hide of the fallen king of the Wyoming buffalo, who I would have killed with my bare hands and skinned with my embouchure

Kenneth Woods
Conductor, cellist, chamber musician, guitarist, author

*The adjective here is somewhat robust. An unexpurgated version of the poem can be found at kennethwoods.net/blog1 posted on 26 January 2013. Ed.

Kenneth Woods conducted the Wilmslow Symphony Orchestra concert on April 20 2013. They performed Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto No.2 and Bruckner Symphony No. 7. He recited this poem before the performance where it went down rather well. Woods has a blog at kennethwoods.net/blog1 with much lively comment and details of his recordings, including the symphonies of Hans Gál.
Die Herrgotts-Symphonie
[God’s Symphony]
A Bruckner novel by Robert Hohlbaum. 1925

What follows is a translated précis of the plot:

Wolf and Bruckner are together and Wolf is playing his new songs to Bruckner, and expresses his hatred of Hanslick. Bruckner is amazed at how many songs Wolf had composed in the space of a few days; he has been working on a single motive in the Scherzo of the Ninth symphony for over two weeks. The two men go for a walk in the park. Bruckner stands still and absorbs the glories of spring, overcast by a sense of valediction. Wolf races passionately all round the park. Twilight falls and Bruckner becomes troubled by all the difficulties his Ninth presents, like a great dark wall in front of him. Two men approach, one with a deep North German bass voice, the other a Viennese with a shrill tenor voice. It is Brahms and Hanslick, and Hanslick is fulminating against “these symphonic monsters”. Wolf plants himself in front of Hanslick and whistles Beckmesser’s verses from *Die Meistersinger* at him. He then raises his hat mockingly as they pass. Bruckner is horrified, remonstrates that if Hanslick is their superior it must be the will of God. Wolf blasphemes about the will of God; Bruckner is shocked to the core.

* * * *

A Lieder concert is taking place in a well-to-do house, light streaming out the windows, plenty of chatter, the high professorial voice of Hanslick heard above it all. A group of music students listening outside argue about Hanslick and his treatment of Bruckner. Cheers for Brahms resound out of the windows; the choral students hurry off to the third rehearsal of Bruckner’s *Te Deum*.

Brahms wanders home, disenchanted by his success, and back home, seeing a portrait of himself as a young man caught by a shaft of moonlight, ponders the struggles of his life. Anxiously he listens to the wind of a growing storm. The sound of the wind carries the message of God’s compassion towards those who with painful wisdom know the frontiers of humanity. Brahms slams the window closed, but nobody hears the feeble sound.

* * * *

Bruckner sat by the window in his study. The angry words of Hugo Wolf rang louder in his confined room than the storm outside. Bruckner suffers a spiritual crisis. He prays; God doesn't hear him. Everything he has created is as dust before God.

He didn't hear a knock at the door, but suddenly three boys stood before him. Two of them gabble their apologies for intruding, they've been rehearsing his *Te Deum*. The third boy falls to his knees: he had lost God in recent years, but Bruckner’s music has restored his faith. The boys leave, a heavenly sound rises in Bruckner’s heart and fills the room, the night, the world, and rises on the soaring wind heavenwards. From the eyes of a thousand stars God looks down on the blessed ones that sing his praises.

* * * *

Hugo Wolf was caught up in the fire of creation, sounds of the storm all around him coming threateningly closer. From the flickering shadows a form materialises and icily grips his hand. A voice in his ear says, “You will never finish the song. It will become dark inside you and I shall choke you before the last sound.” Wolf throws the figure to the ground and rages against God who would turn out the light. He, Wolf, can
create something out of nothing, just like God. He’s left with an aching, ghostly chill; the eternal Other, Inexhaustible, smiles at the poor creature who boasted he could be His equal.

* * * *

In the hall of the Musikverein a performance of Brahms’s German Requiem is under way. Brahms listens. When as a younger man he had composed the work, death seemed far away; now the work seems too harmonious to confront approaching death. He looks so grimly at the applauding audience that for a moment they fall silent - then resume with redoubled enthusiasm. But Brahms remains distant and alienated from all the love that compassionately greets him.

