Bruckner on a small scale

IT IS THE IMMENSE canvasses upon which Bruckner painted his symphonies, and the extensive palette of late-Romantic orchestral colour, that appeal in the first instance to many of those who love his music. On almost the same scale but with a necessarily more restrained range of sound is the string quintet (a much anticipated recording of which by the Fitzwilliam String Quartet is in need of support - see next page), in which Bruckner shows himself to be a master of the small ensemble. But he never wrote any music for chamber orchestra.

Bruckner for chamber orchestra was brought into the world courtesy of Schoenberg’s ‘Society for Private Musical Performances’ in an arrangement of the Seventh Symphony by Eisler, Stein and Rankl, which is now quite often performed, recorded and well received. In March 2013 the students of the Royal Academy of Music in London premiered a splendid chamber orchestra arrangement of the Second Symphony by Anthony Payne, conducted with conviction and affection by Trevor Pinnock, a recording of which is due for release soon. Possibly the sheer lyricism of the thematic material of those two symphonies makes them the most likely candidates for the chamber orchestra treatment.

But we learn from the ever-inventive organisers of the BrucknerTage festival in St Florian of a project to celebrate the Bruckner double centenary in 2024, to commission, perform and record chamber versions of all the symphonies by musicians from all over the world. In the cellar beneath the library at St Florian they have also hosted ‘jazz versions’ of the symphonies, and these too will be part of the project. And Australian musicologist John Phillips has mentioned a very exciting upcoming CD release, for Preiser Records, by Argentinian-Austrian conductor Ricardo Luna, of Bruckner sketches and fragments arranged for the very ensemble used for Schoenberg’s concerts, including an arrangement of Phillips’ Documentation of the Fragments of the Finale of Symphony No. 9.

There is something very appealing about these performances of Bruckner by more manageable ensembles. Of course you miss the grand tutti statements, the blazing brass, the full string sound, the sheer power, but you gain intimacy, revealing clarity, the special communicativeness of solo playing, and a suitability for resources and venues that might otherwise find the requirements of a Bruckner symphony prohibitive.

kw
Letter to the editor

From John Proffitt, Houston, Texas USA

THANK YOU for publishing the report on Prof. Paul Hawkshaw’s newly published Critical Report on the Bruckner Eighth Symphony on Page 1 of the July TBJ. I am pleased to see the charge against Robert Haas of falsification in his edition of the Eighth Symphony refuted by Hawkshaw’s research, which discovered the disputed measures 609 - 615 of the Finale in Bruckner’s own hand, mislabeled by Bruckner himself as belonging to the Adagio and hence stored among the Adagio papers. To quote Hawkshaw, “Haas didn’t compose these measures; he didn’t compose anything.” For years Haas has been posthumously pilloried for two very specific musical sins - the mixing of different sources for his composite edition and composing the bridge passage in question himself. The first “sin” will remain a matter of musicological debate and ultimately a question of taste over which people of good will will continue to disagree; the second alleged “sin” was in my opinion much more serious in its implied charge of fraud against Haas - and I am happy to see that particular issue resolved. I do wonder, however, how long it will take the anti-Haas “lobby” to acknowledge this new information?

On a different matter from the March TBJ, I would like to comment on, and supplement, David Singerman’s review of The Wind and Wind-Chorus Music of Anton Bruckner by Keith William Kinder. Prior to publication, Prof. Kinder contacted me in Houston for information regarding the world premiere compact disc recording I had produced a few years earlier of choral works of Bruckner. This recording, Albany Records CD TROY 063, remains in print. It contains seventeen Bruckner works, including the first (and to the best of my knowledge, only) recordings of Germanenzug (1863) and Das deutsche Lied (1892), both excellent examples of the composer’s writing for male chorus and brass ensemble. Germanenzug was acknowledged by Bruckner to be his first ”real” composition and, in fact, the middle movement (“Light illumines Odin’s Hall, far from Earthly Pain”) was sung at his funeral in 1896. Das deutsche Lied was composed in June 1892, between Psalm 150 and Helgoland and is, therefore, the penultimate work to be completed by Bruckner. Its trenchant brass writing is quite similar to the opening pages of the Finale of the Ninth Symphony. Though lasting slightly less than three minutes in performance, this motet packs a potent, and dramatic, punch in its brief span. Both works are central to this genre, and both are very much available on the Albany recording.

* * * * *

THE FITZWILLIAM STRING QUARTET has a significant unfinished recording project that has been gathering dust for some time now: Bruckner’s String Quintet (plus Intermezzo) and String Quartet on 1870s Viennese style gut strings, with violist James Boyd. The music has already been recorded by engineer Phil Hobbs but they need to find £1,200 to pay for editing before it goes into production, since their regular label found they were unable to fund/release it without a financial contribution from the FSQ. Record companies in general seem no longer willing to take the risks they once did. Indeed, there have been big changes in the industry since the Fitzwilliam was first signed up by Decca in 1974. Having invested so much time and study into this recording they decided the only way forward was to dig into their own pockets, leaving the quartet kitty virtually empty. Anyone who pledges support will receive a free download of the Bruckner recording when it comes out.

If you wish to take part in supporting this project, you can send cheques to FSQ, c/o Heather Tuach, 20 Batchelor Street, London N1 0EG or by credit card using PayPal to brucknerjournal@gmail.com (be sure to specify what the payment is for)

Donald Macauley’s biography of Robert Simpson
The Power of Robert Simpson
will be reviewed by Dr Dermot Gault in the next issue of The Bruckner Journal.

Published by Xlibris, 418 pp, available from www.xlibrispublishing.co.uk, and other on-line outlets and good bookshops. Paperback price in the region of £16.

“Consult with your friends, with Schalk.”

More Questions and Answers from Sources for the Eighth Symphony

Paul Hawkshaw,  
Yale School of Music

TWELVE YEARS ago the present author began a long-overdue critical report for Leopold Nowak’s scores of the eighth symphony.\(^2\) Thanks in large part to the infinite wisdom and patience of the staff of the Music Collection of the Austrian National Library and the Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag (Vienna), the volume is finally at the press. Along a route full of surprises, the study evolved into a reassessment of the tumultuous history, as told in more than eighty primary sources, of the genesis of the two manuscript versions and four editions in which the eighth symphony is presently known. The following is a summary of the findings with some observations about the participation of the brothers Franz and Josef Schalk in the compositional processes, as well as some specific thoughts on Robert Haas’s editorial approach.

First a brief recap of the well-known history of the symphony:\(^3\) Bruckner composed the work between the summer of 1884 and August 1887. On 19 September 1887, he sent the score to one of his staunchest supporters, the conductor Hermann Levi, in the hopes of obtaining a first performance in Munich.\(^4\) Levi’s now famous rejection of the symphony (cited above) in early October 1887 served as catalyst for a tortuous series of revisions that culminated in a new version of the symphony completed in March 1890. The readings in the manuscript scores of 1887 and 1890 have since come to be identified as the first and second versions of the symphony (VIII/1 and VIII/2).\(^5\) In March 1892, the first edition appeared, edited by Josef Schalk and Max von Oberleitner.\(^6\) It differed from both the 1887 and 1890 manuscript scores, although the second version served as its starting point. Hans Richter conducted the Vienna Philharmonic in a triumphant premiere using the first edition score on 18 December 1892. Over the course of the twentieth century, the Bruckner Collected Works Edition published three scores of the symphony: two different readings of the second, or 1890, version (affectionately known as Haas and Nowak) and one of the first edited by Leopold Nowak.\(^7\) The contrasting editorial stances of Robert Haas and Leopold Nowak in their respective editions of VIII/2 have been a source of controversy for more than half a century.\(^8\) New scores of both versions are now in preparation for the New Bruckner Edition.\(^9\)

---

\(^1\) The author would like to thank Doctor Mario Aschauer very much for his helpful comments on the present paper. Hermann Levi gave Bruckner the advice to consult with his friends, specifically with Josef Schalk, in his letter of 7 October 1887 rejecting the eighth symphony. "...beraten Sie sich mit Ihren Freunden, mit Schalk." Andrea Harrandt and Otto Schneider\(^+\), eds. _Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe_, XXIV/1/2, Briefe, 1887-1896. (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1998/2009 and 2003), 2:23. [Harrandt].


\(^4\) Harrandt, 2:21.

\(^5\) Throughout this article, all sources originating as part of the composition and copying of the first manuscript version will be identified as belonging to VIII/1 and those associated with the second version as belonging to VIII/2. For much of the twentieth century, Levi’s rejection of the symphony was the subject of a serious misunderstanding. Josef Schalk was believed to have communicated the bad news to Bruckner that Levi could not conduct the work. See for example the Forewords to both of Leopold Nowak’s editions of the symphony. Fortunately Levi’s rejection letter of 7 October 1887 directly to the composer has been found in Munich by musicologist Laurence Dreyfus and since been published in Bruckner’s collected letters. Harrandt 2:23.

\(^6\) Robert Haas, ed. _Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe_, VIII, VIII. Symphonie c-Moll [1890]. (Leipzig, 1939) [Haas] and Nowak 1 and 2. The contrasting editorial stances of Robert Haas and Leopold Nowak in their respective editions of VIII/2 have been a source of controversy for more than half a century.


THE EIGHTH SYMPHONY survives in well over ten thousand folios of autograph and copy scores, score fragments, sketches and performance parts, by far the largest body of sources for any Bruckner composition. Considered all together, they fill in many details of the historical sketch outlined above; they provide definitive information about some troublesome editorial issues; and they pose some surprising biographical questions specifically about the relationship between Bruckner and the Schalks. The findings of the Critical Report can be summarized in ten points as follows.

1. An unprecedented number of sketches and copy scores survive for the first version. At one point, the first movement and Adagio existed in complete score skeletons with orchestration and content considerably different from what we know. Bruckner not only lavished considerable care on the composition of the first version, as soon as it was finished, he was confident enough in the result to make a sizable investment purchasing at least two complete copy scores and possibly an additional score for two of the movements.

2. Levi’s rejection remains the single most important event in the history of the symphony. Not only did it signal the beginning of Bruckner’s revisions, it triggered the direct involvement of Franz and Josef Schalk in the compositional process as Bruckner followed Levi’s advice. Deryck Cooke, though relying entirely on secondary literature, was not far from the mark when he labeled the second version the “Bruckner-Schalk revision.”

3. The revision process for VIII/2 was inextricably bound up with and similar to contemporaneous preparations for printing the third and fourth symphonies. Josef Schalk’s remark to his brother on 26 November 1888 is particularly telling in this regard: “Above all he [Bruckner] wants to submit the many alterations he is now undertaking with extraordinary intensity and diligence to the third and eighth symphonies to you and your judgment.” Many of Bruckner’s best-known paleographic idiosyncrasies – extensive voice-leading marginalia, frequent passages of pencil overwritten in ink, and the ubiquitous superfluous accidentals, for example – originated in the revision scores of the late 1880s as he devised methods of assessing, assimilating and correcting his students’ work as well as his own. His students eventually grew impatient with these analytical processes and began to bypass the composer all together.

4. However much the Schalks were involved, and however confused its contents may appear, Bruckner must accept sole responsibility for the final reading of VIII/2 now preserved in Wn Mus. Hs. 19.480 and 40.999.

5. Unless one is willing to recognize each of thousands of surviving revisions as a separate reading, the traditional understanding of two manuscript versions remains valid from both paleographic and musical perspectives. As Dermot Gault has pointed out, an intermediate reading of the Adagio survives in the copy score Wn Mus. Hs. 34.614 b. Claims to the contrary in the recent literature notwithstanding, this manuscript contains no autograph entrances. Those that have been attributed to Bruckner are in the hand of Josef Schalk. Who arranged for the preparation of this source - Bruckner or the Schalks - is not known at present. Alexander Hermann suggests that very early revisions to the end of the development of the first movement in Wn Mus. Hs. 4041 and 4044

---

10 The new report [Hawkshaw] contains two catalogues of all the sources – one by location and one by content; detailed descriptions of their contents; and facsimiles of many of them. Digital reproductions of the sources in the Austrian National Library can be found by searching the HANNA catalogue on the library’s website.

11 Hawkshaw, Nos. 1-38, 42-46, 57 and 59. The changes in orchestration throughout the history of the composition of the first movement, for example, are listed in Table 3 below. Greater awareness of the existence of these skeletons might insert a note of caution into discussions of the Finale completions of the ninth symphony.


13 Harrandt 2: 45-46. “Jede der vielen Änderungen, die er jetzt mit ausserordentlich angestrengtem Fleisse an der 8. od[er]. 3. vornimmt, wünschte er vor allem dir und deinem Urtheil zu unterbreiten.”

14 Hawkshaw Nos. 57-60. The library sigla used in this paper are as follows: Kj Jagiellonian University Library, Cracow; Kr Benedictine Monastery Library, Kremsmunster; Wgm Archive of the Society for the Friends of Music, Vienna; Wlc Library of Congress, Washington; and Wn Music Collection of the Austrian National Library, Vienna.
constituted a distinct version. These ultimately unused measures, while more extensive than most, had no more staying power than thousands of other changes that also fell by the wayside.\(^\text{15}\)

6. However disappointed Bruckner may have been at Levi’s rejection, his initial reaction was not one of negative impetuosity with wholesale house cleaning. Bruckner wrote to Levi on 20 October 1887: “I will do whatever I can to the best of my knowledge and ability.”\(^\text{16}\) He abandoned the earlier reading gradually over an extended period.

7. Though the manuscripts for the four movements of the second version (Wn Mus. Hs. 19.480 and 40.999) are dated between March 1889 and March 1890, many undated revisions must be assigned to the period between October 1887 and the winter 1888-89.

8. It is now possible to identify the passages that Bruckner recommended to cut from performances of VIII/2 as opposed to those proposed by the editors in the first edition.\(^\text{17}\)

9. Preparations for the first edition are well documented in more than two dozen letters dating from 12 June 1891 to 9 March 1892 from Robert Lienau, Max von Oberleithner, Carl Röder and Josef Schalk indicating that the editors deliberately bypassed the composer.\(^\text{18}\)

10. In their editions of VIII/2, both Robert Haas and Leopold Nowak mixed layers of revision. Given the material that Bruckner left us, it is impossible to make an acceptable score of this version without doing so.

As is well known, the principal text of movements one, two and four is preserved as Wn Mus Hs 19.480, and the Adagio as Wn Mus. Hs. 40.999. The first movement is a copy score of the first version by Karl Aigner, not Leopold Hofmeyr as is often claimed, into which Bruckner wrote his revisions.\(^\text{19}\) The Scherzo/Trio is a new autograph score created specifically for VIII/2. The Adagio is also a copy in an unidentified hand (Anonymous 8/2) of the first version that Bruckner modified for VIII/2. In the Finale, he used the autograph score of the first version to make his revisions. In all four movements, two more copyists assisted Bruckner: Leopold Hofmeyr and Anonymous 8/1. Autograph dates in the four manuscripts confirm that he worked on them between 4 March 1889 and 10 March 1890; these have traditionally been regarded in the literature as the revision dates for VIII/2.\(^\text{20}\)

Bruckner worked on the new version in many other surviving manuscripts as indicated in Table 1. Most are revised sources for VIII/1 rather than newly prepared material for VIII/2, and many were discarded from Wn Mus. Hs 19.480 and 40.999. Layers of compositional activity in the sources and the testimony of numerous passages in Bruckner’s and the Schalks’ correspondence confirm that the spurt of activity between March 1889 and March 1890 was the culmination of an extended gradual transition that began soon after the composer learned of Levi’s decision. Bruckner in fact altered many passages numerous times between 1887 and 1890. Because the composer did not date any of the changes prior to March 1889, and because many are in pencil that has been erased, covered over or long since faded, it is difficult to establish a chronology of the intervening stages with much precision. Table 1 presents a hypothesis.


\(^{16}\) Harrandt 2:26: “Es wird das Möglichste geschehen – nach bestem Wissen und Gewissen.”


\(^{18}\) Wn Fonds 32 Oberleithner 168, 169, 250, 251 and 252.

\(^{19}\) Robert Haas, for example, misidentified the copyist as Leopold Hofmeyr on fol 2r of Wn Mus. Hs. 19.480, vol. 1.

\(^{20}\) See, for example, Nowak 2, “Vorwort.”
Table 1

Hypothetical Chronology of Revisions for VIII/2

1887

Wn Mus. Hs. 6083, 1st movt (and 1888)
Wn Mus. Hs. 40.987, 1st movt (possibly 1888)

1888-February, 1889

Wn Mus. Hs. 6044, 1st movt (possibly earlier)
Wn Mus. Hs. 6041, 1st movt (possibly earlier)
Wn Mus. Hs. 6002 b, 1st movt (possibly later)
Wn Mus. Hs. 6039, 1st movt (possibly earlier)
Wn Mus. Hs. 28.432, 1st movt
Wn Mus. Hs. 19.480/1, 1st movt (and later; possibly earlier)
Wn Mus. Hs. 28.419, 1st movt (Franz and Josef Schalk)
Wn Mus. Hs. 6084, Scherzo/Trio (and later)
Wn Mus. Hs. 34.613, Scherzo/Trio (Franz Schalk)
Wn Mus. Hs. 19.480/3, Adagio (possibly earlier)
Wn Mus. Hs. 40.999, Adagio (and later)
Wn Mus. Hs. 28.235, Adagio
Wn Mus. Hs. 6053, Adagio
Kr C56/14 V a 5-7, Adagio
Wgm A178 iii-vi, Adagio
Wn Mus. Hs. 34.614 b, Adagio (Josef Schalk)
Wn Mus. Hs. 6053, unidentified sketches (Finale ?)
Kr C56/14 III-1 b, Finale
Kr C56/14 II-2 g-i, Finale
Kj c, Finale
Kr C56/14 a4, Finale
Kj h and [j], Finale
Wn Mus. Hs. 19.480/4, Finale (and later)