* * * *

At the same time a proud singer from Berlin is to perform a concert for the Wagner Verein in the Bösendorfer Hall of Lieder by Hugo Wolf. She refuses to go on stage because the audience is too small, and Wolf's work not significant enough. Wolf glares at her, the vehemence of his expression forces her onto the stage, but she sabotages the concert by spiteful behaviour, deliberately inappropriate tempos etc. Each song becomes an occasion for bitter strife between the singer and Wolf the accompanist. Wolf wanders through the moonlit spring evening in a state of terrified delirium, and finally realising this is a ridiculous nightmare he trudges home.

* * * *

Wolf is stuck in a desert land where he cannot compose - nothing will come to him. He learns that Bruckner is ill and rushes to see him. Kathi won’t let him in, Bruckner will see no-one. Wolf insists that she tell him it is Hugo Wolf who wishes to see him. Bruckner can’t face seeing his friend, the young man who raged against the Almighty.

The name of Wolf sinks away in Bruckner's mind, along with everything else in the world and he sits with pen in hand waiting for his inspiration to take on form. A star in the heavens comes close and fills his heart with song, a sequence of chords such as he had never heard before. Star upon star, the music of the spheres grew in unmistakable clarity. This would be the Last, the Greatest... The ground disappears beneath him, he floats in the clouds, his hand fumbling helplessly. Silently an Old Man entered and stood behind Bruckner, looking over his shoulder.

“What have I done to deserve this honour?” stammered the Master.

“I have come to thank you for dedicating your Ninth to me.”

“It is not finished - the fourth movement remains undone.”

“Then write it with me, simple and effortless.”

“Oh, but I would rather hear for at least one time my Sixth!”

“Can’t you hear it?”

Bruckner listens - more splendid than ever it had sounded in the depths of his soul. He closes his eyes. Smaller and smaller the world sank away; ever stronger he was greeted by his peerless composition...

* * * *

Brahms is at Bruckner’s funeral. The organ and heavenly choir pierce his soul. “Do you feel how great we are? Why only now? Why only today?” He presses close to the coffin till he stands at the feet of the corpse which is transfigured before him. “Non confundar in aeternum.” With trembling hands he embraces the coffin - then staggers back before the glare of a wild pair of eyes glowing with vehement hatred. Brahms walks away, one of hundreds, and Hugo Wolf’s gaze returns to the dead man, to whom shall belong once more his great understanding and love.

Passing through the church door Johannes Brahms sees three students shaken by bewildered youthful weeping. Brahms wonders who might weep for him when he goes. “A few old people, a few women.” He feels the frost of the earth in his soul.
Wolf storms out alone into the day. That which in the church had been stillness and transfiguration, here in the troubled reflection of life was death, that followed as an inexorable shadow behind the Wanderer.

* * * *

These earthly sounds were but a faint echo of the mighty Te Deum upon whose thunder Anton Bruckner floated through heaven. For a moment, God’s heartbeat, the joyful music paused, the clouds parted, and Bruckner saw the earth he had left. He goes before God’s throne: “There are two fellows down there for whom things are worse than it ever was for me. May I ask You to send them a little heavenly sound down so that they know that You have not forgotten them?” Bruckner raises his baton. Two shimmering clouds fly down to earth. “Non confundar in aeternum.” It sinks into Brahms’s fractured soul, erases all earthly pain, grows in an old, bitter-sweet but endlessly more beautiful, transfiguring sound. The night that surrounds Wolf dissolves before victorious light. Anton Bruckner smiled. His smile was also a sound, a sound which climbed down to earth to bless all those of pure heart.

Robert Hohlbaum (August 28, 1886 – February 4, 1955) was an Austrian-German librarian, writer, and playwright. He was the son of an industrialist Alois Hohlbaum in what is now Krnov in the Czech Republic, then part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and known by its German name, Jägerndorf.

Hohlbaum studied at Graz and Vienna and received his doctorate from the University of Vienna in 1910. He gained employment as a scientific librarian, but maintained an avocation as a writer, writing principally for the journal Muskete. Hohlbaum was a nationalist and became an officer in the Austrian army during World War 1. After the war was over he became involved with the Austrian wing of the right-wing German People's Party.

In 1933 Hohlbaum moved to Germany, where he became a citizen in 1937. He thrived during the Third Reich, becoming first the director of the municipal library at Duisberg and later, in 1942, that of the state library at Weimar.

In disgrace after the war, Hohlbaum was able after a number of attempts to return to Austria in 1951. He settled first in Vienna, and later in Graz, where he died in 1955. His most significant work after the war ended was a Bruckner book, Tedeum.

Illustrations from lithographs by Kart Stratil 1894–1963
Translation and summary by Ken Ward

**World-wide Concert Selection**

**July - Oct 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.

**Argentina**
1 Aug 8.30pm, Buenos Aires, Teatro Colon +5411 4378 7100
Ravel - Concerto for Piano (left hand) Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Orquesta Filarmónica de Buenos Aires / Enrique Arturo Diemecke

**Australia**
7, 9 & 10 Aug 8pm Sydney Opera House +61 2 9250 7777
Wagner - Wesendonck Lieder Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Sydney Symphony Orchestra / Simone Young

**Austria**
6 July 6pm St Florian Abbey +43 (0)732 775227
Kropfreiter - Introduction, Meditation and Finale (organ) Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Bruckner Orchester Linz / Dennis Russell Davies
19 July, 4.30pm, St Florian Abbey - voluntary donation
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4 arr. organ, 4 hands
Arr. and performance by Peter Frisée und Roman Hauser
10 Aug 11am, 11 Aug 7.30pm Salzburg, Großes Festspielhaus, +43 662840310
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra / Christian Thielemann
15 Sep 7pm, Linz, Brucknerhaus +43 (0)732 775230
Beethoven - Piano Concerto No.3 Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Bruckner Orchester Linz / Dennis Russell Davies
18 Sep 7.30pm, Linz, Brucknerhaus +43 (0)732 775230
Bruckner - Overture in G minor Rachmaninov - Piano Concerto No. 2
Stravinsky - Rite of Spring
St Petersburg Philharmonic / Yuri Temirkanov
BRUCKNERTAGE - ST FLORIAN

18 Aug 8pm, Marble Hall
Hindemith - Trauermusik; Mozart - Piano Concerto K271
Bruckner - Christus Factus Est; Haydn - Symphony No 96
Britten - Simple Symphony
Sting solos of the Vienna Philharmonic / Matthias Giesen

19 Aug 8pm, St Florian Abbey
Bruckner - Ecce sacerdos; Part - Morning Star
Giesen - Psalm 90; Bruckner - Virga Jesse
Bruckner - Mass No. 2; Sulzer - Cantiones sacrae
hard-chor. Altomonte Orchestra Wind Ensemble / Matthias Giesen

20 Aug 8pm, Sala terrena
Wagner - Prelude to Tristan
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (arr. 2 piano, 4 hands)
Franz Farnberger, Matthias Giesen, pianos

21 Aug 8pm St Florian Abbey
Graber - Fanfare, and works by Bruckner & Wagner
arr. Organ. Giulio Mercati, Organ

22 Aug 8pm Marble Hall
Wagner - Wesendonck Lieder
& songs by Schumann, Brahms, Liszt
Angelika Kirschschlager & Helmut Deutsch

23 Aug 8pm St Florian Abbey
Bruckner - Symphony No.3 (1873)
Altomonte Orchestra / Rémy Ballot

24 Aug 8pm
Bruckner Uncensored - A Jazz tour of the monastery - Vienna Symphony Jazz Project

19 Sep 7.30pm, Linz, Brucknerhaus +43 (0)732 775230
Bruckner - Psalm 150
Fiala - Lux Aeterna Jenkins - The Armied Man
Upper Austrian Youth Orchestra / Mirga Gražinytė-Tyla

19 Sep 7.30pm, Vienna: Musikverein +43 1505 8190
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Vienna Philharmonic / Lorin Maazel

21 Sep 6pm Linz, Brucknerhaus +43 (0)732 775230
Bach - Toccata & Fugue in D minor. arr. accordions
Mozart - Fantasy K608 arr. accordions
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6 Adagio arr. accordions
M Stockhausen - Ein Glasenperl
Norddeutsches Philharmonisches Akkordeon-Orchester / Gil Raveh

24 Sep 7.30pm Linz, Brucknerhaus +43 (0)732 775230
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Vienna Philharmonic / Lorin Maazel

26 Sep 8pm, St Florian +43 (0)732 775230
Works by Krospfreiter on 10th anniversary of his death
Bruckner - Tota Pulchra es Maria; Te Deum
Altomonte Orchestra St Florian / Matthias Giesen