March 1889–March 1890

Wgm A178 i-ii, 1st movt
Wn Mus. Hs. 6002 a and c, 1st movt (and earlier)
Wn Mus. Hs. 19.480/1, 1st movt (and earlier)
Kj a, Trio
Wn Mus. Hs. 28.242, Trio
Wn Mus. Hs. 19.480/2, Scherzo/Trio
Kr C56/14 V a1, Adagio
Wn Mus. Hs. 40.999, Adagio (and earlier)
Wgm A178 vii, Adagio
Wlc ML 96.B82 a Music 1229, Finale
Kj f, Finale
Kr C56/14 III-2 j, Finale
Kj g, Finale
Kj i, Finale
Kj k, Finale
Wgm A178 xi, Finale
Wn Mus. Hs. 19.480/4 (and earlier)
Without question the most startling revelation in the sources is the extraordinary extent to which Bruckner involved Franz and Josef Schalk in the revisions for the second version. Table 2 lists the manuscripts for the eighth symphony that were in the possession of the Schalk Family. The relationship between Bruckner and the brothers as reflected in these sources raises unanswerable and troubling questions about his frame of mind revising the work as well as about the specifics of his interaction with his students. Friedrich Eckstein described Bruckner’s conversations with them as follows: “I know that every note … was set in stone during endless conversations among Bruckner, Franz and Josef Schalk, and [Ferdinand] Löwe… It is certain that these conductors advised Bruckner regarding changes at least in the instrumentation, but also in tempo and dynamics.” José Schalk confirmed Eckstein’s observation in the above-cited letter of 26 November 1888 when he told his brother that Bruckner was working diligently on revisions to symphonies three and eight and wanted “above all” to consult Franz about them. In fact the Schalks were both working on the eighth symphony before the first version was finished and continued to be involved until the first edition appeared. Josef prepared a four-hand arrangement of the first two movements during the summer of 1886, and Franz had either already started, or was about to begin, a new orchestration of the first movement in May 1887 (Wn Mus. Hs. 28.419). Bruckner continued to consult with Josef at least as late as 31 January 1890 when the latter informed his brother that Bruckner had opted for the soft ending of the first movement as they had preferred.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wn Mus. Hs. 6083</td>
<td>aut score, VIII/1 1st movt, with entrances by Karl Aigner and aut sketches for VIII/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wn Mus. Hs. 6084</td>
<td>aut score, VIII/1 Scherzo/Trio, with aut sketches for VIII/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wn Mus. Hs. 40.987</td>
<td>copy score by Anonymous 8/6, VIII/1 1st movt, with autograph entrances and entrances by Franz Schalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wn Mus. Hs. 34.613</td>
<td>copy score by Anonymous 8/6, VIII/1 Scherzo/Trio, with entrances by Franz Schalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wn Mus. Hs. 34.614 a</td>
<td>copy score by Anonymous 8/1 and Anonymous 8/4, VIII/1 Adagio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wn F60 BRGA 62</td>
<td>copy score by Anonymous 8/1, VIII/1 Finale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wn F18 Schalk 453</td>
<td>pa 4-hd arrangement by Josef Schalk, VIII/1 movts 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wn Mus. Hs. 28.432</td>
<td>aut sketch, VIII/2 1st movt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wn Mus. Hs. 28.419</td>
<td>score sketches and fragments, VIII/1, with sketches for VIII/2 arranged by Franz and Josef Schalk, 1st movt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wn Mus. Hs. 34.614 b</td>
<td>copy score by Anonymous 8/5, intermediate Adagio, with entrances by Josef Schalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wn Mus. Hs. 40.999</td>
<td>copy score by Anonymous 8/2, VIII/1 Adagio, with aut revisions for VIII/2; entrances by Leopold Hofmeyr and Anonymous 8/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 In hindsight it is easy to see that the evidence has been there all along in Josef Schalk’s correspondence with his brother. See Josef’s letters: 11 December 1886 when he informed Franz that Bruckner wanted to talk with him about the Finale [before the movement was finished!]; 9 May 1887 where he observed that Franz was working on the first movement; 26 November 1888 when he informed Franz that Bruckner wanted his [Franz’s] advice about revisions of Symphonies 3 and 8; and 31 January 1890 when he told Franz that the composer has accepted their advice to end the first movement of VIII/2 softly. Thomas Leibnitz, *Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner*. (Tutzing: Hans Schneider Verlag, 1988), p. 111; [Leibnitz]; Harrandt, 2:12 and 45-46; and Leibnitz, p. 274.

22 Friedrich Eckstein, “Leidenschaftliche Erörterungen um Bruckner,” in *Anbruch* 18/2 (1936): 48. Eckstein does not specify which works; certainly the eighth symphony was among them. The present author has yet to find any evidence of Ferdinand Löwe’s involvement in sources for the eighth symphony. On 11 December 1886 Josef Schalk mentioned Löwe in his letter to Franz as a musical advisor to Bruckner in Franz’s place. While the passage comes in the context of a discussion of the eighth symphony, it is not clear that Josef is referring specifically to that work with regard to Löwe. Leibnitz, p. 111.

23 Harrandt 2: 45-46.

24 Hawkshaw, No. 53. The earliest indication that the Schalks were involved with the eighth symphony is the date 9 July 1886 on Josef’s four-hand arrangement of the first two movements (Hawkshaw, No. 48). See also the letter from Josef to Franz Schalk of 9 May 1887 cited below. Harrandt 2:12.

25 Leibnitz, p. 274.
In engaging students or former students for the preparation of piano reductions or editing finished scores, Bruckner followed a time-honored practice. Although one might be surprised at his wanting a four-hand arrangement of two movements of an unfinished work, there was nothing out of the ordinary in his asking a former student (Josef) to prepare it. The composer may have anticipated a four-hand performance at the Viennese Academic Wagner Society or possibly even a relatively early printing. Did Bruckner ask Franz to begin preparations for printing in the spring of 1887 anticipating that the Finale would soon be complete? Is it that what Josef was referring to when he wrote to his brother on 9 May of that year: “I am glad you have time to work on the first movement of the eighth.” Although such a move would have been unprecedented for the composer, and no evidence survives that a publisher stood in the wings at that early date, such high expectations are not beyond the realm of possibility. Bruckner was riding a wave of post-seventh optimism and excited anticipation at finishing the eighth.

Table 3

Chronological List of Instrumentations First Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Draft: before 10 October 1884</th>
<th>VIII/1: 7 February 1886</th>
<th>Arrangement of VIII/1 by F. Schalk ca. 1887</th>
<th>Arrangement of VIII/1 by F. Schalk ca. 1888</th>
<th>VIII/2: 10 March 1890</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fl 1-2</td>
<td>fl 1-2</td>
<td>fl 1-3</td>
<td>fl 1-3</td>
<td>fl 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ob 1-2</td>
<td>ob 1-2</td>
<td>ob 1-3</td>
<td>ob 1-3</td>
<td>ob 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cl 1-2 in B flat</td>
<td>cl 1-2 in B flat</td>
<td>cl 1-3 in B flat</td>
<td>cl 1-3 in B flat</td>
<td>cl 1-3 in B flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bn 1-2</td>
<td>bn 1-2</td>
<td>bn 1-2</td>
<td>bn 1-2</td>
<td>bn 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hn in F 1-2</td>
<td>hn in F 1-2</td>
<td>hn in F 1-2</td>
<td>hn in F 1-2</td>
<td>hn in F 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hn in F 3-4</td>
<td>hn in B flat basso 3-4</td>
<td>hn in E flat 3-4</td>
<td>hn in F 3-4</td>
<td>hn in B flat basso 3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenor tuba in B flat 1-2</td>
<td>tenor tuba in B flat 1-2</td>
<td>tenor tuba in B flat 1-2</td>
<td>tenor tuba in B flat 1-2</td>
<td>tenor tuba in B flat 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bass tuba in F 3-4</td>
<td>bass tuba in F 3-4</td>
<td>bass tuba in F 3-4</td>
<td>bass tuba in F 3-4</td>
<td>bass tuba in F 3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cht</td>
<td>cht</td>
<td>cht</td>
<td>cht</td>
<td>cht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tpt in F 1-3</td>
<td>tpt in C 1-3</td>
<td>tpt in C 1-3</td>
<td>tpt in F 1-2</td>
<td>tpt in F 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alto and tenor tbn</td>
<td>alto and tenor tbn</td>
<td>tenor tbn 1-3</td>
<td>tenor tbn 1-3</td>
<td>alto and tenor tbn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bass tbn</td>
<td>bass tbn</td>
<td>bass tbn</td>
<td>bass tbn</td>
<td>bass tbn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tim</td>
<td>tim</td>
<td>tim</td>
<td>tim</td>
<td>tim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vl 1</td>
<td>vl 1</td>
<td>vl 1</td>
<td>vl 1</td>
<td>vl 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vl 2</td>
<td>vl 2</td>
<td>vl 2</td>
<td>vl 2</td>
<td>vl 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va</td>
<td>va</td>
<td>va</td>
<td>va</td>
<td>va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vc</td>
<td>vc</td>
<td>vc</td>
<td>vc</td>
<td>vc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>db</td>
<td>db</td>
<td>db</td>
<td>db</td>
<td>db</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is impossible to believe is that, at that early stage, Bruckner expected Franz to produce the massive re-orchestration and arrangement of the first movement of VIII/1 that now survives as Wn Mus. Hs. 28.419 (see Table 3). Did Franz, with Josef’s encouragement, begin arranging the symphony on his own initiative? Did the brothers already anticipate problems with the symphony in the spring of 1887? Was Hermann Levi’s comment in his rejection letter to Bruckner, “consult with your friends, with Schalk” an indication that the conductor knew Franz and Josef were already working on the symphony and had suggestions for its improvement? Whatever the impetus for their involvement, there is no question the Schalks, with Bruckner’s complete blessing, had an enormous influence on all four movements of the second version. Further studies will determine the exact extent to which the brothers, once the news of Levi’s rejection broke, instigated change, followed suggestions from the composer, or both.

The new soft ending of the first movement in the second manuscript version will serve by way of illustration. Franz Schalk began to edit the first two movements in the copy scores Wn Mus. Hs. 40.987 and 34.613 respectively. His re-composition and re-orchestration (with numerous contributions from Josef) of the first movement of VIII/1 with suggestions for VIII/2 is preserved in the miscellany Wn Mus. Hs. 28.419. Franz stopped his score at bar 419 (first version), at which point Josef sketched in the earliest surviving reading of the soft ending for the movement (see Plate 1). Alexander Hermann sees Josef’s sketch as evidence that

Plate 1. Wn Mus Hs 28.419, fol 22v: arrangement of VIII/1 by Franz Schalk, 1st movt, mm 403-419, with pencil sketches for the ending in VIII/2 by Josef Schalk

28 Hawkshaw, Nos. 43 and 44.
29 Hawkshaw, No. 53.
the idea for the soft ending originated with the Schalks.\textsuperscript{30} It is equally possible that Josef was just responding to an impetus from the composer. Bruckner indicated that he was thinking about a soft ending himself in two different copy scores when he wrote \textit{pp} at m 438 of Wn Mus. Hs. 6002 and again at the end of Wn Mus. Hs. 40,987.\textsuperscript{31} Whatever the source of origin, Bruckner made Josef’s effort his own much longer ending in a subsequent sketch Wn Mus. Hs. 28.432 (Plate 2). The Schalk defenders among Bruckner’s early biographers were correct that whatever the composer borrowed passed careful scrutiny and changed considerably in his hands before being immortalized in the manuscript scores.\textsuperscript{32}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Plate 2.}
Wn Mus. Hs. 28.432, fol 1r: aut sketch VIII/2, 1\textsuperscript{st} movt, mm ca 401ff
\end{center}

In the first movement, in addition to the new ending, the orchestration and transition from the development to the recapitulation must have been major points of discussion with the brothers. As indicated in Table 3, Franz’s arrangement (No. 53 a) includes triple woodwinds, eight horns at the outset, two trumpets in F, one in B flat and specifically three tenor trombones. Bruckner’s own ruminations about revising the orchestration were extensive and evident in four different fragments.\textsuperscript{33} Eventually he settled on triple woodwinds, eight horns in F, three trumpets in F, and alto, tenor and bass trombones. We have already mentioned Bruckner’s initial, longer proposals to revise the end of the development.\textsuperscript{34} The Schalks made four attempts at this section of the movement, two of which (by Josef) contain substantial cuts. In the Adagio we may also be indebted to the Schalks for the triple woodwinds and the first trumpet in F. Although to date no Finale source with either

\textsuperscript{30}Hermann, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{31}Hawkshaw Nos. 50 and 43 respectively.
\textsuperscript{33}Wn Mus. Hs. 6002, 6039, 6041 and 6044; Hawkshaw Nos. 48-51.
\textsuperscript{34}Preserved in Wn Mus. Hs. 6041 and 6044.
of the Schalks’ handwriting has surfaced, it is clear from Josef’s letter of 26 November 1888 that Bruckner discussed the movement extensively with them.

I must tell you that, in the Finale, a large number of bifolios has been removed between E Major and, as he [Bruckner] refers to it, your favorite spot. I doubt it will help, but we must allow him to have faith in himself. The most important thing is to sustain his morale.”

The composer’s relationship with the brothers vis-à-vis the eighth symphony followed his overall pattern of interaction with advisor/editors during the last decade of his life. At first they spent long hours of painstaking work adjusting his scores with him. Bruckner consulted them; he appreciated their advice; and he incorporated some of their suggestions into the final product. Eventually the students grew impatient with what they regarded as the composer’s pedantry (his concern for parallel fifths and octaves for example), bypassed him all together, and made editorial alterations, mostly in the printed scores, without his knowledge or consent. As Thomas Leibnitz, who has studied the Schalks’ relationship with the composer more than anyone else, wrote:

…at times the students and friends preferred the easier path of making changes on their own…to the laborious road of discussion and persuasion….[Their] alterations to Bruckner’s music spanned the gamut of sought-after advice to covert manipulation.

-----------------------------

ROBERT HAAS was well aware of the extent of the Schalks’ influence on the eighth symphony. In his edition he attempted to ameliorate the brothers’ impact by including or reverting to passages that he felt Bruckner had wrongly eliminated under pressure from the brothers and Levi.

Baffled by the score, Hermann Levi in Munich, seconded by Josef Schalk in Vienna, applied intense pressure for extensive revisions….Especially the Finale betrays a soulless superficiality and the cursory, casual style that one must expect of an arrangement in which cuts have been wrung out of the work…..The deleted passages can and must be restored; they encompass 10 measures in the Adagio and 50 in the Finale. At the same time various misunderstandings and glaring absurdities can and must be eliminated.

Haas has been sorely criticized in the recent literature for, among other things, arbitrarily mixing versions and composing a passage in his edition. The fact is that, even though he did not have ready access to them all, Haas knew the sources for the eighth symphony better than anyone, and it is time to look at his work again very carefully.

At the very least, it is important to refute once and for all the unfounded accusation that Haas composed measures 609-614 in his edition of the Finale (Nowak 2, mm 577ff.). The passage to which Josef is referring in the above-cited letter of 26 November 1888 is the absurd cut that Bruckner made between rehearsal letters Pp and Uu - the recapitulation of the third group. On the substitute folio 168r of Wn Mus. Hs 19.480/4 Bruckner wrote (Pp bleibt weg) dafür Uu -- (Pp is deleted) go to Uu (Plate 3). The same folio contains an incomplete four-measure transition (the brass parts in measure 577 are missing) to connect the end of the second group to the coda. Thankfully no subsequent editor, including Josef Schalk, allowed Bruckner’s cut to stand. Schalk and Nowak restored the recapitulation of the third group (the measures from Pp to Uu), but kept the four new measures that Bruckner had written on folio 168r to serve as the transition from the end of the second group to the coda. Nowak took the brass parts in his measure 577 from Haas.

36 See Hawkshaw No. 63, the engraver’s copy for the first edition, for a discussion of the degree to which the editors changed the printed score of the eighth symphony without his knowledge. Also Paul Hawkshaw. “An Anatomy of Change: Revisions to the Mass in F Minor.” In Bruckner Studies. ed. Timothy Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw. Cambridge University Press, 1997: 25-29 discusses this process as it affected the Mass in F Minor.
37 Leibnitz, pp. 277-279.
38 Haas, “Einführung”.
Plate 3.
Wn Mus. Hs. 19.480, Vol 4, fol 168r: aut score with entrances by Anonymous 8/1, VIII/2 Finale, mm 577-580
When Bruckner added the present folio 168, he removed another one that he mistakenly identified as belonging to the Adagio (Plate 4). This folio, now in Kremsmünster, has a complete six-bar transition from the second to the third group. Haas is the only editor who restored these measures to their rightful place if one does not take the cut from Pp to Uu. Haas did not compose an accompaniment to the sketch for these measures found on fol 169r of the autograph score as he has often been accused. He must have realized that, by restoring the transition from the Kremsmünster folio (a logical editorial decision given what Bruckner left us to work with),
he was now on a very slippery slope. If he restored one cut, shouldn’t he restore them all, as he more or less tried to do? Otherwise isn’t one mixing versions? Ironically that is the very sin for which Haas has been repeatedly castigated, when in fact he is the only editor who did not mix versions in this passage.

Haas was well aware that the sources leave many questions unanswered. Why did Bruckner leave his new transition incomplete, for example? Did he just forget about the resolution of the brass chord from the previous page (Nowak 2, m. 576 and Haas, m. 608)? How did the composer come to identify the discarded Kremsmünster folio 168 as part of the Adagio? On a larger scale, if he wanted to cut the recapitulation of the third group, why didn’t Bruckner cross the passage out as he had done with so many others in the Adagio and Finale? Or just discard the bifolios all together as he had done in the rest of the symphony? Is it possible he wanted the cut from Pp to Uu to be optional? As can be seen in Plate 3, he did not suggest an option as he did in the autograph score for the cut from m. 345 to 386 of the Finale (fol 144r). Yet his designation of both passages as “for later times” in his letter to Weingartner indicates that he was not happy eliminating either one. In that case, why not include alternate transitions before letter Pp as he did for the earlier cut? Could Bruckner not make up his mind about this one? Or again, did he simply forget?

Any observer, confronted by the innumerable and often impenetrable layers of change in the autograph pages, might wonder about the composer’s state of mind in preparing the second version of the eighth symphony. His contemporaries were certainly concerned about it. Were some of the surviving inconsistencies the product of alcoholism as Franz Marschner suggested and Max Auer was at great pains to deny; or a relapse of the nervous condition of the 1860s as suggested by August Stradal; or depression over Levi’s rejection; or some combination of all these things? Whatever the cause, extraordinary credit must go to the brothers Franz and Josef Schalk who devoted an enormous amount of time, energy and expertise to support an often obstreperous composer through a period of great personal difficulty. Theirs cannot have been an easy task. Although it was Levi to whom Bruckner responded initially, Franz and Josef were the ones who rolled up their sleeves and helped with the revisions. As Thomas Leibnitz has observed, the Schalks’ efforts were born out of genuine love and respect for the composer, however complicating they may have become for subsequent editors.

Editorial rhetoric and the futility of trying to distinguish the composer’s work from that of the Schalks aside, Robert Haas was right about one thing: Bruckner obviously felt pressure — internal, external or both — to shorten the eighth symphony. At the very least it caused the composer to suggest two bad cuts in the Finale. That having been said, whatever the Schalks may have contributed, nothing found its way into the second manuscript version without the composer’s direct involvement. Bruckner must accept full responsibility for the readings in Wn Mus. Hs. 19.480 and 40.999 as well as for all the subsequent confusion that has ensued from them.

Paul Hawkshaw is Professor in the Practice of Musicology at Yale School of Music, and Director of the Yale Summer School of Music/Norfolk Chamber Music Festival. He is co-editor of The New Bruckner Edition. This paper was first delivered to The Bruckner Journal Readers’ Conference, Hertford College, University of Oxford, UK, on 13 April 2013.

Professor Hawkshaw’s critical report, in German and English, will be published early in 2014 by Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, Vienna ISBN 978-3-900270-74-2 / ISMN 979-0-50025-255-9
The Hawkshaw editions of both version of Symphony No. 8, to be published in The New Bruckner Edition and intended to supersede both Haas and Nowak editions, are in preparation

40 Harrandt, 2:114. The cut from 345-386 is designated as optional in the autograph and all the copy scores, though neither Haas nor Nowak printed the options in their editions. The cut from Pp to Uu is designated as optional in a copy score (now in private possession) and a preliminary sketch in Cracow. Hawkshaw Nos. 61 and 29 h respectively.
42 See Göllerich-Auer, 4/2: 564-571. The author would like to thank Malcolm Hatfield for his thoughtful papers and many insights into Bruckner’s complex personality, including “Anton Bruckner: a non-pathological view on his personality and implications for his approach to the task of composing” in The Bruckner Journal, 17/1 (2013) pp.3-13.
43 Leibnitz, p. 279.
44 As mentioned above, the same cannot be said for the first edition.
BRUCKNER – A COMPROMISED COMPOSER?

by Abram Chipman

THESE ARE exciting times for those of us who venerate Anton Bruckner and his music. A number of smaller works (primarily choral) are coming to the notice of concertgoers and record collectors. The frequency of new performances and recordings of the symphonies is expanding to the point where few if any of us can comprehensively keep up. New books and editions of the scores arrive with regularity. And, for those who follow this journal and the bi-annual meetings of it, the controversies about the versions of his major works get increasingly lively and passionate.