2 Oct 7.30pm Linz, Brucknerhaus +43 (0)732 775230
Ways between Bruckner and Wagner
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7, Adagio, arr. organ
Wagner - Prelude Tristan, Overture Rienzi, Prelude Parsifal
Prelude Act 1 Die Meistersinger
Hansjörg Albrecht - organ

4 Oct 7.30pm Linz, Brucknerhaus +43 (0)732 775230
5 Oct 7.30pm Vienna: Musikverein +43 1505 8190
Rimsky-Korsakov - Russian Easter Overture
Prokofiev - Violin Concerto No 2
Bruckner - Symphony No. 1
London Philharmonic Orchestra / Vladimir Jurowski

6 Oct 6pm St Florian +43 (0)732 775230
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Bruckner Orchestra Linz / Dennis Russell Davies

8 Oct 8pm Puchheim, Basilika Maria
Mozart - Symphony No. 32
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Bruckner Orchestra Linz / Dennis Russell Davies

11 Oct 3.30pm, Vienna: Musikverein +43 1505 8190
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5 - public rehearsal
Vienna Philharmonic / Herbert Blomstedt

Brazil
12 Oct 8pm Rio de Janeiro, Theatro Municipal +55 21 4003 2330
Part - Silouans Song Elgar - Cello Concerto
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Brazilian Symphony Orchestra / Roberto Mincuk

Canada
19, 21 Sep 8pm Montréal, Maison symphonique +1 514 842-2112
Mozart - Overture Magic Flute; Violin Concerto No. 5
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3
Orchestre Symphonique de Montréal / Kent Nagano

Denmark
3 Oct 7.30pm Copenhagen, Koncerthuset, +45 3520 6262
Dean - Trumpet Concerto Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
DR Symphony Orchestra / John Storgårds

24 Oct 7.30pm Copenhagen, Koncerthuset, +45 3520 6262
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
DR Symphony Orchestra / Herbert Blomstedt

Finland
9, 10 Oct 7pm Helsinki Music Centre +358 600 900 900
Shostakovich - Scottish Ballad Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Helskinki Philharmonic / Thomas Sanderling

France
4 July 9pm, Colmar, Eglise protestante St-Matthieu
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Radio Symphony Orchestra Berlin / Marek Janowski

Germany
1 July 8pm Darmstadt, Staatstheater +49 6151 281160
Hovhaness - Symphony No. 2 Mysterious Mountain
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Orchester des Staatstheaters Darmstadt / Martin Lukas Meister

1 July 7.30pm Weimar, Konzertzentrum +49 (0)3643 842-2112
Rott - A Prelude to Julius Caesar
Jolivet - Concerto for Bassoon, Strings, Harp & Piano
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Staatkapelle Weimar / Sebastian Weigle

6, 7 July 8pm Lübeck Music & Congress Centre +49 (0)451 7904 400
Schumann - Piano Concerto Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
NDR Sinfonieorchester Hamburg / Thomas Hengelbrock

7 July 11am, 8, 9 July 8pm Köln Philharmonie +49 (0)221 280 280
Jongen - Symphony Concertante for Organ & Orchestra
Bruckner - Te Deum
Gürzenich Orchester Köln / Marcus Stenz

10, 11 July 8pm Duisburg, Theater am Marienstor +49 (0)203 3009100
Tönende Apokalypse - Sounding the Apocalypse
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Duisburger Philharmoniker / Cristian Maneal
12 July 8pm München, Matthäuskirche am Sendlinger-Tor-Platz
**Bruckner** - Mass No. 2, and motets
Münchner Motettenchor / Hayko Siemens

14 July 11am, 15 July 8pm, 16 July 7pm
Karlruhe, Badische Staatstheater +49 (0)721 933333
**Schönleben** - Violin Concerto No. 4
**Bruckner** - Symphony No. 9
Badische Staatskapelle / Justin Brown

14 July 5pm, Ebrach, Musiksommer +49 (0)9552 297
**Bruckner** - Symphony No. 5
Philharmonie Festiva / Gerč Schaller

14 July 6pm, 16, 17 July 7.30pm Münster Großer Haus +49 (0)25159 09100
**Britten** - Violin Concerto
**Bruckner** - Symphony No. 5
Sinfonieorchester Münster / Fabrizio Ventura

20 July 8pm, Schwäbisch Gmünd, Heilig-Kreuz-Münster
**Bach** (arr. Webern) - Ricercar 6 voices
**Bruckner** - Symphony No. 4
Radio Sinfonieorchester Stuttgart / Michael Sanderling

21 July 3pm Ottobeuren, Basilika +49 (0)8332 921950
**Bruckner** - Symphony No. 4
Radio Sinfonieorchester Stuttgart / Michael Sanderling

27 July 7pm Herrenchiemsee, Spiegelsaal +49(0)89 936093
**Bach** - Suite No. 3 in D and Concerto for 2 violins in D minor
**Bruckner** - Symphony No. 6
Orchester der KlangVerwaltung / Enoch zu Guttenberg

6 Aug 8pm Berlin, Konzerthaus +49 (0)30 203092101
**Mahler** - Blumine (from Symphony No. 1)
**Sauseng** - Rose aus Asche **Bruckner** - Symphony No. 7
Vienna Youth Orchestra / Herbert Böck

21 Aug 8pm Wiesbaden, Kurhaus +49 (0) 611 1729290
**Mozart** - Piano Concerto No. 20 **Bruckner** - Symphony No. 3
hr-Sinfonieorchester / Paavo Järvi

25 Aug 11:15am, 26 Aug. 7.30pm Oldenburg, Staatstheater
**Wagner** - Prelude to Parsifal +49 (0)441 2225111
**Liszt** - Piano Concerto No. 1 **Bruckner** - Symphony No. 6
Oldenburgisches Staatsorchester / Roger Eppe

29, 30, 31 Aug 8pm Berlin, Konzerthaus +49 (0)30 203092101
**Schubert** - Symphony No. 8 **Bruckner** - Symphony No. 9
Konzerthausorchester Berlin / Iván Fischer

1 Sep 5pm Ebrach, Musiksommer +49 (0)9552 297
**Bruckner** - Symphony No. 6 **Philharmonie Festiva** / Gerč Schaller

7 Sep 7pm Reedøfin, Langstedt +49 (0)385 591 8585
**Weber** - Clarinet Concertino **Bruckner** - Symphony No. 8
Vienna Philharmonic / Lorin Maazel

8 Sep 7pm, Bonn, Beethovenhalle, + 49 (0) 228 5020 1313
**Beethoven** - Egmont Overture
**Schumann** - Piano Concerto **Bruckner** - Symphony No. 4
NDR Symphony Orchestra Hamburg / Thomas Hengelbrock

25 Sep 3pm Ottobeuren, Basilika +49 (0)8332 921950
**Bruckner** - Mass No. 3
Choir of Zürich Opera, Zürich Philharmonia / Marc Albrecht

28 Sep 7.30pm Sondershausen, Haus der Kunst +49 036 3278 8111
29 Sep 7.30pm Nordhausen, Theater +49 (0) 36 1198 5852
**d’Albert** - Aschenputtel Suite **Schubert** (arr. Liszt) - Wanderer Fantasy
**Bruckner** - Symphony No. 6
Loh-Orchester Sondershausen / Markus L Frank

28 Sep 8pm Odenthal, Altenberger Dom +49 (0)2174 419930
**Mendelssohn** - Symphony No. 5 **Bruckner** - Mass No. 1
Wuppertal Concert Society Choir, Bayer Philharmoniker / Bernhard Steiner

30 Sep 6pm, 1, 2 Oct 7.30 pm Schwerin, Staatstheater 0049 (0)385 53000
Works by **Bruckner** and others
Mecklenburgische Staatskapelle / Marcus Bosch

6 Oct 7.30pm Recklinghausen “Ruhfestspielsaal” +49 2091477999
7, 8, 9 Oct 7.30pm Gelsenkirchen, Musiktheater im Revier
**Wagner** - Overture *Die Fene* +49 (0)209 4097200
**Bartok** - Violà Concerto **Bruckner** - Symphony No. 6
Neue Philharmonie Westfalen / Heiko Mathias Förster

11, 12 Oct 8pm Berlin, Konzerthaus +49 (0)30 203092101
**Britten** - Symphony for Cello & Orchestra
**Bruckner** - Symphony No. 2
Konzerthausorchester Berlin / Mario Venzago