The conventional wisdom many of us learned from Robert Haas, Robert Simpson and Deryck Cooke holds that Bruckner hardly needed enemies when he had friends like Herbeck, Löwe, and the Schalk brothers. These and others stand accused of desecrating what Bruckner wrote in the guise of improving it, cajoling or tricking him into accepting their falsified editing and thereby producing some of the earliest published texts. The only path to authenticity, in this view, is to return to the oldest available manuscripts, which form the basis of scores published decades after the composer’s death by the Bruckner Society. The revisionist view propounded by Egon Wellesz, Dermot Gault, Benjamin Korstvedt and William Carragan, among others, holds that composing was a continuing work in progress for Bruckner that entailed collaboration with his acolytes and students on the changes he made from the original versions. Hence there can be many “valid” scores of each major work, particularly those like the Third, Fourth and Eighth Symphonies that yield literally thousands of differences to the discerning eyes of scholars who examine drafts and printer plates of the music. Preferences can be based, in theory, on pure musical values but in fact seem to this writer often conflated with personal and political views about the editors in question, the mental stability of the composer, and even feelings about how conductors who champion one or another printed variant interpret that score on the podium. Indeed, all of us – scholars, critics and lay listeners – have our own histories of experience with mentors and editors that can (unconsciously?) colour how we respond to artists who may struggle with intrusions upon their autonomous creativity.

It should be acknowledged, of course, that changes made in the corpus of Bruckner’s work entailed one of three distinct processes. Some were done presumably of his own free will (e.g., the First Symphony). Others were drastic rewrites by editors working without the composer’s awareness - e.g., Löwe’s vandalism of the (three movement) Ninth, while the composer was safely in the grave, and the Schalk brothers’ falsification of the Fifth under circumstances that probably qualify as a criminal conspiracy. The most frequent situation was that wherein an early draft was subject to changes by the usual suspects mentioned above with the composer’s evident awareness. Why did Bruckner sign off on these? Overt, whole-hearted agreement? Tolerance under protest? Passive abdication for pragmatic reasons of making his music more saleable or publishable? We may never know for sure which of these applied in which instances. One may be left with one’s personal reactions to the perceived quality of the changes (i.e., the question “Can I imagine Bruckner, left to his own devices, making such silly changes?”) The composer’s motivations are controversial and there are neither recorded “fly on the wall” accounts of his interactions with Löwe and the Schalks nor psychoanalytic confessions by him of his perhaps conflicted feelings about them. Nonetheless, the truth about Bruckner’s approval of, or qualms about, editorial suggestions from his associates is crucial to how we value those very text.

It is, thus, the responsibility of the psychologist who raises these questions to use whatever indirect data exists to form hypotheses about Bruckner’s character and way of being in the world. Like an archaeological dig, such clues to his personality may permit reconstruction of his likely attitude towards the creative process and negotiations surrounding it. Fortunately, there is much relevant anecdotal data in the literature as to his behaviour in areas not directly involved with the compositional process. My descriptive data is based on what is consistently portrayed by the biographical literature available.

Most repeatedly described is Bruckner’s obsessive-compulsive character, evinced by his persistent need to count the leaves in trees, write down the times of day when he prayed, and ruminate upon the sight of corpses in great detail (not to mention take exceptional pains to number bars and phrase lengths). The early Freudian view of obsessinality was that it arose in that stage of development around control and defiance struggles of the child (i.e., the potty-training crisis or “terrible twos”). The defence mechanism of reaction formation (i.e., turning unacceptable impulses into their opposites) is developed in that stage and involves the management of
primarily aggressive, hostile and disorderly impulses. Later, Eric Ericson restated this developmental stage as all about conflicts over autonomy vs. shame and doubt. More recent views from ego psychologists and existential analysts posit the individual’s lacking and desperately seeking a sense of agency in his or her transactions with the environment. Under any of these formulations, the person displays strong conscientiousness, an inhibition of defiance and rage (or, alternatively, a habitual stubbornness) and a sense of being controlled from without by others’ frameworks of morality and rectitude that gets rigidly internalized. The imperative is to make very sure one is doing the right or expected thing by rechecking, sometimes in a ritualistic way, one’s most minute deeds. While such individuals can certainly be creative and original, they rarely can feel inner certainty or finality over their point of view and often dread an inevitable punishment or humiliation over acting in nonconformity with social or even professional norms. Hence, criticism can devastate and lead to undoing of whatever the transgression is felt to be. And Bruckner, as described to us, rarely confronted others, was ever dominated by doubt, and was shattered by rejections of his work throughout his life. Like today’s perpetual graduate student, he sat at the feet, first of Sechter and then of Kitzler, well past the age when most composers of his genius level were bursting with music to present to the world. Can we imagine, therefore, his holding a particular solution to a compositional problem as a source of certainty?

Not entirely separate from his obsessionality was Bruckner’s proneness to depression. We possess no clear account of the genesis of the episodes of mental distress that led him to seek treatment at the sanatorium at Bad Kreuzen in 1867, and then again a year later. However, the first treatment occurred at what should by rights have been a time of publicly recognized professional achievement. He’d just witnessed the successful premiere of his first big mass (the D minor) and was graduated from the two lengthy periods of compositional tutorials. It is almost as if he feared success (and encroaching independence) even more than the disappointment of failure or of others’ intrusions into his judgment. Indeed, one notes his negotiations, on the verge of leaving St. Florian for Linz and Linz for Vienna, to be assured that he could return to his old job(s) up to a year later if the new one(s) didn’t work out. True inner confidence in his capacity to “make it” didn’t run very deeply in him, however earnestly he believed in the quality of his compositions. He may have covertly needed the security of a humbler status (like accepting criticisms of his symphonies by men who were less adept than he about composition) to feel safe. We can also note the composer’s devaluation of his own work. He wrote nine numbered symphonies, but disowned two others (the real First, in F minor, dismissed as a “Study” Symphony and the actual Third put down as the “Nullte” or “Zero”). Such rejection of his own “imperfect” work could have easily disposed him to join in others’ devaluation of what were major accomplishments (i.e., the Eighth Symphony in its fledgling 1887 version).

We note next Bruckner’s awkwardness and social ineptitude. He was a peculiar sight around Vienna, as has been repeatedly described. He conveyed the general persona of a provincial soul without guile. He was the butt of practical jokes, even from those who found him loveable (e.g., the school children who trained a dog to show “preference” for a phrase of Bruckner’s over one by Wagner). Recall, in fact, his timid presentation to Wagner of two scores, between which the master was supposed to choose which one to have dedicated to him. After a night in his cups, Bruckner awoke unsure of whether his idol had chosen the Second or Third Symphony. And can we fully discount the anecdote about his forcing a coin into the hand of a conductor who had done well by one of his scores? This naiveté and lack of shrewdness, it would seem, is inconsistent with the capacity for such political manipulation as it would have taken for him to somehow get the better of Schalk’s or Löwe’s pressures.

The above traits, in this writer’s view, lend support to a view of Bruckner as vulnerable, anxious, perhaps suggestible, and plagued by lack of confident assertiveness. It doesn’t make him mentally ill in a major sense so much as burdened by neurotic-level inhibitions that compromised his struggle for acceptance. These, along with other, more adaptive, factors added to his long struggles with perfecting his major creations to the satisfaction of himself and those on whom he depended for support and advocacy. Nor should the above qualities be taken to signify an inability for constructive collaborations with his colleagues and advocates at certain times. It is the pervasiveness of such vulnerability that remains a striking part of our understanding of Bruckner. The extent of these characteristics shown by him, is anything but common amongst world-class composers. Was Bruckner a “one-off” example among creative musicians of the uncertainty that seemed to plague him? In fact, his case had one intriguing parallel from which we may learn.

I think of Bruckner’s Russian (though shorter-lived) contemporary, Modest Mussorgsky, as one from whom we can “cross-validate” our dynamic understanding of Bruckner. Both were composers of towering genius,
whose works were long heard in editions of dubious authenticity, Mussorgsky’s primarily vandalized by Rimsky-Korsakov. They had, of course, profound differences. Bruckner was an ascetic creator of absolute works, except for the setting of religious texts. Mussorgsky always attached programmatic content to his pieces, which were predominantly vocal as well as earthy and for the stage rather than the church or concert hall. Mussorgsky’s nemesis, Rimsky, had a track record of his own as a composer. Bruckner’s editors were men who had no surviving achievements in that specialty. Mussorgsky lacked notable obsessive characteristics, having been flamboyant, perhaps bipolar and histrionic and even somewhat anti-intellectual or atheoretical about musical craftsmanship. Bruckner was a lonely anchorite to Mussorgsky’s social, substance-abusing, life of the party. Both, nonetheless, existed in similar social/political contexts - being part of circles that were dedicated to cultural goals within music. The Viennese cabal that promoted Bruckner was partly about the cause of advancing Wagner and placing Bruckner as his symphonic equivalent. The Petersburg “five” shared an initial goal of introducing a Russian, anti-Western nationalist style. That factor could be one external element in their both being the targets of colleagues’ apparent exploitation in the name of support. Indeed, we have ample evidence of Rimsky’s narcissism, patronizing diminishing of more than one colleague, and arrogant certainty of his creative rectitude. There is less documentation of the personal motivations of Bruckner’s advocates, leaving us to speculate on their envy of the man whose potential greatness offered them coattails to be carried by. Like editors in various domains who “show off” by a superfluously intrusive approach to the work they go over, the Schalks, Löwe et al may have subconsciously wanted to bask in Bruckner’s reflected glory.

More importantly, there were individual psychological similarities of great importance between the two composers. Bruckner was a somewhat incoherent blend of the would-be Viennese cosmopolitan and the country bumpkin. Mussorgsky, whose father was the illegitimate son of an male aristocratic and a female serf, has confounded his biographical commentators as to whether he fully identified with the poor and wretched of the earth or the aristocracy, both of which he compellingly portrayed in music. I would hypothesize that this contradictory blend left both composers with a lacuna in their self-concept. As Heinz Kohut has posited in his theoretical model, a major achievement of healthy self-fulfilment is what he calls a “cohesive self”, a consistent mental representation or image of what the person is and how he or she functions with others. If these two composers brought a lack of wholeness or coherence to their dealings with peers, it is perhaps no wonder that their artistic identity remained partly subject to how others chose to define them. And if Bruckner was a perpetual student into his late thirties, such a characteristic would colour others’ conception of him and his needs.

Another profound commonality in the lives of Mussorgsky and Bruckner is doubtlessly even more relevant, because it is so rare. Neither man ever married or even had a known sweetheart or romantic/sexual partner, heterosexual or homosexual. Nor do we hear about one-night stands or visits to prostitutes on the part of either. The likelihood is that both of these men practiced life-long celibacy. Bruckner made inappropriate marriage proposals to servant girls whom he hardly knew – and they apparently didn’t run screaming about attempted rape. Mussorgsky confided to Glinka’s sister (a mother figure) that if she ever heard that he had committed suicide, it would be in the wake of having gotten married. What does this mean to their struggle to be recognized despite pressure from their associates to fulfil a possibly alien creative style? It means lifelong loneliness in terms of intimate support and belief, the absence of a “hero’s helpmate” (to paraphrase Richard Strauss). It means nobody to ever come home to who believed in their musical greatness and destiny.

In Bruckner, there was strength and determination to have his true voice heard by posterity. That is largely why he donated his manuscripts to the Vienna library, where much of the archaeological work we celebrate can be done on his behalf. Mussorgsky was in no condition to do this for himself in his final years. Ironically, it was Rimsky-Korsakov who took this step for him. Both composers benefited from subsequent scholars who did what it took to make their work legible and coherent for performers in its original form. The energy that Bruckner’s devotees, in particular, expend on such excavations stands as testament to the greatness of the material that is still coming into the domain of us all.

Abram Chipman has worked as a Clinical Psychologist in and around Boston, USA, since the mid1960's. He received his Ph.D from Columbia University, and post-doctoral training at Yale. Chipman is a passionate devotee of Classical Music and for some years wrote record reviews for various periodicals (most notably HIGH FIDELITY) where his usual “beat” included Bruckner. He has published clinical studies of Bartok, Sibelius, and Janacek.
What Happened to the Sixth?
A comparative study of the first edition and the Collected Edition of Bruckner’s Sixth Symphony

A paper delivered at the Eighth Bruckner Journal Readers’ Conference

Louis Cameron Lohraseb
Yale School of Music & State University of New York at Geneseo

WHILE BRUCKNER scholarship often is concerned with the different versions of a particular symphony that were generated by the composer, the Sixth Symphony has its own problems even though Anton Bruckner created only one version, in 1881. It is indeed unique: the only completed symphony never to have been performed in its entirety during the composer’s lifetime and never to have been revised by the composer, indeed brought to print posthumously without the supervision of the composer. Thus the modern interpreter of the Sixth is left with many questions on how best to present this masterwork. Broadly speaking the Sixth has been published in two editions, the first edition prepared by Cyrill Hynais and then further edited by Josef Schalk and published three years after Bruckner’s death (Universal Edition, 1899), and the manuscript-based Collected Edition (International Bruckner Society, ed. Robert Haas, 1937, ed. Leopold Nowak, 1952). My examination of the first and final movements in the first edition version and the Collected Edition (using the Nowak score) has resulted in a list of over 2000 differences between the two publications. In the list I grouped the first, second, third, and fourth instrumental parts together when applicable, and have not taken into account differences in abbreviation (e.g. “rit.” versus “ritard.”). When dealing with differences in placement of dynamics or expressions, I have used discretion. Also in this paper I have used the piano-tuners’ convention for pitch, whereby the cello’s lowest note is C2, and middle C is C4.

Tempos in the first movement

The principal defining characteristic of the first edition is the presence in it of a large number of specific tempo indications and tempo alterations intended to be helpful to an effective rendering of the symphony. Such indications are far rarer in the manuscript and accordingly are not in the Collected Edition either. For example, in the first movement, the Collected Edition lacks a tempo marking at the beginning of the third theme group, leading most conductors from the past and present to play this music at around the tempo of the second theme group, which is marked in both publications “Bedeutend langsamer,” that is, “significantly slower”. Structurally, the movement is made to sound both more logical and more vigorous if the third theme group in both the exposition and the recapitulation is taken at the tempo suggested in the first publication, “Gemäßiges Hauptzeitmaß,” that is, “moderated principal tempo”. Now the music which begins the third theme group (mm. 101–110 in the exposition, mm. 285–294 in the recapitulation) consists of a brilliant set of rising sequences that create an exhilarating effect, missing if the tempo is too slow. Each measure out of the ten derives in rhythm from the first theme accompaniment and in contour from the first measure of the section, m. 101, as shown in example 1. The problem with not returning to a moderated principal tempo as is called for in the first publication is that at a slow tempo the music sounds heavy and dull, its relationship to the first theme being lost, leading audience members to doubt the coherence of the work. The first publication gives the conductor as much guidance as one could need in this particular passage, writing at m. 101 under “Gemäßiges Hauptzeitmaß” the modification, “etwas breit,” (somewhat broad, but presumably not as broad as the previous second-theme music) and even writing at the top of m. 105 “etwas belebend” (somewhat more lively or energized) at a location where the harmonic rhythm is accelerated fourfold.

Example 1
Bruckner, Symphony No. 6
first movement
Then at m. 110 and m. 294, the first publication writes “poco riten.”, followed by “Ruhig beginnend, dann ein wenig belebend,” (beginning quietly, then a bit more lively). While the latter indication works well with the material, one must be cautious of the “poco riten.” in both measures 110 and 294, because of the reorchestration in that measure emphasizing the last repetition of the sequential pattern. However, using Bruckner’s original scoring of that measure, the “poco riten.” is not as needful, but still can be observed. In fact, all of the additional tempo indications in the first publication not only provide the modern performer with evidence as to how this music was performed in Bruckner’s day, but also help to focus and clarify the form of the movement.

**Tempos in the fourth movement**

The form of the fourth movement, which is in essence a typical Bruckner sonata movement of three independent themes, has many elements which make it elusive, in particular the absence of the A1 theme from the recapitulation, surely due to the fact that that theme is utilized throughout the development especially toward the end. Thus, while there are twenty-one additional tempo markings in the first movement of the first edition, the final movement contains no fewer than forty-five additional tempo markings.

In that movement’s first theme group, the first edition does not provide many tempo alterations save for the marking of “etwas breit” at m. 47, at rehearsal letter C well within the A2 theme, followed by a “rall.” and a subsequent “Hauptzeitmaß” in m. 53, all missing from the Collected Edition. Those indications explicitly help to serve the music, and indeed many of today’s conductors play the music much that way even though using the Collected Edition. It is in the second theme group, beginning at m. 65, rehearsal letter D, where the first edition has many new tempo markings. At the start of the section there is the indication of “Gemäßigtges Hauptzeitmaß”, which is lacking in the Collected Edition. If the beginning of the movement is taken with a certain amount of brio, then this second theme group would be served well by a moderated tempo. The first edition goes on to give very detailed instructions, indicating a “poco rit.” in m. 72, an “etwas gedehnt” (somewhat stretched or broadened) in m. 77, as well as the additional indication of “accelerando” at m. 113, which leads to the beginning of the third theme group at m. 125, strongly derived from the second half of the first theme, as shown in example 2, which the first edition indicates as “Schnell” (fast). These and other additional tempo indications in the exposition of the finale all serve to bring out the inherent qualities in the musical gestures, and by so doing help the listener understand the formal conception of this often-puzzling work.

**Example 2**
*Bruckner, Symphony No.6, finale*

The development section is also full of additional tempo indications, which are again very helpful to a proper performance of the work. The Collected Edition has only Bruckner’s original marking of “bedeutend langsamer” (significantly slower) at the beginning of the development, and there is not another tempo indication until the recapitulation, where the Collected Edition indicates “Tempo Imo”. Beginning in the fourth bar of the development with “belebter” (livelier), the first-published edition gives very detailed instructions on how to conceive of the development in terms of tempo. It seems appropriate, for example, that in m. 211 there should be the marking “Sehr gemäßigtges Hauptzeitmaß”, as this is the point in the development, mentioned earlier, that brings back the first theme of the movement. If it were true that this entire development should be conceived at a slower tempo, then this quasi-false recapitulation would fail to achieve its effect. Also particularly helpful is the indication at m. 325 of “nach und nach belebter” (more and more lively) until the recapitulation at m. 345, marked “Im Hauptzeitmaß” (in the principal tempo) in the first edition.