12 Oct 7pm Ulm, Münster +49 (0)731 161 4444
**Bruckner** - Symphony No.8
Philharmonisches Orchester der Stadt Ulm / Timo Handschuh

18 Oct 8pm, Berlin, Konzerthaus, Kleiner Saal +49 (0)30 203092101
**Gesualdo** - 10 Madrigals from Bk V arr. string quintet
**Bruckner** - String Quintet
M. Erxleben, G. Gunnarsdottir vlns; B. Rivińius, F. Korinth vlas; S. Gigiber cello.

31 Oct 8 pm, 2 Nov 7 pm, 3 Nov 11am, München Philharmonie im Gasteig, +49 (0)8954 818181
**Beethoven** - Piano Concerto No. 3 **Bruckner** - Symphony No. 4
Münchner Philharmoniker / Alan Gilbert

1 Nov 6pm Baden Baden, Festspielhaus +49 (0)7221 30 13101
**Mendelssohn** - 3 Psalms
**Brahms** - Warum ist das Licht gegeben den Mühseligen
**Bruckner** - Ave Maria, Os Justi, Locus iste; Mass No. 2
RIAS Kammerchor; Akademie für Alte Musik Berlin / H-C Rademann

**Japan**
5 July 7.15pm, 6 July 2pm Tokyo Sumida Triphony Hall +81 3 5608 5404
**Sciarrino** - Autoritratto nella Notte
**Zimmermann, B A** - Musique pour les soupers du Roi Ubu
**Bruckner** - Symphony No. 7

New Japan Philharmonic / Kazushi Ono
13 July 3.30pm Kamakura Arts Centre +81 (0)120 119240
**Mozart** - Piano Concerto No. 9 K 271 **Bruckner** - Symphony No. 4
NHK Symphony Orchestra / Mchinoshi Inoue

10 Aug 7pm, 11 Aug 4pm, Yamagata, Terssa Hall +81 (0)23 646 6677
**Salieri** - Overture Falstaff **Dittersdorf** - Harp Concerto
**Bruckner** - Symphony No. 1 (Vienna version)
Yamagata Symphony Orchestra / Norichika Imori

27 Sep 7pm Osaka, Symphony Hall +81 (0)6 64536000
**Bruckner** - Symphony No. 8 (1887)
Osaka Symphony Orchestra / Hiroshi Kodama

12 Oct 6pm Tokyo Suntory Hall +81 3 3584 9999
14 Oct 2pm Tokyo Metropolitan Art Space +81 3 59851707
**Skwaczewski** - Passacaglia Imaginaria
**Bruckner** - Symphony No. 4
Yomiuri Nippon Symphony Orchestra / Stanislaw Skrwaczewski

13, 14 Oct 2pm Tokyo Sumida Triphony Hall +81 3 5608 5404
**Schumann** - Cello Concerto **Bruckner** - Symphony No. 6
New Japan Philharmonic / Tatsuya Shimoto

3 Nov 2pm, Kawasaki Symphony Hall +81 44520 0200
4 Nov 2pm Tokyo Suntory Hall +81 3 3584 9999
**Sibelius** - Violin Concerto **Bruckner** - Symphony No. 4
Tokyo Symphony Orchestra / Hubert Soudant
Netherlands
6 July 8pm Amsterdam, Concertgebouw +31 (0)20 6718345
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 18  Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Radio Filharmonisch Orkest / Marc Albrecht

28, 30 Sep 8.15pm Amsterdam, Concertgebouw +31 (0)20 6718345
Brahms - Violin Concerto  Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Netherlands Philharmonic Orchestra / Marc Albrecht

25 Oct 8.15pm, 27 Oct 2.15pm Amsterdam, Concertgebouw
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5  +31 (0)20 6718345
Amsterdam Concertgebouw Orchestra / Nikolaus Harnoncourt

Norway
17, 18 Oct 7.30pm Bergen, Grieghallen +47 5521 6150
Schubert - Symphony No. 5  Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Bergen Philharmonic Orchestra / Robbin Ticciati