It is interesting to note the differences in both the language and placement of certain markings between the two editions in the passage beginning at m. 356 until the beginning of the coda at m. 371. The “langsam sempre” (remaining slow) present in the Collected Edition in m. 356 has been altered to “zögernd” (hesitating, or as performers say, taking time) in the first edition, in addition to a fermata at the end of the first half of m. 358 which is not present in the Collected Edition. The second half of m. 358 also has the indication of “allmählich belebend” (gradually lively) in the first edition, which is five bars earlier than the “accelerando sempre” found in the Collected Edition in m. 362. It would be interesting to test the relative merits of these somewhat different approaches in performance! The additional markings of “Beschleunigtes Hauptzeitmaß” (accelerated principal
tempo) at the glorious presentation of the A2 theme in m. 285, and the ritard in mm. 405–406 before the return of the principal theme of the first movement in m. 407 are also welcomed enthusiastically.

Perhaps the most reasonable explanation for the lack of tempo indications in the manuscript of the Sixth, reflected in the Collected Edition, is that this symphony was created right before the great popular success of the Seventh Symphony, apparently leaving the manuscript of the Sixth to be neglected for revision and publication during the composer’s lifetime. That is significant because as William Carragan points out, Bruckner was rather sparing with tempo indications in his manuscripts (Carragan, 2013) and tended to enter them only in rehearsal, as in the Second, or at the time of publication, as in the Seventh. In his own preparation of the Second Symphony for the Collected Edition, Carragan found crucial tempo indications by examining the individual parts that were used on the two occasions when the composer himself conducted the piece (Carragan, 2013). And in the case of the Seventh, two letters from Bruckner to Artur Nikisch sent while Nikisch was preparing the premiere performance refer to essential tempo indications which were at that time not present in the manuscript score from which he was working (see Crawford Howie, *Anton Bruckner, A Documentary Biography*, Edwin Mellen Press, 2002, page 405), and are today widely presumed to be those in the first edition.

**Reorchestrations**

Besides the addition of copious tempo alterations, the first publication of the Sixth Symphony is also notorious for its many reorchestrations. A common difference between the Collected Edition and the first publication lies in the tessitura of the first oboe. There are more than twenty-four separate differences between the two scores concerning the first oboe in the first movement alone. In almost all of these cases the first publication lowers the part if Bruckner has written E6, F6, and F#6. Often the first oboe will begin a phrase in a certain octave, and when the editor of the first edition thought it appropriate, he would shift the oboe down an octave, as in mm. 33–34, *example 3*.

**Example 3**  
*Bruckner, Symphony No.6, first movement*

However, not all of these changes were as simple as a mere displacement of the first part by an octave. In other cases, the editor of the first publication changes the other parts around the oboe in order to accomplish his goal, for example in mm. 84–86, *example 4*, the second flute part has been changed as well as the first oboe. The first publication begins in m. 84 by shifting the first oboe’s part down an octave, then in 85 having the second flute play what the first oboe originally had. Thus the countermelody is enriched at the expense of the main melody, and instead of having an oboe in each octave, both of the flutes are in the top octave and both of the oboes are in the bottom octave.

**Example 4**  
*Bruckner, Symphony No. 6, first movement*
The orchestration of the first publication is thus less inventive and rich than the original, because having both instruments sounding in different registers provides more variety than simply having two identical instruments play in unison.

Another revision typical of the first publication is to change the instrument with which the oboe is doubling. This often leads to musical lines which are not as simple and direct as what Bruckner originally intended. Where in the Collected Edition the first oboe doubles the first flute in mm. 97–100, the first publication removes the oboes completely in mm. 97–99, example 5, and with a single oboe entering only in m. 100, right before the third theme, leading to some very awkward voice leading. These changes are in sharp contrast to Bruckner’s compositional method, which was always very attentive to accuracy of voice leading. The editor of the first publication seems not as concerned with such matters, as is evidenced by these modifications in the first oboe, as well as in other parts of the score. Note for example the difference in the first and second trombone parts in measure 202: Bruckner cross-stems the two voices to maintain the integrity of the musical line, while the first publication simply exchanges the notes to keep the higher pitch always in the first trombone.

**Example 5**
*Bruckner, Symphony No. 6, first movement*

![Example 5](image)

The fourth movement oboe part has also been altered in many of the same ways. In some instances, such as in mm. 37, 53, 89, the first oboe part has been brought down the octave in the first edition to play in unison with the second oboe, whereas in locations such as in mm. 48–49, the second oboe has been brought down the octave from the first oboe; see example 6.

**Example 6** *Bruckner, Symphony No. 6, finale*

![Example 6](image)

Sometimes the editor of the first edition decided to omit the oboes entirely, which is the case in mm. 91 and 116. The case of m. 91 is of particular interest, as it shows that the editor of the first edition tried to temper the high oboe tessitura not only in louder passages, but in softer ones as well, indicating that these changes in the first edition were not made in order to increase the amount of volume that the oboe could produce. Rather, it seems that the editor of the first edition believed that the timbre of the oboe in such a high register was not appealing. One of the most striking reorchestrations in the final movement includes the clarinets as well as the oboes. In m. 128 of the Collected Edition, both the clarinets play a quarter note B and have rests for the rest of the measure until their next entrance in the second half of m. 130. In the first edition, however, the clarinets and oboes sustain these notes with a diminuendo to piano. In addition, where the following measures in the Collected Edition have the clarinets and oboes playing in unison in the same octave, the first edition has both instruments playing in octaves. This undoubtedly creates a thicker, less concentrated texture, thereby making a smaller difference between Bruckner’s original fortissimo passage and pianissimo passage. By doing so, the first edition continues to mollify the distinct and startling dynamic changes of the manuscript.
In order to obtain a performer’s perspective on the issue of the tessitura of oboe parts in the Sixth, I consulted Anna Steltenpohl, an oboist in the Rochester Philharmonic Orchestra and the Orpheus Ensemble. In a personal interview I presented the tessitura problem to her, and she told me that in fact the range of the oboe parts in the manuscript and Collected Edition is more or less usual. It was her belief that while an F#6 might be considered on the edge of the expected range of a professional oboe player, one should remember that Stravinsky calls for an A6 in his *Pulcinella*. Ms. Steltenpohl also said that there is no loss of control, color, or volume when playing the E6, F6, and F#6, and that indeed Bruckner’s music is considered by oboists to be a standard of good idiom.

These first-edition changes in the first oboe part can be seen as an attempt to make the score more accessible, but upon examination seem inferior to the original music created by Bruckner. The manuscript (and thus Collected Edition) range of writing for the oboe is not particular to this symphony, but can be found readily in both the Fifth and Seventh Symphonies which flank it chronologically. In the first movement of the Fifth, Bruckner writes E6 (mm. 85, 471, 472), F6 (mm. 296, 480), and even F#6 (m. 483), and in the Seventh Symphony, there are numerous times that he writes E6 (first movement mm. 29, 37, 102, 144, 259–260, 347, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 433–443) and F6 (mm. 241, 242, 243, 295). The ending of the first movement of the Seventh is perhaps the most telling example, with Bruckner making the first oboe hold an E6 for over 10 measures. The first publication of the Seventh Symphony consistently retains these high oboe notes, and does not try to modify them as was somewhat later done in the first publication of the Sixth. This also is in agreement with Benjamin Korstvedt when he labels the first edition of the Seventh authentic and the Sixth not authentic, while Deryck Cooke, in *The Bruckner Problem Simplified* (1969), labels all first editions “spurious” which seriously oversimplifies the case.

In the first publication there are other changes in orchestration besides the first oboe part. Some of these changes are not as obtrusive as others. There are numerous instances where the first publication replaces one note in a chord with a different note. The differences can be minimal, and often there seems to be no justifiable explanation (e.g. first movement mm. 38 and 40 in the first bassoon). In other cases, the first edition makes a dramatic difference in the conception of a section, as is the case with the conclusion of the first part of the third theme group, also in the first movement. In both the exposition at measures 109–110 and the recapitulation at measures 293–294, the first publication changes the final measure of a four-measure repetition to add a certain kind of emphasis. To achieve this in the exposition, as shown in example 7, the editor of the first edition both adds and deletes; in measure 110 the four horns impractically play in octaves the music that the upper winds and strings have been playing for the three previous measures, and the bassoons join them, but the other brass lines are removed. Again, the voice leading is quite awkward, especially for the third horn. While Bruckner makes it clear that this bar is to be emphasized more than the others (note the three accent marks in the Collected Edition on the triplet group in the strings that are absent from the previous three measures), the new orchestration of the first publication does not have the elegance of the original conception as shown in the manuscript. In the previous three bars, the lower brass and trumpets provided support to the upper winds and strings in the first half of the bar, and the horns and bassoons provided the same support in the second half of the bar. By making the horns and bassoons play the same line as the winds and strings in the final bar of the pattern and deleting the trumpets and low brass (with the exception of an eighth note on the downbeat), the editor of the first publication has created a sound that is not as inventive and indeed is somewhat clichéd.

One of the best-known peculiarities of the first edition of the Sixth is its repeat of the second half of the trio in the third movement, a marking which is not in the manuscript and thus is left out of the Collected Edition. While the repetition creates a more conventional structure and gives the principal horn player another opportunity to showcase the high “Eroica” E-flat, it again sacrifices the unique for the sake of making the symphony more conventional and presumably more understandable. This third movement, and in particular this trio, is one of Bruckner’s most interesting and enigmatic conceptions, and the omission of the repetition of the trio shows a composer who is secure in his abilities and flexible in his formal conceptions. On the other side of the spectrum, the first edition also suggests two places for a cut, one in the second movement, and one in the finale.
In the second movement, it is suggested to cut out the recapitulation of the B theme group, which would result in a lopsided form and a tragic loss of beautiful music. In the finale, the first pianissimo bars of the coda, in F minor, are suggested to be cut, which, among other problems, would result in an ill-placed non-sequitur from the dominant of F major to A major (a problem which the editor says can be avoided with the addition of a “Luftpause”; however, it is clear that this solution is not satisfactory). Both of these potential cuts are harmful to the musical structure, and thankfully it does not seem that the majority of conductors who perform this piece would even consider them.

A curious change in the first publication can be found in the addition of a bit of new composition early in the development of the finale. In m. 196, before the strings’ lyrical transformation of the A1 theme in F major, there is an isolated pickup based on the preceding theme of mm. 186-196 in the first oboe. In the Collected Edition, there is nothing but silence; see example 8. Only a further examination of the sources could clarify this discrepancy, but to add such a phrase was well within the capability of Josef Schalk.

While the first publication is replete with dubious reorchestrations, there are two instances in the Collected Edition which also prove to be problematic. The first appears in m. 112 in the first horn, where Bruckner has written on the second beat the following four eighth notes (in concert pitch): B Bb B B, where in the analogous passage in the recapitulation, both flutes play at m. 296 in octaves the following four eighth notes: Db C C Db (Nowak, 1952). This inconsistency is not the fault of either Nowak or Hynais or Schalk (or Haas, for that matter), as the manuscript (Austrian National Library Mus.Hs. 19.478) clearly shows both passages, from which there can be no doubt as to what Bruckner wrote on paper. The distinguished Bruckner conductor Günter Wand was the first to call attention to this difficulty, and in his recording of 1995, he changed the horn passage in the exposition to follow the contour of the flute passage in the recapitulation, see example 9. William

---

1 The development begins at measure 177, rehearsal letter M, “bedeutend langsamer”, 4/4 in the first publication, 2/2 in the Collected Edition.
Carragan agrees with this change, and believes the manuscript notes to be an uncharacteristic oversight on the part of the composer (Carragan, 2013).

Example 9
Bruckner, Symphony No. 6, first movement

The other problematic area is at the beginning of the recapitulation, in the second clarinet part in m. 215, where the collected edition shows B B B (sounding G# G# G#) on beat 2.5, where the first publication shows B flat B flat B flat (sounding G G G), as shown in example 10. Harmonically, the Collected Edition notes do not fit with the harmony being produced on that beat by the violoncellos. Furthermore, the harmony on beat 2.5 is one that is not found in the simpler scoring of the corresponding measure in the exposition (m. 33), which is much closer to a pure dominant, Bruckner having changed the music at the recapitulation to be more harmonically inventive and urgent. The manuscript supports this notion, which is full of erasures in this section. The manuscript shows in m. 215 small markings above the second clarinet notes in question, which could possibly be construed to represent flat accidentals, which would make the manuscript agree with the first publication and the Collected Edition would be wrong. Whether this problem is the fault of the composer or subsequent editors is irrelevant to the fact that the notes should be rendered as they appear in the first publication, with the second clarinet consistent with the cellos and thus with the rest of the orchestra.

Example 10
Bruckner, Symphony No. 6
first movement

Dynamics and articulation

Of the over 1200 differences between the two publications in the first movement, over half of them concern dynamic markings and expressions. The dynamics in the first publication mainly serve to dull the sharp and vivid contrasts that are a hallmark of the manuscript, and to give specific dynamics to certain instruments where the manuscript gives a universal dynamic. In order to achieve these goals, the first publication goes as far in certain cases as to give a completely different dynamic marking at crucial moments in the piece. Again, the arrival of the third theme group is a point of interest. In the exposition, the dynamics in m. 101 are basically consistent between the two sources, with the exception of ff being replaced by f in the trumpets in the first publication. Startlingly, the first publication accompanies the same material in the recapitulation with the indication “pp cresc. sempre”, even though the Collected Edition has ff in every part, as was the case in the exposition. Because in the recapitulation Bruckner does not give music corresponding to the four measures of crescendo which precede m. 101 in the exposition, it seems as though the first publication tries to eliminate the shock of a sudden orchestral fortissimo by starting the third theme group with a pianissimo. However, throughout the whole symphony, the Collected Edition indicates that Bruckner wants this sort of shift in dynamic to be sudden.
There are no major dynamic negations in the fourth movement of the first edition such as those present in the first movement, but there is the general sense of softening Bruckner’s original stark dynamic contrasts. As was the case in the first movement, there are numerous dynamic additions, not in the Collected Edition, which can help the performer and the conductor shape the phrases. For example, in m. 390 during the coda of the movement, the first edition calls for a diminuendo, followed by a series of terraced dynamics, with a “mezzo-forte” in m. 391, a “forte” in m. 393, and a “fortissimo” in m. 395. While one might argue that a sustained fortissimo for the entire passage could be quite exhilarating, perhaps the advice given by the first edition might help shape this passage and make it even more exciting.

This idea that Bruckner’s original dynamic conceptions need to be softened is not only seen in the first publication of the Sixth Symphony, but in other first publications, such as that of the Second Symphony (Carragan, 2005). We know that Bruckner strongly emphasized the abrupt terrace dynamics in his performances of the Second Symphony, as revealed in copious pencil notations in the parts, which suggests that the softening modifications in the first publication of both the Second and Sixth Symphony should be rejected (Carragan 2013). But in many instances where Bruckner’s dynamic indications are unusually bare or vague (mm. 30, 31, 32, 82, 83, 164, 178, 203, 217, 219, 220, 270, 271), the addition of new dynamics in the first publication is revealing to the student and helpful to the conductor.

While the modifications present in the first publication in terms of dynamics generally soften the original intent, changes regarding articulation both soften and make more harsh what is presented in the collected edition. The difference between the keil (vertical solid arrowhead) found extensively throughout the Collected Edition and the staccato (dot) that replaces it in the first publication pervades the entire movement, from the opening to the final bar. These two markings are not interchangeable, although many publishers do not try to distinguish between the two, using the staccato as the default. The problem with that particular solution is that the staccato does not imply the same weight as the keil, nor does it imply the same fractioning of the value of the note, and therefore the keil should be used rather than the staccato if the composer so specifies.

While the decision in the first publication to use the staccato softens the presentation of the work, there are also new articulations introduced into the first edition such as the cap accent, which seems to indicate a heavier or more emphatic sound, in the brass and upper string parts beginning at first movement m. 33 and the analogous location in the recapitulation (m. 220), and in the trumpets, trombones, upper winds and upper strings at m. 40. However, where the editor of the first publication probably thought that the brass would overpower the rest of the orchestra (i.e. trumpets in mm. 175–176), he changed accents clearly written by Bruckner in the manuscript into tenuto markings or completely removed them.

The problem between the keil and the staccato is heightened further in the final movement of the first edition. Beginning in m. 47, the marking which was written into the first edition is in shape and size between a true keil and a staccato. To make matters worse, the lack of consistency with which the marking is written makes it even harder to distinguish whether or not it is to be interpreted as a keil or a staccato. However, there are clear examples, such as in m. 208 where the editor of the first edition uses staccatos and the Collected Edition uses keils. On inspection of the manuscript it seems to me that it could be interpreted either way.

Just as the staccatos in the first publication lighten the overall impression, so too do the publication’s modifications in regard to note duration. In every instance, the first publication has a shorter value. Often at the end of phrases, as at m. 104, the first publication changes Bruckner’s original quarter note to an eighth note, eighth rest. In measures where Bruckner writes consecutive dotted-eighth note and sixteenth note cells, the first publication has eighth note, sixteenth note rest, and sixteenth note cells. Both of these changes demand a lighter style of playing that the original scoring does. And while it is not prudent to make such changes without the composer’s intent, these changes suggest that original performances of this work were lighter and, by implication, faster than those usually encountered today.

**Conclusion**

Despite its many debatable and adventurous modifications, the first publication for all its faults can be very useful to study for those wanting to improve their understanding of this enigmatic work. In his foreword to his contribution to the Collected Edition, Nowak writes the following: “…[T]he inaccuracies and discrepancies [present in the first and subsequent editions] may well be the reason why the Sixth Symphony has lagged
behind some of the others in popularity; quite undeservedly so, because its spirited straightforwardness, its wealth of serene melody, and its imperious rhythms fully entitle it to a parity with all the other symphonies" (Nowak, 1952). While this statement rings true over fifty years later, the symphony is now suffering from quite an opposite stigma, that of over-sterilization. In fact, it can be said that neither the first-published edition nor the Collected Edition is wholly good or wholly evil. Rather, both have aspects that can inform the student and performer of the correct way to conceive of the symphony, and at this point in the editing history of the symphony, it is only through a complete study of both texts that an informed vision of the piece can be construed.
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MAY 1945

As the Allied tanks trod Germany to shard
and no man had seen a fresh-pressed uniform
for six months, as the fire storm
bit out the core of Dresden yard by yard

as farmers hid turnips for the after-war,
as cadets going to die passed Waffen SS
tearing identifications from their battledress,
the Russians only three days from the Brandenburger Tor -

in the very hell of sticks and blood and brick dust
as Germany the phoenix burned, the wraith
of History pursed its lips and spoke, thus:

To go with teeth and toes and human soap,
the radio will broadcast Bruckner's Eighth
so that good and evil may die in equal hope.

Peter Porter (1929-2010)
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This listing features several notable new issues, including a version of Sym. 7 in an edition by T. Kawasaki (Tokyo New City Orch./Naito), and a version of Sym. 8 including the 1888 Intermediate Adagio ed. Gault and Kawasaki (Philh. Festiva/Schaller) and variants of the other movements ed. Carraga. Recordings of the 1887 version of Sym. 8 come from Botstein and Nagano, and van Zweden adds Sym. 6 to his ongoing cycle with the Netherlands Radio PO. Klaus Sonnleitner includes the 5 organ works definitely by Bruckner in his recital on the St. Florian Bruckner organ.
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THE BACK COVER states that ‘this performance of the Symphony is Skrowaczewski’s own edition (not published)’, leaving us to wonder how this edition relates to the published ones.

In fact, he seems to be following Nowak for the first movement and for most of the second, and so the percussion is there at the climax of the Adagio. But at the end of the movement, where Nowak (following the manuscript) has the strings change from arco to pizzicato halfway through bar 216, Skrowaczewski follows Haas in delaying the pizzicato for another bar (according to Bornhöft’s editor’s report, this reading derives from a score of the first edition belonging to the conductor Karl Muck, in which he entered some emendations given to him by Bruckner).

What matters most is Skrowaczewski’s individual feeling for the music, in particular his deeply-felt slow movement. Phrases are moulded expressively, and the observance of dynamics is both scrupulous and imaginative. Details come through well, every wind entry in the scherzo making its mark.

In the Finale tempi are mostly as per Haas, and there is little or no slowing down at the end of the various recurrences of the first theme (although, according to Bornhöft, the controversial tempo indications in the manuscript are in Bruckner’s handwriting). Skrowaczewski eases off the pace for the second group, and the new tempo is maintained for the third theme at bar 93, which is march-like rather than ponderous. There’s a lot of unobtrusive know-how here, but somehow I don’t feel that Skrowaczewski is as engaged with this movement as with the rest.

The performance has been cleanly recorded. Final applause has been edited out, and there is little, apart from an obvious bow change in the opening cello theme and a couple of unobtrusive coughs later, to show that this was a live performance.  

**CD Reviews**

**Bruckner - Symphony No 7 in E**  
London Philharmonic Orchestra / Stanislaw Skrowaczewski  
Recorded live at the Royal Festival Hall, London, on 24 October 2012  
LPO-0071

**Bayerisches Staatsorchester / Kent Nagano**

**CD1: Symphony No. 4 (1st version 1874) [75:10]**

I. Allegro [21:17]  
II. Andante quasi Allegretto [20:22]  
III. Sehr schnell – Trio. Im gleichen Tempo [13:26]  
IV. Allegro moderato [20:05]

**CD 2: Symphony No.7 in E major (Nowak) [66:57]**

I. Allegro moderato [20:12]  
II. Adagio. Sehr feierlich und sehr langsam [22:11]  
IV. Finale. Bewegt, doch nicht schnell [12:38]

**CDs 3 & 4: Symphony No.8 (first version, 1887) [37:04] [62:21] (available separately FARAO Classics B108075)**

I. Allegro moderato [19:55]  
III. Adagio. Feierlich langsam, doch nicht schleppend [33:37]  
IV. Finale. Feierlich, nicht schnell [18:44]

Recorded No. 4 07/2007, No. 8 07/2009 Farao Studios, Munich; No. 7 live 09/ 2010 St Bravo Cathedral, Ghent.  
FARAO Classics 4 CD box B 108074 (also available as Pure Audio Blu-ray disc A 108076)

ATTENDING the performance of Bruckner’s Eighth Symphony by Lorin Maazel and the Vienna Philharmonic on the penultimate night of the Proms reminded me how crucial the presence of a truly world class orchestra is to the success of what its admirers might legitimately claim to be the penultimate symphony ever written.

The excellence of the contribution here of the Bavarian State Orchestra is indisputable; time and again, listening to these recordings I am struck by their beauty of tone. This is one of the world’s oldest orchestras, claiming its origin as far back as 1523 and a 200 year-old pedigree as a full symphony orchestra. Previous directors include such notable Brucknerians as Bruno Walter, Hans Knappertsbusch and Wolfgang Sawallisch. Their recordings with Kent Nagano of the two earlier symphonies have been previously issued but this is the first appearance of the Eighth; all three symphonies are also available separately. This attractively packaged, hinged box-set, with cardboard slipcases and a booklet with full notes is presented as a tribute to their collaboration on Bruckner with their conductor Nagano now that he is leaving them, but it is as much a testimony to their prowess as an orchestra as his direction. They are served by sound of the highest quality, with excellent balance and a little space round the instruments and climaxes which carry enormous weight without loss of clarity. There is virtually no audience noise in the live Seventh.

While these recordings of Bruckner’s first thoughts in the Fourth and Eighth are by no means the only ones available, many of the others are now deleted and these are certainly amongst the best. Even those who are wedded to later revisions of the scores will find great interest in, and occasionally possibly a preference for, these first versions. However, most committed Brucknerians are already habituated to the idea of a multiplicity of versions jostling for pre-eminence, so these
simply offer another welcome option. The purchaser of this set is indeed getting something unique very conveniently packaged. But putting aside editorial concerns, the question is, how good are these recordings? I certainly very much enjoyed listening and re-listening to them as aesthetically convincing and satisfying in their own right. Some commentators have found that Nagano’s style veers too close to “Bruckner Lite”; I cannot say that I hear this defect but I readily concede that other interpreters bring more weight to their accounts of these masterpieces.

Looking – or rather listening - in slightly more detail at the recordings individually, the listener will find that the Fourth emerges as highly enjoyable. The gentle beauty of Nagano’s aptly conjures up Bruckner’s medieval, chivalric idyll as well as confirming its links with its Romantic, nature-inspired predecessors like Mendelssohn, Schumann, Weber and, of course, Wagner. In this version, however, after the characteristic rising and falling horn motif based on a fifth, the pacesettles to more of a swift Allegro than the more familiar, “Bewegt, nicht zu schnell” (“Lively, not too fast”). Tennstedt and the Berlin Philharmonic bring more grandeur to the opening theme and its development, their timpani underpinning that majesty, whereas Nagano creates a more lifting, carefree atmosphere.

The revised version of this movement certainly creates a less episodic, more unified impression and one cannot help feeling that Bruckner was right to tighten up its structure, but the additional time granted by the original version gives more space to building the great chorales. There is less contrast between the martial and bucolic passages in Nagano’s more lyrical conception; thus the sudden outburst by the brass and strings at 4’04” seems almost too abrupt and incongruous with the lyricism which precedes it. However, Nagano’s control over the ebb and flow of this movement is admirable: the shimmering strings herald the return of the main subject on solo horn at 6’37” and the music builds majestically in two great waves before the appearance of the yearning, sighing descent of the second subject on strings. The movement could perhaps end satisfactorily at 15’32” but the recapitulation and subsequent gallop to the finishing line, which Bruckner retained in the revisions, thrillingly justifies its prolongation.

The second movement, however, really does outstay its welcome at over 20 minutes, but the crescendo from 16’00” to the end of the extended waltz section in its original, slower form, eventually much excised and abbreviated, creates a haunting effect. The replacement of the original third movement by the “Hunt Scherzo” cannot be much regretted by anyone, as the original is clearly amongst the weakest of Bruckner’s inventions. It is restless, dramatic, driven music, again typically exploiting the interval of a fifth but nowhere near as exciting as what superseded it and presenting insufficient contrast with the movements either side of it to qualify in character as a true Scherzo. Similarly, the original Trio is inferior, being rather shapeless; a bitty conclusion confirms the general impression that the movement would better have been limited to a more succinct ten. Similarly, the Finale seems cruder and more disjointed than its successor; the opening three minutes are considerably less compelling than the familiar version, even if there is no lack of propulsion in the grand, proto-Sibelian conclusion.

The Seventh here strikes me as a very successful performance, albeit slightly domesticated in comparison with the savage beauty of Knappertsbusch’s astonishing 1949 recording with the VPO, still my favourite recording despite its relatively primitive sound. Nagano secures powerful and graceful playing in the opening Allegro without finding the yearning intensity that Knappertsbusch brings to the heartfelt cry from the violas. However, textures are light and transparent and there is no lack of gravitas; one always feels that Nagano knows where he is going with the music. The same clarity allied with a suspicion of some lack of passion informs his direction of the Adagio; it is here that Nagano’s grasp of the long line is most apparent. This is a restrained, noble account whose impact is enhanced by the golden aureola suffusing the orchestral sound, which is in turn further mellowed by the warm ambience of a cathedral acoustic similar to the sonic landscape of the Ebrach recordings under Gerd Schaller. Bruckner’s Scherzos are pretty much bombproof when played by an orchestra and conductor of quality and so it proves here. The Finale is just a tad too civilised but Nagano achieves a telling contrast between the two alternating themes of the angular, aggressive brass chords boldly blasted out and the smooth legato of the conci.
original manuscript.” Some conductors exclude them altogether, but here Nagano compromises by replacing each three with a mere one.

The Finale can drag in less skilful hands and the extra material here does little to alleviate that danger. Tennstedt in his live recording with the BPO in 1981 provides the best example of how to handle it and he is assisted in his endeavours by the tauter structure of the 1890 version; he emphasises the barbaric splendour of this music with thumping timpani and raucous brass, whereas Nagano returns to his default position throughout these three recordings which is to accentuate its lucent beauty. Yet he gives the heroic horn tune its full measure and guides the music to its monumental conclusion, as Bruckner enters his own Christological Valhalla to echoes of “Das Rheingold”.

Ralph Moore

Bruckner - Symphony No. 8 (mvts 1, 2 & 4 variants c. 1888, ed. Carragan, mvts 3 'Intermediate Adagio' ed. Kawasaki & Gault)

Otto Kitzler (snr + jnr) - Trauermusik - To the memory of Anton Bruckner

Philharmonie Festiva / Gerd Schaller
Live recording in Ebrach Abbey 7/2012

Produced by Prof. William Carragan
Performed by the Munich Philharmonie Festiva
Gerd Schaller (conductor) & Otto Kitzler (snr + jnr)

Otto Kitzler (snr + jnr) - Trauermusik - To the memory of Anton Bruckner

Philharmonie Festiva / Gerd Schaller
Live recording in Ebrach Abbey 7/2012

Produced by Prof. William Carragan
Performed by the Munich Philharmonie Festiva
Gerd Schaller (conductor) & Otto Kitzler (snr + jnr)

IT IS IMPORTANT to understand exactly what is being performed here. The so-called ‘Intermediate Adagio’ exists in a copy-score only, and it is conjectured that this is a version by Bruckner possibly dating from around 1888. Although there is nothing in Bruckner’s hand on the score, there are sketches elsewhere that are preparatory to this version. It is an interesting score and well worth hearing in performance, constituting an intermediate stage between the Adagios of 1887 and 1890. Amongst an intriguing collection of smaller changes there is one major difference: the build up to the climax, which is thoroughly reworked and includes a wonderful passage for four horns alone, unlike anything to be heard in any other version. The climax itself is already similar to 1890, the six cymbal clashes of 1887 having been replaced by a mere two. This Adagio has been recorded before by Akira Naito and the Tokyo New City Orchestra, but this performance in Ebrach Abbey is beautifully shaped, and the rich and full sound of the orchestra - primarily members of the leading orchestral ensembles of Munich - has been well caught by the recording technicians.

But the other three movements are something else. If the ‘Intermediate Adagio’ is to be performed, the question arises into which version of the symphony it should be inserted. Prof. William Carragan’s venture here is to answer, ‘Neither,’ and create an edition of the score that gives an indication of what Bruckner was doing with the other movements over roughly the same period that the ‘Intermediate Adagio’ came into being. As Paul Hawskshaw’s paper on the sources of the Eighth records, with this symphony there is no shortage of preparatory and discarded revision material. Prof. Carragan has taken up pencil notations in manuscripts for the first two movements, and taken some material from a composite score of the Finale in which the 1887 version had been revised into the 1890 version, but which shows some evidence of the progress of that revision. This edition of the symphony is therefore not anything that Bruckner himself ever conceived as a version or a completed whole, nor even is it an edition necessarily incorporating a consistent level of revision throughout. As Prof. Carragan writes in the CD insert notes, ‘it will always have to be regarded as experimental, not on the same editorial level as the … versions of 1887 and 1890… But in it we have a fascinating view of the work-in-progress of Bruckner the eternal reviser.’

The performance and recording are excellent. The Abbey acoustics can be difficult for those in the audience, but the recorded sound is very fine, with a nicely judged mix of clarity of detail and appropriate reverberation. The woodwind solos, often plaintive responses to bold statements in the strings and brass, sound with a haunting clarity, and are expressively played, the oboe particularly distinctive throughout. In the first movement the contrapuntal interplay between duplet and triplet rhythms in the strings in the Gesangsperiode registers well. In this edition of Prof. Carragan’s there is a striking passage in the development, at about 10:50, where the low strings repeat again and again the falling three note motive from the end of the main theme, with solemn woodwinds intoning above - an addition that showed Bruckner lengthening the development rather than moving towards the concision that became the great strength of the 1890 version. And indeed, the performance does lose some degree of tautness over the development, but the coda - still the loud blazing C major of the 1887 version - is as convincing as I have ever heard it. Although going to the major, it nevertheless sounds like a frightening amplification of the ‘annunciation of death’ by horns and trumpets that closes the first wave of the coda.

There are little differences to delight and intrigue throughout - note the little bassoon figure leading to the horn’s repeated note with its appoggiatura at 1:55 and 2:07 into the Scherzo. There are other variants in the Trio, slightly melancholy and prefiguring motives from the Adagio, which give a different slant to the mood of the piece. The finale receives a powerful performance, the breit and sehr markig markings for the phrases of the second theme strongly observed, the sound of the brass, both in the Wagner tuba chorales and the mighty tuttis, very impressive.

The only danger with this recording is that those confused by the versions of Bruckner symphonies we already have, and those wishing in vain to have ‘the Bruckner problem’ simplified, might consider the situation to be exacerbated beyond tolerance by the mere existence of a recording of this edition. On the other hand, those of us interested to hear
what ideas Bruckner might at some stage have had for this symphony, even if he was to discard them later, would be sorry not to have had a chance to hear this otherwise unavailable music.

And there is an interesting fill-up. Bruckner sought lessons in composition and orchestration from the Linz conductor, Otto Kitzler. The Trauermusik - To the memory of Anton Bruckner was written in 1905, most probably by Kitzler snr (Bruckner’s teacher), though at times it was credited to his son, also Otto. Only the piano duet version survived, and some programme note and review descriptions of the orchestration. From these Gerd Schaller has orchestrated the work, and it comes across as a heartfelt tribute to the composer in whose memory it was written.  

Ken Ward

Bruckner - Symphony in D minor, ‘Die Nullte’
Philharmoniker Hamburg / Simone Young

SIMONE YOUNG’S Bruckner interpretations I have found difficult to warm to, and confess to having developed something of a prejudice against them, so I embarked on listening to this recording with low expectations, confident that it would not find a place among those I would be inclined to recommend. Well, it just goes to show how misleading prejudices can be: this is a quite wonderful recording and performance of this symphony. For me that impression was apparent from the very opening bars. The tempo is slow, almost as slow as Maazel with the Bavarian Radio Symphony Orchestra, but whereas Maazel’s performance seems plodding and immediately boring, Young’s musicians from the Hamburg Philharmonic play with an alert vitality which makes you prick up your ears right from the start. The recorded sound from the Laeiszhalle Hamburg is very clear, not dry but providing a resonant and transparent picture, and the violins sound beautifully grainy, as can be heard in the nicely judged crescendo in bar 15 before the repeat of the opening theme.

Young’s approach does the symphony full justice as a valid part of the Bruckner cannon, even if the composer himself wasn’t convinced. She takes it seriously and it is as though Bruckner had written ‘Feierlich, misterioso’ instead of merely ‘Allegro’ as the opening tempo marking. Josef Wöss, editor of the first published score of 1924, writes that Bruckner’s ‘Allegro’ should be understood as ‘Allegro un poco moderato’, though it’s hard to understand why Bruckner’s Allegros should be understood differently to anybody else’s. Young’s tempo is nothing like an Allegro, not even moderato, and her performance of the first movement is amongst the slowest - in fact, only Maazel is slower - but the playing is so cleanly articulated and the rhythms so energetically sprung that she makes a very convincing case.

Her way with the Andante has a similar gravitas. I suppose it has something of ‘early’ Bruckner is viewed from the stance of the later symphonies, but the Andante proves itself worthy of this slow and deeply expressive approach. The opening theme sounds like a prayer, indeed the whole movement has an air of religious contemplation, whereas some quicker performances present it more as a dreamy reverie. The contrasting colour of the strings and wind instruments in this movement is particularly effective, and they all play excellently. The Scherzo is both weighty and imbued with an air of mystery which leads nicely into the slow introduction to the Finale. The Allegro vivace main theme with its wide leaps and thundering unisons sounds tremendous, and when it gets into all its contrapuntal shenanigans the movement seems to prefigure the finales of both the Fifth and the Ninth. The second theme sounds somewhat Mendelssohnian and some of the melodic phrases and great brass gestures reminded me of that other influential composer, of whose fantastic symphonic score Bruckner possessed a copy, Berlioz.

There are some good recorded performances of this symphony, including those by Haitink with the Concertgebouw, Tintner, Skrowaczewski, Blunier (who has the advantage of Bruckner’s rarely recorded orchestral pieces as fill-ups) and even a spirited attack on the work available on YouTube by Hortense von Gelmini with the N Tintner, Skrowaczewski, Blunier (who has the advantage of Bruckner’s rarely recorded orchestral pieces as fill-ups) and even a spirited attack on the work available on YouTube by Hortense von Gelmini with the Nürnberg Symphony Orchestra – but this recording by the Hamburg Philharmonic is amongst the best recorded, and the performance is such as to make you wonder why Bruckner ever thought it should be nullified.

Ken Ward

---

**BRUCKNER SOCIETY OF AMERICA**

**BEST BRUCKNER RECORDINGS OF THE YEAR 2013**

- **Best Audio Recording**: Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchestra’s complete set of the Bruckner symphonies conducted by Herbert Blomstedt, released by Querstand on SACD
- **Best Video Recording**: Cleveland Orchestra’s Blu-Ray/DVD of Bruckner Symphony No. 4 conducted by Franz Welser-Möst, released by ARTHAUS MUSIK
- **Best Historical Recording**: Boston Symphony Orchestra’s DVD of Bruckner Symphony No. 7 conducted by Klaus Tennstedt Nov. 1977, released by ICA Classics

Further information at www.abruckner.com
Mozart - Clarinet Concerto
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8 (1890 Nowak)

Matthias Schorn (clarinet), Innviertler Symphonie Orchester / Nicholas Milton
Live recording in the concert hall of Ried im Innkreis, 31 Aug., 1 Sep., 2012 Avi-music 2 CDs 8553279

THE ANNUNCIATION OF DEATH - Todesverkündigung - is what Bruckner called the climax of the first movement where trumpets and horns alone blaze out the rhythm of the main theme, assisted by a thunderous drum roll. In Die Walküre the word, which Bruckner himself took up, refers to that moment when Brünnhilde tells Siegmund of his imminent death at the hands of Hunding; Bruckner in his Eighth translates the term into a traumatic symphonic event that can shake us all with the certain knowledge of our own mortality, and in this performance there are no holds barred: the trumpets especially ring out implacable and shattering. For this symphony to register with full power the first movement must indeed be this trenchant, otherwise the movements that follow are bereft of their raison d’être, and the Innviertler SO perform it magnificently. The opening presentation of the first theme is full of mystery and foreboding and the lyrical second theme, though it maintains some element of vigour appropriate to an Allegro moderato movement, here has an atmosphere of melancholy, of wistful suffering. Conductor Nicholas Milton (1996-2002 leader of the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra, a chamber musician, and since 2006 dedicating himself exclusively to conducting) structures the movement masterfully. This is a live recording of a concert to celebrate the orchestra’s first fifteen years. Innviertel is a region of Upper Austria, bordering on Bavaria, and the orchestra is a mix of young musicians from the area and members of renowned professional orchestras. Being from the same province as the composer, they may indeed have an instinctive sense of how the music should go. Milton shares artistic directorship with American Karen Kamensek, and on the evidence of this recording the standard of musicianship is excellent. In the first part of the concert, and on the first CD, Matthias Schorn (principal clarinettist of the Vienna Philharmonic) gives a warm-hearted and lyrical performance of Mozart's clarinet concerto, with the quite close recorded clarinet producing a wonderfully beautiful and detailed sound.