Romania
13 Sep 7.30pm Bucharest, Sala Palatului +4021315 7372
Rimsky-Korsakov - Russian Easter Overture
Prokofiev - Violin Concerto No. 2  Bruckner - Symphony No. 1
London Philharmonic Orchestra / Vladimir Jurowski

Russia
27 Oct 7pm Moscow, Conservatory, Great Hall +7 495 629 9401
Britten - Violin Concerto  Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1889)
Tchaikovsky Symphony Orchestra / Vladimir Fedoseyev

South Korea
24 July 8pm, Seoul Arts Center +82 (0)2580 1300
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Bucheon Philharmonic Orchestra / Hun Joug Lim

Spain
23 Aug 8pm San Sebastián, Auditorio Kursaal+34 943 00 30 00
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 20  Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1889)
Orquesta Sinfónica de Euskadi (arr. Guilmant) - Sinfonia, Cantata BWV 29

10 Oct 6pm, 11 Oct 7.30pm Stockholm, Berwaldhallen +46 (0)8784 1800
Beethoven - Piano Concerto No. 3  Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Swedish Radio Symphony Orchestra / Daniel Harding

Switzerland
23, 26 Aug 7.30pm, 24 Aug 6.30pm, Lucerne, Culture & Congress Centre +41 41226 7777
Schubert - Symphony No. 8  Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Lucerne Festival Orchestra / Claudio Abbado

5 Sep 7.30pm Lucerne, Culture & Congress Centre +41 41226 7777
Eisler - Ernstie Gesang  Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Staatskapelle Dresden / Christian Thielemann

14 Sep 6.30pm Lucerne, Culture & Congress Centre +41 41226 7777
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8  +41 312 294 3000
Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra / Lorin Maazel

15 Sept 3pm Zürich, Opera House +41 44 268 6666
Bruckner - Mass No. 3
Choir of Zürich Opera, Zürich Philharmonia / Marc Albrecht

UK
8 Aug 7.30 Aldeburgh, Snape Maltings +44 (0)1728 687110
Britten - Cello Concerto  Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Britten-Pears Orchestra / Robin Ticciati

Bruch - Violin Concerto No. 1  Bruckner - Symphony No. 9 (with finale, SPCM)
Orchestra of the Canongate / Robert Dieck

24 Aug 8pm, Edinburgh, Usher Hall +44 (0)131 228 1155
Brahms - Violin Concerto No. 1  Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1889)
Tonhalle-Orchester Zürich / David Zinman

29 Aug 7.30pm, London Royal Albert Hall 0845 401 5034
Mozart - Der Schauspieldirektor, Overture  Éötvös - DoReMi
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Philharmonia Orchestra / Esa-Pekka Salonen

3 Sep 7pm London Royal Albert Hall 0845 401 5034
Beethoven - Piano Concerto No. 2  Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Oslo Philharmonic Orchestra / Vasily Petrenko

6 Sep 7.30pm London Royal Albert Hall 0845 401 5034
Bach (arr. Guilmant) - Sinfonia, Cantata BWV 29
Bach - 3 Chorale Preludes, BWV 662, 667, 668
Bach - Prelude & Fugue in A minor, BWV 543
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Klaus Sonnleitner - organ
Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra / Lorin Maazel

16 Nov 7.30pm Bath Abbey
Bach - Jesu, meine Freude, chorale
Bruckner - Mass No.2

Britten - Missa brevis, for boys voices and organ
City of Bath Bach Choir / Nigel Perrin - Michael Sealy, organ

USA
July 31 6.30 pm Chicago, Millennium Park
Bruckner - Symphony No. 2

Grant Park Orchestra / Carlos Kalmar

31 Oct, 1, 2 Nov 8pm; 3 Nov 3pm Chicago, Symphony Center
Mozart - Piano Concerto K 595
Chicago Symphony Orchestra / Bernard Haitink

With gratitude to Mr. Tatsuro Ouchi whose website
www.bekkoame.ne.jp/~hippo/musik/konzertvorschau/bruckner.html
is the source for much of the concert listing information

A recommended web-site for locating
Bruckner (and all other) concerts:

www.bachtrack.com

---

**Bruckner Society of America**

Kilenyi Medal of Honor has been presented to:

Maestro Christoph von Dohnanyi - February 16, 2013 - Symphony Hall, Boston USA
Maestro Leon Botstein - February 24, 2013 - Peter North Symphony Space, New York City
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