The recorded sound is generally very good, with great presence. It’s only in the closing pages of the symphony where, on my equipment at least, the full detail of the orchestral tutti fails to come through: you can hear the timps, trumpets and trombones, but much of the rest of the welter of sound is hard to locate. The contribution of the Wagner tubas to the opening section of the coda, especially the 2nd tuba, fails to come over strongly, one of the risks in recording a live performance, but the two trumpet crotchets that precede the blazing overlay of themes, often lost in muddled ensemble or reverberation, here sound with stirring clarity. Milton takes the opening of the finale fast, like most conductors taking scant notice of Bruckner’s tempo and metronome marking, which is a shame. Nevertheless, it is a stormy, dramatic and powerful performance, taking off where the stomping high speed Scherzo left off. The Scherzo Trio has a light dreaminess to start with, but mutates to sterner stuff with its trumpet fanfares in the second part. In the Adagio the heavy tread of the double-basses underlines the pulsing accompaniment to the theme, marking the rhythmic accents with sombre resonance. Pacing throughout the Adagio is assured and unfaltering, and that ff subsidiary peak on the way to the summit, where two motives from the main theme are rammed together and into which Haas felt the need to insert more reflective bars from the 1887 version, works perfectly here as a unified moment of crisis.

Altogether this is a performance of considerable gravitas and splendour. No doubt everyone who was there will wish to have a copy of this two CD set, and anyone interested in the work of the Innviertler Symphony Orchestra and their conductor Nicholas Milton will find it a worthwhile acquisition. But also, as a Mozart and Bruckner concert, it makes for very rewarding listening, standing comparison with many more renowned ensembles. It must have been quite a night in the concert hall of Ried im Innkreis. Ken Ward

Bruckner - Symphony No 2 in C minor (1877 version, ed. William Carragan)

Orchestre de la Suisse Romande / Marek Janowski
Pentatone Classics PTC 5186 448

WITH THE latest tranche of issues from Pentatone Classics, Marek Janowski has now recorded all nine numbered Bruckner symphonies with the Suisse Romande Orchestra. Belatedly catching up with this series, I am struck by the clarity of the sound and the care that has been taken over balance. The heavy brass is kept down so that wind lines can come through, and while brass dynamics do need to be controlled, in passages such as the big F minor tutti in the middle of the first movement the trombones are very discreet indeed. The effect is of a lighter Bruckner than usual, but to a large extent the approach suits this particular symphony, with its gently interweaving contrapuntal lines and placid-plaintive temperament.

Janowski’s tempi are flowing, the occasional broadenings giving the music shape. The steady pace for the Scherzo – which is in any case only Mäßig Schnell in the 1877 version – allows the Trio to unfold unhurriedly at the Gleiches Tempo Bruckner asks for.
There are however places (especially in the Finale) where one wants more drama and more power. One might also feel that other conductors have found greater depth in the slow movement (Janowski does take the option of including the passage at letter C). It’s still an agreeable and well-detailed performance which I suspect I will be coming back to.

Dermot Gault

Bruckner - Symphonies 3 (1889 version) & 6

Berner Symphonieorchester / Mario Venzago
54’35” (CD1) and 50’34” (CD2) CPO 777 690-2
Grosser Saal, Kultur-Casino Bern, 30 April & 1 May 2012 (Symphony 3), 5-8 February 2011 (Symphony 6)

IN AN ESSAY included in the CD booklet, Swiss conductor Mario Venzago explains at length his approach to conducting Bruckner. Suggesting that many recent recordings of Bruckner sound the same, he argues that composers’ scores present not only the musical text but also suggest how the work should be interpreted, something influenced by performance fashions at the time of composition. For this reason, he believes performing traditions that perpetuate past tastes should be replaced by new ones that communicate better to today’s audiences.

Venzago goes on to argue that massiveness in Bruckner is a tradition that has been acquired and points out that brass instruments played more softly and lyrically in his time. He also feels that solemnity in Bruckner should not mean dragging tempos. For these reasons, Venzago endeavours to perform Bruckner with a slimmer, more Schubertian tone as well as using a “rubato-rich, bar-line-free playing style”. He further explains that he is attracted to the colour, pictorialism and sensuousness of the music as well as its “sacral theatricality”, admitting that he frequently allows himself agogic and dynamic liberties in his interpretations.

In practice, Venzago’s performances of the two symphonies in this set are neither as wayward or as individual as these explanations might suggest. There are occasionally awkward gear changes (such as immediately before letter E in the first movement of the Third Symphony), but Venzago’s approach to pacing mainly tends to involve accelerating into crescendos and slowing down for diminuendos, an approach not dissimilar to that of Eugen Jochum. In terms of the orchestral texture he presents, string vibrato is used sparingly but tutti passages have plenty of weight and volume.

For the most part, I did not find the performance of the Third Symphony particularly inspiring. I’m not sure this can be attributed to Venzago’s performance approach as opposed to a simple lack of interpretative fire on the day. The Adagio comes off well, but the other movements rarely rise above the routine.

The Sixth Symphony enjoys a considerably better performance. Once again, there are some slightly disruptive tempo changes, and I’m not sure I like the alle breve presentation of the passage commencing at letter D in the Adagio, which gives it an awkward gait. For the most part, however, Venzago’s performance is deeply felt, and the Scherzo, one of the fastest on record, is fiery and exciting. I would not put this ahead of Blomstedt’s excellent version on Querstand, but it’s definitely a performance I want to listen to again.

The Berner Symphonieorchester is not the most refined ensemble in the world, but do everything Venzago asks of them. CPO’s engineers present both symphonies with a close focus sound, very vivid but somewhat hard sounding in tutti passages.

Christian Hoskins

DVD + Blu-ray reviews

Celibidache in St Florian - Bruckner’s Mass in F minor - A Jan Schmidt-Garre Film
(plus a bonus track of Celibidache and Munich Philharmonic in Moscow, 1989)

Munich Philharmonic Choir and Orchestra, Margaret Price, Doris Soffel, Peter Straka, Matthias Hölle, Hans Sotin Cond. Sergiu Celibidache, in Philharmonie im Gasteig, Munich & St. Florian (9/1993)
60 mins + 5 mins bonus track NTSC DVD, subtitles GB, FR, ES ARTHAUS MUSIK DVD 101678

This film has been issued before on ARTHAUS Musik, 10025, in 2002 under the title Sergiu Celibidache and Bruckner’s Mass No. 3 in F minor, with the subtitle ‘in rehearsal’. It is a very fine film which intercuts various rehearsal stages in Munich and extracts from the performance of the Mass in the Abbey at St Florian. There is no commentary or voice-over, just a couple of explanatory texts superimposed at the outset, otherwise the soundtrack is all music and Celibidache’s voice (and even his whistling), with one or two brief conversations between conductor and musicians.

It opens with a rehearsal in St. Florian Abbey in which Celibidache is concerned to compensate for the reverberant acoustic. He demands that the orchestra move to the left and right, sit as close as possible together and the choir come forward, brusquely brushing aside a voice-off that tells him this is impossible. It must happen and it shall happen - Celibidache is not to be thwarted by the mere ‘impossible’.

A considerable portion of the film is spent on rehearsal of the Kyrie, including rehearsal of the orchestra alone that then fades, magically, into rehearsal of the choir supported just by piano, then orchestra and soloists. The choir sounds wonderful, and Celibidache thinks so too. The extract ends with the conductor announcing, with a mischievous twinkle, that they can now have ‘a twelve minute break’. In the Gloria we
witness the choir rehearsal of the fugato, ‘In Gloria Dei Patris’, followed by the orchestra, Celibidache paying special
attention to which parts are to be heard in the foreground. The ‘Et incarnatus est’ is shown complete from the performance
with tenor Peter Straka excelling. The rehearsal of the ‘Benedictus’ leads in to an extract from the later pages leading to
the ‘Hosanna’ from the performance in St Florian, as is the closing chapter, the ‘Dona nobis pacem’ - performed with full
Celibidachean intensity and slowness.

So there’s no complete performance here, but much of the music-making and the rehearsal is very moving, and it’s
awe-inspiring to witness Celibidache’s knowledge of and care for the music which he even rehearses without a score.
The bonus is hardly relevant, but fascinating to watch. Firstly some general views of Moscow in the snow, beginning to
turn to slush, and then Celibidache’s arrival and a brief interview in which he says they’ve come to Moscow because
they’ve heard that here is the best audience in the world (not a view one might take today), and then he rehearses the
Soviet Socialist Republic’s national anthem, followed by that of Germany over which the closing shots are of a smart
couple and a hurried woman approaching along the red carpeted chandeliered corridors, and a stereotypically severe and
rather stout lady programme seller. This five minute snippet is a sharp reminder of extraordinary times. Ken Ward

Bruckner - Symphony 7 in E
Wolf - Five songs for soprano and orchestra
Strauss - Befreit, Op39/4

Renée Fleming - Staatskapelle Dresden / Christian Thielemann
Semperoper Dresden, 1 September 2012 106 mins. Opus Arte OA BD7127D

THIS OPUS ARTS Blu-ray disc (also available as a DVD) preserves a performance of Bruckner’s Seventh Symphony from
Christian Thielemann’s inaugural concert as Principal Conductor of the Staatskapelle Dresden. Thielemann’s relationship with the
orchestra was already well established by this time, his first appearance as a guest conductor having taken place in 2003, and has
resulted in a number of recordings, including a performance of Bruckner’s Eighth Symphony on the Profil label (which received a
qualified recommendation in The Bruckner Journal 14/3 in November 2010). With this new release, there are now two Thielemann performances of the Seventh Symphony on Blu-ray and DVD to choose from, the other being from a 2006 concert with the Munich Philharmonic on the C Major label. Although there are some
differences between the two performances, Thielemann’s conception of the symphony is largely the same as it was six years earlier,
with measured accounts of the first and last movements (22’40” and 13’37” respectively in the new performance), richly
upholstered orchestral textures and an interventionist approach to tempo and phrasing.

Thielemann’s pacing of the symphony’s serene opening statement is more flowing than before, much to the benefit of the performance, and the music’s mystery and power is strongly conveyed during the opening part of the movement. However, the pulse slackens during the development and again in the latter stages of the recapitulation (from around letter K in the score). Thielemann secures a tremendously articulate response from the orchestra at such points, but the overall impression is of the music being stretched beyond the natural contours of its expression.

The opening of the Adagio is not entirely clean (Wagner tubas entering ahead of strings), but the main theme is powerfully
moving and the climax at bar 27 is tremendous. The second subject ideally needs a lighter touch, but the flute decoration after
letter F is sublime. Thielemann maintains a strong sense of line as the movement progresses. The performance edition is
described as being as Haas, and indeed it is for the most part, but Thielemann includes the cymbal, triangle and timpani scoring
from the Nowak edition at the climax, which is spectacularly delivered. The coda is exquisitely played and deeply affecting.

The performance of the Scherzo has considerable forward momentum and power. As in 2006, Thielemann’s account of the
Trio is rich, slow and intense. Less convincing, however, is the interpretation of the Finale. Here, Thielemann indulges in
numerous unmarked tempo changes for expressive effect, a typical example being his sharp slowing for the passage
commencing at letter V in the score, about ten minutes into the performance. As impressive as such episodes sound in isolation,
they do nothing to promote the movement’s structural coherence. The coda, too, suffers from a long, unmarked rallentando, an
unhelpful interpretative mannerism that has become a common feature in performances over the last couple of decades.

All things being equal, I would be inclined to favour Thielemann’s new performance of the Seventh Symphony slightly
ahead of the otherwise similar one from Munich on C Major, partly a result of the greater incisiveness and depth of feeling of the
Dresden Staatskapelle’s playing. However, it is worth noting that the C Major disc includes a fine performance of the Fourth
Symphony given in Munich in 2008.

Accompanying the Seventh Symphony on the Opus Arte disc are five rarely heard orchestrations of songs by Hugo Wolf. Three of the songs, Er ist’s, Anakreons Grab and Mignon, were orchestrated by Wolf himself, while Elfenlied owes its scoring to Günter Raphael and Verborgenheit to Joseph Marx. These are given idiomatic performances by soprano Renée Fleming and are sensitively accompanied by Thielemann. An encore comes in the form of Strauss’s deeply moving Befreit, although here Thielemann rather underplays the song’s emotional climax.

Henning Kasten’s video direction maintains the viewer’s interest throughout and the picture quality is excellent. Thielemann
is seen to use a score in the Wolf songs but conducts the Bruckner from memory. The sound in both stereo and surround features
an ideal blend of transparency and plushness as well as some occasional audience noise. The rear cover of the disc case promises
subtitles for the songs in five languages, but were unavailable on my copy of the disc. Texts of the songs in German, English
and French are, however, provided in the booklet note.

Christian Hoskins
**Concert reviews**

**HOUSTON, USA**

**GRACE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH**

**26 APRIL 2013**

attr. Bruckner - Symphonisches Praeludium (cond. Michelle Perrin Blair)
Bruckner - Mass No. 3 in F Minor

Cynthia Clayton, sop., Melanie Sonnenberg, mezzo, Joseph Evans, tenor, Timothy Jones, bass-baritone.
Houston Symphony Chorus (chorus master Dr. Charles Hausmann)
University of Houston Moores School Symphony Orchestra / Franz Anton Krager

BRUCKNER has been a long journey for me. My first introduction was in the fall of 1969 in my first musicology class at university as a freshman music major. The professor played part of the scherzo from Symphony No. 7 and then commented that anyone enjoying that music should seek another career. I took his comment to heart. I listened to Bruckner no more until hearing a Mass setting (which, regrettfully, I do not know) at church around 1990. I sought out Bruckner’s music afterward, but it was the symphonies that received all of my obsessive attention until last October when on tour with John Berky's group last fall. A member of the group, David Singerman, handed me his iPod numerous times with instruction to listen to various choral pieces. So quite literally my knowledge of and experience with this music has taken place in the past year.

I learned of this performance last fall when browsing the U of H calendar searching for concerts. It was more than a surprise. In preparation I downloaded a poorly scanned study score and purchased Janowski’s & Herreweghe's recordings. For a couple of months I listened to the recording in study or as background while performing other tasks. Later on I acquired Jochum’s recording of all three Masses. I can think of no other Mass setting that more effectively uses the music to emphasize the theology of the liturgy. Throughout the Gloria and Credo there are musical cues to Bruckner’s intense faith: the chorus hanging on to certain words such as Deus, Domine, and Filius, transitions from joy to quiet reverence, and grand pauses where in Mass the congregation is performing some rubric.

The superb Houston Symphony Chorus has been part of my cultural life for over forty years. They never disappoint. Dr. Hausmann has developed a very fine ensemble and Maestro Krager has built a fine university orchestra. I have attended their performances for some years and marvel at their progress as I played in this very orchestra as a student. That orchestra forty years ago could not have performed Bruckner. For the record this group performed the Fourth Symphony earlier in the year so they had some experience with Bruckner. It suits their capabilities and their conductor.

Grace Presbyterian Church is located in west Houston. It in no way has the stone cathedral acoustics we associate with Bruckner's music. But it is conducive to a good experience, the pews have rather large aisles that allow music to expand rather than being lost in the seats and carpets. This church has a marvellous organ that I will love to see in my own parish church (or better in Houston’s Jones Hall!). There is a marvellous array of trumpets directed at the audience.

The orchestra was a sympathetic accompaniment to the superb choir. This is not university level material though the ensemble performed very well. One expects aggressive trumpets and horns in a university orchestra, but lauds must go the violins and bassoons. The chorus sang using German pronunciation of Latin. I find it somewhat jarring, but it is what Bruckner would have heard in concert performances. That issue aside every word was clearly and distinctly enunciated.

The opening Kyrie set the foundation for the whole performance: expressive, clear voices and outstanding playing by horns and first violins. The singers held onto the syllables KY and CHRI to a marvellous, almost chilling, effect: forceful, separate and leading into the next syllable. This Kyrie was a slow great crescendo that whispered away in the final twenty bars.

The Gloria is a masterpiece. It was performed as it should be: joyous and enthusiastic. The chorus was on fire and the strings supported the voices very well. There are several shining stars in this performance that must be credited: The chorus sang forcefully yet with great clarity; the Fugue was performed with aplomb, sounding so easy; The last two bars leading to Andante, mehr Adagio have a slight ritardando that underscores this transition. Small detail, rewarding result.

The rousing Credo is also a masterpiece. I struggle deciding which is my favourite: the Gloria or the Credo? I have decided they are co-favourite. This is curious, very difficult music with frequent dissonance, syncopation, complex rhythms and abrupt transitions. The chorus sang it superbly. There was a very pleasing ritardando and pause before “et incarnatus est” as well as an unmarked grand pause after “passus et sepultus est”. Small but
important details abound elsewhere. “Et resurrexit” was sung with a nice crescendo as was “et ascendit in cælum”. “Non, non” in “non erit finis” was chilling.

Inserted at the customary place in the Mass as the Offertory, the Ave Maria from 1882, contemporary with the Seventh Symphony, was sung in the MWV critical edition. It is scored for alto (low voice) and organ (harmonium, actually). It was tenderly sung by Timothy Jones, a wonderful bass-baritone and faculty member at the University of Houston Moores School of Music.

The Sanctus is brief but worthy of attention. The chorus was most effective singing “sanc-” in crescendo and “-tus” in decrescendo. The tympani, violins and violas beautifully accented “Sabbaoth”. The change of tempo and meter for the Hosanna with charging trumpets, horns & tympani brought forth a very rousing end. I once dismissed the Benedictus to a friend and he strongly suggested that I listen more carefully. His advice is much appreciated. This is fine music which Bruckner was to quote later (in the Adagio of the Second Symphony, for example). Beginning at 105 the choir sang “bene(dictus)” with a slight ritard, lingering on “blessed”. It is not indicated, but I expect Bruckner would have approved as it is another of those instances of using the music to emphasize the theology. The Agnus Dei is an intensely lovely piece with beautiful climaxes but in the end Bruckner’s supplication whispers away into sublime reverence. Carefully placed and sung crescendi (agnus Dei) and ritardandi (mundi) along with the ubiquitous strong first violin plus wind dialogues created a sublime conclusion that almost brought tears to this listener.

Specific praise must be given to organist Sigurd Øgaard who provided a thunderous underpinning to the big climaxes and the university timpanist, Leah Cables.

The concert was introduced with a performance of the Symphonic Prelude well conducted by Michelle Perrin Blair, a graduate student. This music was unknown to me. I could find no score for study though I did read its history and controversy. Is it Bruckner? I do not know. One does hear hints of themes not yet composed. The orchestra was strong and I hope one day to hear another live performance of this piece.

Ray Elliott

A note from John Proffitt

THESE PUBLIC concerts on April 26 & 27 were the culmination of two years’ work pulling the artists and performance venue together for as close as perfect circumstances as possible. Hans Graf had wanted for many years to schedule the Mass in F Minor with the Houston Symphony Orchestra, but management was not enthusiastic (imagine that!) and this dream of Maestro Graf was not to be realized. I consulted with him first, before moving forward with an alternative, and he was very supportive. “His” Houston Symphony Chorus (of which I’m a member) teamed up with the excellent Moores School Symphony Orchestra at the University of Houston to present the Mass in a large Presbyterian Church, which (unlike any of Houston’s concert halls) also boasts a large pipe organ – and excellent acoustics, an absolute joy for a chorus to sing in! My friend and colleague, Franz Krager (also of the Moores School faculty) conducted. I worked with Maestro Krager to prepare the orchestral and vocal scores.

The University of Houston Moores School of Music Symphony Orchestra (to use its formal name, oftentimes abbreviated “MSSO”)) is a terrific ensemble, the program having developed greatly over the past decade under Krager’s leadership. He and I have collaborated over the years on a number of compact disc recordings for Albany (I highly recommend Robert Nelson’s Symphonic Scenes from “A Room With a View”) and when he told me his plan to program the Bruckner 4th as part of the MSSO’s spring 2013 season, I was happy to serve as an unofficial advisor. Shortly thereafter he and I hatched the idea of a Houston-premiere performance of the Mass in F Minor. These concerts were an incredible experience for all, as I think the resulting recording captures.

This was in many ways the culmination of a dream for me, too, to produce and record a major Bruckner symphonic work...and to do it right! The performances were not note-perfect, but the minor imperfections in my opinion did not significantly detract from a powerful, dramatic rendition that did complete justice to Bruckner’s masterwork. And the Houston Symphony Chorus is one of the very best all-volunteer choruses associated with a major American orchestra, and did they shine!

The concert opens with the controversial Symphonisches Praeludium which some attribute to Bruckner in one way or another. He may have provided some input by way of advice or sketches, if only because some of the thematic content derived from unpublished and unknown works of his at the time (1876), but the final form of the work is almost surely from his students at the Conservatory. Dr. Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs’s essay in The Bruckner Journal Vol. 11/1, March 2007, (also available at www.abruckner.com) gives a comprehensive analysis of the work, although he comes down too strongly in favour of significant Bruckner authorship for my comfort. Nevertheless, it’s an effective piece and my intent was to use it as a quasi “organ prelude” or Introit for the Mass. And one additional idea I had for the performance: we added the lovely Ave Maria III as the Offertory. Although it was written a number of years after the Mass (in 1882, to be precise), the Ave Maria makes a sublime Offertory at the traditional point in the Roman Catholic Mass. Its key of F Major works to perfection in context, and in terms of mood and affect makes an appropriate transition from the fff end of the Credo and the pp beginning of the Sanctus.
I recorded in high-resolution, 5 channel surround sound, which I hope will be made available at some point in the future on a Blu Ray disc, and have also done a standard mix-down to a stereo CD, which will be available from www.abruckner.com from mid-October 2013. A note on balance. As the producer, I was determined to avoid the artificial spotlight effect that in my opinion mars many large orchestra recordings with soloists. And especially in Bruckner, the vocal soloists are but one thread in the overall texture and should not be made artificially prominent by the microphone placement or engineering. Another major feature of this recording is the very deliberate presence of the pipe organ at major climaxes, with the 32-foot deep bass pedal stops underpinning the wonderful chordal structure. Bruckner did not write a separate organ part for the Mass, but it’s known from performance history that he improvised ad lib in the first public presentations. The fine Schantz pipe organ at Grace Presbyterian Church works well in this role.

The CD recording of this inspired and inspiring concert, which was sponsored by the Bruckner Society of America, is available from mid October 2013 at www.abruckner.com

CHICAGO, USA SYMPHONY CENTER 13, 14 JUNE 2013

Wagner - Siegfried’s Rhine Journey and Funeral March
Beethoven - Piano Concerto No. 4 (Rudolf Buchbinder)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 1

Chicago Symphony Orchestra / Riccardo Muti

MUTI obviously gave a great deal of thought and preparation to these performances (I attended the first two of three scheduled) of Bruckner’s bold breakthrough work. In the opening movement especially, not only were details brought out that I hadn’t noticed before, but they were played out in counterpoint to the main proceedings, an exciting effect. Tempi were on the broad side - the performances came in at a bit over 50 minutes each - giving extra heft and weight. This symphony, obviously, was not to be dismissed as an “early” work. The downside came in the finale, which I thought sagged a tad in the middle in the first performance, and he did slow down a bit at the coda. Still, a fine piece of conducting that succeeded in playing up both the work’s originality and its debts to other composers - particularly the two on the first half of the program. The orchestra was splendid throughout, the brass solid even at the end of a long concert.

Sol Siegel

SEOUL, KOREA SEOUL ARTS CENTER CONCERT HALL 24 JULY 2013

Bruckner – Symphony No. 8 (ed. Haas)

Bucheon Philharmonic Orchestra / Hun-Joung Lim

NOW IN ITS 25th year, the Bucheon Philharmonic, based in a suburb of Seoul, was the first Korean orchestra to perform all the Mahler symphonies and, more recently, those of Bruckner as well (at least, 1-9). The 100+ musicians, 80% female, gave us an 8th that, despite a tentative start, coalesced into a potent and very satisfying performance.

Acoustics in the recently-renovated concert hall are bright and resonant; they seemed to throw off the orchestra at the start. Ensemble and intonation were initially not quite all there, and both strings and winds had a harsh edge. Lim, the orchestra’s music director for virtually its entire history, showed some nice phrasing at times but kept a pretty tight rein in the 17-minute opening movement to allow his players to adjust to the hall. There was, however, no mistaking either the potential or the power of this orchestra. At 13 minutes the scherzo was fast and powerful, but I found the trio to be too fast and rigid, lacking in delicacy.

At this point I was becoming a little concerned about how the rest of the night might go, but thankfully everything came together in the final movements. The strings and winds had adjusted to the hall, and the 24-minute adagio was a thing of beauty, very moving and one of the best live performances I’ve ever heard. Now, finally, we could hear the quality in this orchestra. The lower strings in particular were gorgeous, and we
enjoyed wonderful work by the eight horns in their two groups (the four "extras" against the back wall of the stage handling the Wagner tuba parts with a suitably dark, burnished sound).

Which brought us to the finale, which got off to a rousing start in part due to Ms. Choi Ju-Ok's potent whaling away on the tympani. Lim produced a solid, powerful, and very effective performance, suitably ratcheting up the tension along the way. The absolutely silent full house got very much caught up in the excitement due to good phrasing, sensible tempos (21+ minute timing), ever-building momentum, and careful attention to dynamics. The coda began from nothing, as it should, the orchestra building and building until it finally let loose for a very effective close. The audience, initially stunned silent, then itself let loose with wave after wave of applause and bravos until Lim finally took his concertmistress by the hand and led the entire orchestra off the stage.

Bruckner performances in Asia aren’t the easiest things to track down, but the Bucheon orchestra is certainly one to keep on the radar screen. Oh, by the way, ticket prices are very reasonable: Our seats halfway up in the second tier cost less than $20 US. A very worthwhile experience.

Neil Schore

**Bruckner at the Lucerne Festival, Summer 2013**

For the 75th anniversary of the Lucerne Festival, the organizers had devised the main idea to be the theme of “Revolution.” The events, visited by 85,000 people over the space of four weeks, together offered an immensely varied, overall programme that admirably included contemporary music and modern trends. Among the many highlights, a complete concert performance of Wagner's *Der Ring des Nibelungen*, Stravinsky’s *The Rite of Spring*, Messiaen’s *Turangalîla Symphony* and Berlioz’s *Roméo et Juliette* were especially noteworthy. The 80 year old Claudio Abbado with his unique Lucerne Festival Orchestra and the now 88 year old Pierre Boulez with his Lucerne Festival Academy still remain the mainstays of the festival. But even though we wish them a long, continuing active life, yet the early dawn of a new era in Lucerne may well become unavoidable.

What Bruckner’s symphonies might have to contribute to the theme “Revolution”, if one has in mind their previously rarely-matched extended duration, their seemingly harsh and abrupt contrasts and their harmonic audacity, was here not so important: the main thing is that they were played. And so, the Ninth Symphony conducted by Claudio Abbado, and the Eighth Symphony at the second-before-last concert, under Lorin Maazel, these may be counted as belonging among the other major highlights of the Festival. Abbado, who has previously conducted the Seventh, Fourth, Fifth and First Symphonies in Lucerne, added to that this thrice repeated programme (22, 23 and 26 Aug.), Bruckner’s Ninth, appropriately coupled with Schubert’s likewise incomplete symphony, the two-movement *Unfinished*. In no other symphony did Bruckner penetrate so extremely into harmonically uncharted territory as he did in the Ninth. Although Abbado in no way smoothed out the work’s severe soundworld, the performance never gave the impression of ugliness and he allowed room to each of the top-class musicians assembled in the orchestra to unfold their prowess - a conductor for whom it is no longer necessary to shine through display of his craft.

On 5 September the Sächsische Staatskapelle Dresden under Christian Thielemann made a guest appearance with Bruckner’s Fifth Symphony. It was preceded by Hans Eisler’s orchestral songs, *Erntegesänge*, sung by Thomas Hampson. Having returned to East Germany in 1949, these songs were a response by the composer on the occasion of Kruschev’s announcement of Stalin’s gruesome crimes to the XX Congress. Whether this excellent orchestra with its charismatic conductor succeeded in drawing the listener under Bruckner’s spell must here remain open to question. Thielemann, who up till then had not conducted with immoderate gestures, in the closing apotheosis put on a very studied display, staying the applause by holding for a long while a pose that seemed to imitate Bruckner as conductor in the posture well-known from Otto Böhler’s silhouette, an effect which caused rather uneasy feelings, at least in this writer.

Once again the Vienna Philharmonic with the 83 year old Lorin Maazel provided a great experience. While Bruckner had dedicated the unfinished Ninth *dem lieben Gott*, the dedicatee of the Eighth was Kaiser Franz Josef I, who accepted the dedication and financed the printing costs. The première on 18 Dec. 1892 in the great hall of the Musikverein with the Vienna Philharmonic under Hans Richter was for Bruckner an unprecedented triumph. This internationally recognised first class orchestra thus looks back on a long Bruckner tradition, but also the conductor, who has recorded all the symphonies with the Bavarian Radio Orchestra, has long experience of Brucknerian universe. So the orchestra played what is perhaps the most difficult of Bruckner’s symphonies - in the original version of 1890, free of extraneous additions - in a wonderful symbiosis between orchestra and conductor, who - see above - employing economical but effective gestures, led the orchestra masterfully through the Brucknerian universe.

Albert Bolliger (trans. KW)
I HADN’T planned it this way, but this summer became something of a Bruckner marathon, and I found myself attending 10 Bruckner concerts in Germany, Austria, Edinburgh and London, in which I heard wonderful performances of symphonies 3 - 9. This wouldn’t have been possible were it not for the friendship, hospitality and support provided by Dietmar and Lilo Achenbach of Mannheim, (who put me and a colleague up and drove us around for no less than three visits to Germany), also by the Ebrach Summer of Music and Maestro Gerd Schaller, and by the wonderful team that organise the BrucknerTage festival in St Florian.

It would seem indulgent to fill the pages of The Bruckner Journal with my own reviews of all these concerts (though should readers wish to read them, I did write reviews of most of them that www.bachtrack.com were kind enough to publish on-line), but I thought a short summary to highlight performances and characteristics of those performances would maybe provide something of interest to Bruckner Journal readers.

The first concert was by far the most ferocious, with the young charismatic Bulgarian conductor, Yordan Kamdzhalov, racing through Bruckner’s longest symphony (by number of bars), the first version of the Third (1873), in barely an hour, each movement proceeding *attacca* to the next, and the Scherzo lasting a mere five minutes. The first movement’s opening arose with its characteristic atmospheric magic, the detail of the string ostinato beautifully clear, the trumpet theme and the wind solos that respond to it nicely judged, but by the time of the massive climax of the development we were travelling at high speed, the violins frantically powering through their accompanying arpeggios and scale. There was little respite in the Adagio, Bruckner’s prayerful sudden soft interludes never allowed to moderate the surging progress of the work. After the high-speed Scherzo, Kamdzhalov raced into the finale’s relentless rising quaver figure, unleashing a veritable storm of a movement. At times, such as the brash, brassy third theme’s recapitulation, the music seemed so bizarre that one was reminded of the words of the critic Dömpke who wrote, some years later, “Bruckner composes like a drunkard.” True to his view of the work to the very end, Kamdzhalov made no concessions towards a portentous conclusion, not a hint of a rit. or final additional crescendo: the music just stopped in full flight and conductor, orchestra and audience alike remained momentarily frozen in suspended animation until the magician on the podium relaxed and broke the spell that had held us in thrall since the symphony began.

Fast forward a couple of months, and 340 miles southeast to St Florian, to find me at an even more extraordinary performance of the 1873 Third in the context of the BrucknerTage 2013. Where Kamdzhalov had been all tumultuous fire and passion, here was a performance built on measured calm and transcendent vision - the same score now finding a heavenly length of over 90 minutes. So how did the audience react to an hour and a half of very slow Bruckner? Did they get restless? Did they fidget and cough and rustle their programme notes? Did they leave in droves after each movement, as had the audience at the first performance in 1877? Not a bit of it: the capacity audience sat on the hard pews of St Florian Abbey as though mesmerized. The building is vast and richly decorated and into this glorious space there arose from the Altomonte Orchestra sounds of such surpassing beauty that it would have been enough just to listen and wonder at the sounds alone. The orchestra was founded in 1996 and based at St Florian and is named after Altomonte, father and son, Baroque painters responsible for some of the large frescoes in St Florian. It consists of young musicians from Austria and various countries worldwide, together with first class musicians from such orchestras as the Vienna Philharmonic and the Bruckner Orchestra Linz, and the string tone they produced in the echoing acoustic seemed to glow from within.

It’s very courageous for a conductor to stand in front of an orchestra and large audience and embark on a performance of such extended duration, but there was in Rémy Ballot’s direction of the music such an assured sense of the long paragraph, of faith in the music, that beneath it
all there seemed to be a quietness that took us far, far away from the everyday world of bustle and passion. His beat was primarily steady, with an ongoing pulse that never let the slow tempo get moribund. This was not an interpretation that moved urgently towards its climaxes, it nevertheless maintained an unwavering sense purpose.

The unison climax of the first movement thundered with elemental power; the song-period really sang; the Ländler dances in the Scherzo and Trio had real lift and lift (well, this was Austria after all!), and the brass and woodwind played their extended chorales with great beauty and solemnity - but ultimately it was the achievement of the sublime immensity of the whole that was to be applauded, a performance that, for all the dramatic and, at times, quite strange events that occur during the symphony’s progress, addressed itself to the quiet, transcendent illumination that shines through his composer’s work. It is events such as this that demonstrate the unique ability of music to communicate things are not easily put into words and that we desperately need to hear.

A couple of days earlier, also at the BrucknerTage, the 1889 version of the 3rd had been excellently performed, to a standing ovation, in a version for two-pianos, four-hands, by Franz Farnberger and Matthias Giesen. In August next year the BrucknerTage 2014 will focus on the mighty Eighth Symphony. I think it will be worth making some special effort to be there!

I heard two performances of the Ninth, both with the SPCM performing version of the Finale. I remain endlessly intrigued by the fragments of the finale and take every opportunity to hear performing versions that present them in the context of a complete movement. The big crisis, the massive dissonance at the climax of the Adagio around which the symphony pivots, has been claimed to reveal the doubt and despair the devout Catholic Bruckner revealed as he approached his last days, but recently the composer Keith Gifford suggested to me that this crisis is a contemplation of the crucifixion itself and the very foundation of Bruckner’s faith in salvation. The idea that Bruckner is creating something for us to contemplate rather than expressing his personal distress accorded well with the impressive interpretation presented at this performance. Indeed, in the repeated striving, rising, angular sequences it was possible to picture the Man dragging his cross towards Golgotha, interrupted by sorrowful, prayerful reflections. The Heidelberg Academic Orchestra is a first rate student orchestra. Although they had been playing well enough, with this Adagio suddenly the richness and fullness of tone they achieved, and the perfect shaping of the opening phrase by conductor Jesko Sirvend, came as something of a shock.

For the most part the finale was as moving and as convincing as I have heard, but the coda was problematic, sounding as though it had lost its way. Robert Dick with the semi-professional Orchestra of the Canongait in the Edinburgh Festival Fringe seemed more successful with the coda, beginning it very slow and mysterious and progressing convincingly to a stirring close to a very powerful performance. It was also a joy to hear the trio in the Scherzo movement played fast, with never a moment’s slowing down for the descending figures that lead so many conductors to retreat into sentimentally. It’s so rare to hear it like this, and that alone made it worth the journey from London to Edinburgh (and back on the sleeper)! Overall the performance was one of great power, and the orchestra and conductor have reason to be proud of such an achievement.

There were two very fine concerts in the Abbey at Ebrach, in the Steigerwald, northwest Bavaria. Gerd Schaller is the driving force here behind the Ebrach Summer of Music (Ebracher Musiksommer), a festival at which he has conducted the Philharmonic Festiva in many fine performances of Bruckner symphonies, recordings of which are available on the Profil Classics label. These performances of symphonies Nos. 5 & 6 complete the cycle and will be available on CD in the near future - (a performance by the same forces of the symphony in D minor, “Die Nullte” is scheduled in Bad Kissingen for 7 September 2014). The core of the orchestra is the Munich Bach Soloists, who themselves include many players from the Munich Philharmonic, and other first class players are recruited from all over Germany. All soloists were outstanding, but special mention needs to be made for the first clarinet in the Fifth, whose interjection of the finale fugue theme was fantastic - in all senses of the word. It’s a difficult judgement, how to inflect this strangely irreverent little theme that has the capacity to dismiss the quoted themes from earlier movements and then to power the first fugue and to combine itself with the big chorale theme in a massive double fugue. Bruckner is not generally noted for much humour in his music, but it’s hard to imagine that he didn’t have a smile upon his face as he penned this little motive, and the clarinettist imbued it with such character that it acquired an extra measure of portentousness, a sort of “Heads up, folks! Something really special is on the way!” It was all the more startling in the context of Maestro Schaller’s noble and humane reading of the work. The Fifth symphony sounded before us like the “gigantic masterpiece” (Robert Simpson) that it is, and its powerful accumulative structure was presented as granitic and ornate, and as soaringly beautiful, as the mighty Abbey in which it was performed.

The Sixth began with lively determination, the little triplet-duplet Morse code like rhythm on violins was precisely articulated and the cellos and double basses presentation of the Maestoso main theme had a propulsive energy to set the movement energetically on its way. So it was remarkable how naturally the transition to the lyrical second theme was handled - not even a hint of a lumpy gear change, the tempo perfectly judged. In the accelerando that builds up to the great climax of the development many conductors make an exciting crescendo, but Bruckner’s score calls for something even more dramatic. The accelerando remains quiet, has no crescendo, so that the full orchestra, fortissimo, bursts in unprepared, sweeping all before it. In the Philharmonie Festival’s performance over this passage Maestro Schaller effected a diminuendo to pianissimo, so increasing the tension and dramatic effect of the climax when it came.
One thing that marks out performances of this work is how successfully the finale is negotiated. Even such an undoubted Brucknerian as Georg Tintner had his doubts about the movement and wrote, “So in the Sixth Symphony we have three perfect movements and one that is somewhat problematical - at least to me.” It was Schaller’s great achievement in this performance to negotiate a path through the abundance of contrasted motives whilst always maintaining a sense direction. There is a jaunty little motive in the third theme group, derived from the tragic oboe melody of the Adagio, and a source of embarrassment to Tintner - “the more often it appears, ... the more banal it becomes” - but I love the way it smiles and becomes one of the key elements in the transformation of the movement from its rather severe opening material and stormy episodes towards the optimistic triumph by which it is suddenly blessed at the end.

There seemed nothing problematical in Schaller’s presentation of the music and the closing bars were as effectively delivered as I have heard, the sudden return to the tonic major avoiding entirely the sense of an arbitrary ill-prepared event that it can sometimes have. It was as though something very clear and natural that had been behind the music since the beginning finally burst in full focus into the foreground.

Finally there were the three performances of Bruckner at the Proms. In their different ways, they were all good, but to me it seemed that none of them felt entirely at home with the music. The Philharmonia’s 7th and the Vienna Philharmonic’s 8th were both performances of incredible beauty, and I was in awe of the level of concentration Maazel elicited from both orchestra and audience throughout the long finale to the 8th. Both Salonen and Maazel had places where they chose to do something exceptional - Salonen, for example, had the brass introduce the finale’s 3rd theme extremely slow and weighty (they sounded tremendous!), but after 8 bars it all speeded up - and again in the recapitulation; and Maazel brought everything to a halt for an extended luftpause before a massive, very slow (some might say bloated) presentation of the climax of the Adagio. Generally the critical reaction in the press was very favourable, Maazel and the VPO receiving 5 stars.

Vasily Petrenko and the Oslo Philharmonic delivered a far more rugged 4th. He had the trumpets, tuba and trombones raised high, pointing at us, and it was a very brassy performance. But the most exasperating thing for me was the extreme quietness of the opening tremolo. The first thing the audience heard, except for those leaning on the front rail a few feet from the 1st violins, was the horn call, immaculately played by Inger Besserudhagen. There has been a penchant recently for extreme pianississimos for the opening tremolos of Bruckner symphonies, and I wish it were not so.

The Andante was very nicely played, not too slow, and both its themes beautifully moulded, the overall shape of the movement well handled, and the hushed timpani at the close were perfectly judged. With all this wonderful brass, I was particularly looking forward to the hunting Scherzo, and indeed it did sound good, but Petrenko seemed more concerned to present every detail - and wonderful details they were - than allow the thing to race away with visceral excitement. All the elements in the Finale were of themselves finely played - the grand mysterious opening, the blazing climax of the first theme, the first theme of the second group taken at a melancholy, almost world-weary slowness, and then, as though to brush it out of the way, the second part taken so fast that it was hard to make out exactly what the melody was until the brass give it the full chorale treatment at half the speed in the development - but I’m not sure these elements related cogently one to another. Petrenko went for drama, drawing out the diminuendos, the music becoming very slow and very quiet, before the two occasions when the whole orchestra thunders in with the main theme in the development. It left the impression of a magnificently loud and brassy movement with melancholy interludes and a symphony which didn’t quite add up to a convincing whole.

It has been a wonderful Bruckner Summer (and I did manage some other composers too - not least the Berlin Staatskapelle Ring Cycle and the Hallé Parsifal at the Proms), and if it were to cross your mind that by now maybe I’d had a surfeit of Bruckner - well, just between you and me, maybe - for the moment… But I’ve just seen a flyer: the Hackney Singers are performing Bruckner in Stoke Newington on October 5th...

Stephen Pearsall writes:
The BrucknerTage are days of happiness. Amidst the imposing and awe-inspiring grounds of the monastery there is a buzz, the sound of laughter interspersed with occasionally earnest discussion. Symptomatic of the jovial and relaxed atmosphere, the 3.30pm rehearsal took place while visitors to the church wandered in and out, myself included. It was marvellous to sit outside, taking in the glory of the monastery, and all the while this music resonating from inside the church to the out and beyond.

Ken Ward
Timed Structure Tables for Bruckner Symphonies

Professor William Carragan

This next six pages carry the tenth 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. 9 in D minor**


The vigorous and exciting Walter performance from 1946 is typical of his work from that period. Especially noted are his energetic tempos, leaving room for plenty of nuance. Audible near the very end of the first movement are a few of the rhythmic timpani beats from the old Dutch Bruckner tradition; the full set, in which the drumstrokes occur on each note of the tuba part with the whole notes rolled, can be heard on a van Beinum performance from 1941. In the trio of the scherzo, all four conductors appropriately slow down for the plaintive B theme at measures 53 and 205, and in the ornate scoring of that theme at the beginning of the development, measure 113, even though Bruckner does not say to. But only Wand interprets Bruckner's marking of “Langsamer” at measure 137 to be a further ritenuto before the recapitulation; it is beautifully done. I have analyzed the adagio as being in Bruckner's typical five-part song form, because that is what it sounds like. But beginning in part 4, the assignment of the themes is distinctly innovative. Walter gives us a rousing acceleration in part 3 measures 105-120, again the expression of an old tradition. The other conductors have slight accelerations here and there, always welcome in this movement which should never be heavy-handed, even at the frightful dissonant chord in measure 206.

As for the finale, I have tried to present analyses of the three completions in parallel columns impartially, showing as well as possible in limited space what the sources are for what the completers have done. Most of the sources, including the indispensable Mus.Hs. 6087, are in the Austrian National Library; the word “Bogen” means a bifolio of four pages, customarily prepared with 16 measures, and the letters A through F refer to different styles of paper. The last three surviving bifolios are accepted as being numbers 29, 30, and 32, though the numbering is heavily crossed-out and overwritten on all three. Further details can be found in Phillips’s volume published by the Musicological Press, (MWV), with which my notation conforms. This is not the time for a discussion of the relative merits of these efforts; all the completers have already argued their cases eloquently, and no doubt will continue to do so. At that same time, although I am a rival participant in this business, I must say that Sébastien Letocart’s score, especially with its vast, highly dramatic, vividly resourceful, and excellently-paced coda, deserves much more attention than it has so far received.
### Bruckner: Symphony no. 9 in D minor

Bruno Walter, New York Philharmonic-Symphony Orchestra (1946)
Joseph Keilberth, Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra (Salzburg Festspiel 1960)
Günter Wand, Cologne Radio Symphony Orchestra (1979)

#### I (Kopfsatz)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>meas.</th>
<th>Walter</th>
<th>Keilberth</th>
<th>Wand</th>
<th>van Zweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>[D]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 tail</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1b</td>
<td>E major ...</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1c</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1d</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1k</td>
<td>to D minor</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 tail</td>
<td>to D minor</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ak</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 inv</td>
<td>E major</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bx</td>
<td>A flat, A minor</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1(Bx)</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>G flat major</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>8.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>B minor ...</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>9.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (C1)</td>
<td>F major</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>9.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Development

| section 1  | [F] | 227 | 8.33 | 10.09 | 9.57 | 10.32 |
| (A1)       | F minor | 229 | 8.37 | 10.14 | 10.02 | 10.37 |
| (A1 tail)  | — | 245 | 9.01 | 10.55 | 10.46 | 11.23 |
| bassoons   | dominant of C flat | 267 | 9.34 | 11.42 | 11.35 | 12.14 |
| (A1 tail)  | — | 269 | 9.36 | 11.45 | 11.38 | 12.18 |
| section 3 (C2) | F major | 277 | 9.52 | 12.06 | 11.58 | 12.40 |
| section 4 (B) | [C] | 303 | 10.37 | 12.57 | 12.51 | 13.28 |
| (B, A1b)   | C major, minor | 306 | 10.41 | 13.03 | 12.55 | 13.33 |
| (A1d)      | — | 321 | 11.16 | 13.43 | 13.29 | 14.11 |
| retransition (A1k) | to D minor | 329 | 11.32 | 14.02 | 13.48 | 14.29 |

#### Recapitulation

| march (A2) | A flat major | 356 | 12.16 | 14.64 | 14.35 | 15.22 |
| event (A2) | C minor ... | 367 | 12.43 | 15.28 | 15.02 | 15.51 |
| event (A2) | dom. of E minor | 381 | 13.15 | 16.10 | 15.37 | 16.23 |
| event (A2) | F minor | 387 | 13.28 | 16.22 | 15.49 | 16.35 |
| transition (triplets) | D minor | 401 | 13.63 | 16.53 | 16.21 | 17.07 |
| B1         | D major | 421 | 14.38 | 17.48 | 17.16 | 18.10 |
| B1 inv     | D major | 439 | 15.20 | 18.42 | 18.10 | 19.01 |
| B2         | B flat major | 447 | 15.62 | 19.06 | 18.33 | 19.25 |
| extension  | G flat major | 453 | 16.16 | 19.30 | 18.57 | 19.48 |
| C1         | B minor, D minor | 459 | 16.38 | 19.53 | 19.21 | 20.16 |
| C2         | G flat major | 479 | 17.18 | 20.37 | 20.07 | 21.06 |
| Ck         | B flat major | 493 | 17.45 | 21.08 | 20.40 | 21.41 |
| transition (Sym. 2) | to D minor | 505 | 18.10 | 21.34 | 21.07 | 22.12 |

#### Coda

| drum       | [D] | 517 | 18.41 | 22.07 | 21.50 | 22.54 |
| (A2)       | D minor | 519 | 18.44 | 22.11 | 21.56 | 23.01 |
| (A2 tail)  | D minor ... | 531 | 19.08 | 22.36 | 22.29 | 23.36 |
| peroration (A1 tail) | D minor | 551 | 19.51 | 23.21 | 23.20 | 24.28 |
| rhythmic drum | [D] | 563 | 20.13 | — | — | — |
| end        | D minor | 567 | 20.20 | 23.50 | 23.55 | 25.00 |
## II: Scherzo

### Scherzo pt. 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>meas</th>
<th>Walter</th>
<th>Keilberth</th>
<th>Wand</th>
<th>van Zweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>silence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x (transition)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence</td>
<td>A minor</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scherzo pt. 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>meas</th>
<th>Walter</th>
<th>Keilberth</th>
<th>Wand</th>
<th>van Zweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>drum</td>
<td>(A1)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1(x) oboe</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2 oboe</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retransition</td>
<td>(E flag major)</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>[G]</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trio pt. 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>meas</th>
<th>Walter</th>
<th>Keilberth</th>
<th>Wand</th>
<th>van Zweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>F sharp major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>F sharp major</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>F sharp major</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ax</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (slower)</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K(A) (a tempo)</td>
<td>F sharp major</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence</td>
<td>F sharp major</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trio pt. 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>meas</th>
<th>Walter</th>
<th>Keilberth</th>
<th>Wand</th>
<th>van Zweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B (slower)</td>
<td>F sharp major</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langsamer</td>
<td>A flat major</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a a tempo</td>
<td>F sharp major</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>F sharp major</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>F sharp major</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ax</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (slower)</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (a tempo)</td>
<td>F sharp major</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence</td>
<td>F sharp major</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end silence</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scherzo da capo pt. 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>meas</th>
<th>Walter</th>
<th>Keilberth</th>
<th>Wand</th>
<th>van Zweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>silence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x (transition)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence</td>
<td>A minor</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scherzo da capo pt. 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>meas</th>
<th>Walter</th>
<th>Keilberth</th>
<th>Wand</th>
<th>van Zweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>drum</td>
<td>(A1)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1(x) oboe</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>8.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2 oboe</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>8.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retransition</td>
<td>(E flag major)</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>8.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Scherzo da capo pt. 2 continues next page_
Scherzo de capo pt. 2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>meas.</th>
<th>Walter</th>
<th>Keilberth</th>
<th>Wand</th>
<th>van Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>9.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>(A flat major)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>9.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>(F major)</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>9.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K0</td>
<td>C flat major</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>10.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III: Adagio

### Part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>meas.</th>
<th>Walter</th>
<th>Keilberth</th>
<th>Wand</th>
<th>van Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>to E major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 (Sym. 2)</td>
<td>E major...</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Cross* (trumpets)</td>
<td>B major</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Cross</td>
<td>B flat major</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Farewell to Life (tuben)</td>
<td>B flat minor</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A2)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>meas.</th>
<th>Walter</th>
<th>Keilberth</th>
<th>Wand</th>
<th>van Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A flat major</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A flat major</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2(A2)</td>
<td>G flat major</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk (A1) (horns)</td>
<td>G flat major...</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>7.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuben chord, flute</td>
<td>to E</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>meas.</th>
<th>Walter</th>
<th>Keilberth</th>
<th>Wand</th>
<th>van Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>to E major</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>8.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 inverted, flute/A1, strings</td>
<td>to F sharp major</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>9.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 inverted, trumpets</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>10.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 inverted, oboes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>11.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2/A1</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>11.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Cross</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>13.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>meas.</th>
<th>Walter</th>
<th>Keilberth</th>
<th>Wand</th>
<th>van Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>A flat major</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>14.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A1) strings</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>14.03</td>
<td>15.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descending scale</td>
<td>A major...</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>16.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X (A1)</td>
<td>[F sharp]</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>17.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>meas.</th>
<th>Walter</th>
<th>Keilberth</th>
<th>Wand</th>
<th>van Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>E major</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>16.37</td>
<td>18.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 inverted</td>
<td>G minor...</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>19.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 augmented (Sym. 3)</td>
<td>F sharp major</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>17.56</td>
<td>17.40</td>
<td>20.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ascending scale</td>
<td>E flat major...</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>18.23</td>
<td>20.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>(C sharp minor)</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>21.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>to E major</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>19.59</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>22.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 inv., augm. (Sym. 3)</td>
<td>E major</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>17.22</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>20.48</td>
<td>23.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuation</td>
<td>A flat major...</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>21.23</td>
<td>23.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>meas.</th>
<th>Walter</th>
<th>Keilberth</th>
<th>Wand</th>
<th>van Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Sym. 8)</td>
<td>E major</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>18.21</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>22.06</td>
<td>24.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A2)</td>
<td>E major</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>22.58</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>25.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end</td>
<td>E major</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>19.26</td>
<td>23.56</td>
<td>23.36</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* First four notes of Passion hymn, *Vexilla Regis praeclami*
### IV: Finale completions

Carragan, 1983-2010 (Schaller, 2010)
Samale group, 1986/2012 (Rattle, 2012)
Letocart, 2008 (Couton, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carragan</th>
<th></th>
<th>Schaller</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Rattle</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Letocart</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Couton</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>[G]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>[A]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>[G]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flute</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>flute</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>flute</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buildup</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>buildup</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>buildup</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuben</td>
<td>c6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>tuben</td>
<td>c6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>tuben</td>
<td>c6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transition</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>transition</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>transition</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 (A2)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1 (A2)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1 (A2)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interlude (insert)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 (insert)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1 6085/2r</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1 6085/2r</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6085/2r</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>6085/2r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woodwinds</td>
<td>Eb</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>woodwinds</td>
<td>Eb</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>woodwinds</td>
<td>Eb</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interlude</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>interlude</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>interlude</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 (a tempo)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1 (a tempo)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1 (a tempo)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6087/2r</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>6087/2r</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>6087/2r</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unison</td>
<td>bb</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>unison</td>
<td>bb</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>unison</td>
<td>bb</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (chorale)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>C (chorale)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>C (chorale)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (chorale)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catastrophe</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>catastrophe</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>catastrophe</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Finale completions chart continues next page*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caragan</th>
<th>Samale group</th>
<th>Letocart</th>
<th>source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bogen 13 6087/35r</td>
<td>6087/35r</td>
<td>6087/35r</td>
<td>Bogen 13 (12C) 6087/35r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6087/35v</td>
<td>201 6.34</td>
<td>209 6.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 219 6.40</td>
<td>K (Te Deum)</td>
<td>K (Te Deum)</td>
<td>Bogen 13 (12C) 6087/35r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogen 13 6087/35r</td>
<td>E 203 6.38</td>
<td>E 211 7.03</td>
<td>Bogen 13% missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6087/35v</td>
<td>205 6.42</td>
<td>213 7.06</td>
<td>Bogen 13 (15E) 6087/37-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insert 8 mm.</td>
<td>E 225 6.50</td>
<td>6087/35v</td>
<td>Bogen 15 missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eight whole notes (6085)</td>
<td>209 6.49</td>
<td>217 7.13</td>
<td>Bogen 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6087/35r</td>
<td>217 7.04</td>
<td>225 7.27</td>
<td>Bogen 16 (15D) 6087/41-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence</td>
<td>A 234 7.04</td>
<td>cadence</td>
<td>230 7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Source Chart</td>
<td>Source Chart</td>
<td>Source Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 1 (K,C,A2) Bogen 12C</td>
<td>Bogen 13 6087/35r</td>
<td>6087/35v</td>
<td>Bogen 13 (12C) 6087/35r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6087/35v</td>
<td>235 7.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bogen 13% missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insert &quot;Bogen 15&quot;</td>
<td>Bogen 14 6087/37r</td>
<td>D 233 7.34</td>
<td>Bogen 13 (15E) 6087/37-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogen 14 6087/37r</td>
<td>(A1) B 243 7.52</td>
<td>(A1) B 251 8.16</td>
<td>Bogen 15 missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A1) B 267 7.53</td>
<td>insert F 249 8.02</td>
<td>insert F 257 8.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insert &quot;Bogen 15&quot;</td>
<td>Sec. 2 Bogen 12C 36r* A 251 8.07</td>
<td>Sec. 2 Bogen 12C 36r* A 259 8.30</td>
<td>Bogen 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 2 (C,A1)</td>
<td>insert 257 8.17</td>
<td>insert 285 8.41</td>
<td>Bogen 16 (15D) 6087/41-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 1 (K,C,A1)</td>
<td>277 8.57</td>
<td>climax Bog. 16 6087/41r A1</td>
<td>285 9.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235 7.04</td>
<td>Sec. 3 (B) C 291 8.28</td>
<td>Sec. 3 (B) C 275 8.58</td>
<td>Bogen 17 (16C) 6087/43-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 3 (B)</td>
<td>285 9.19</td>
<td>[140]</td>
<td>Bogen 18 (17D) 6087/51-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogen 17 289 8.97</td>
<td>[140]</td>
<td>Bogen 21 (20F) 418927-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (fugue) exposition d</td>
<td>A (fugue) exposition d</td>
<td>A (fugue) exposition d</td>
<td>Bogen 21 (20F) 418927-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 9.33</td>
<td>327 10.05</td>
<td>325 10.47</td>
<td>Bogen 22 (21D) 6087/57-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>episode 1 bb</td>
<td>episode 1 bb</td>
<td>episode 1 bb</td>
<td>Bogen 23 (22D) 6087/59-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 350 10.31</td>
<td>C 344 10.34</td>
<td>C 334 11.06</td>
<td>Bogen 24 (23D) 6087/61-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insert &quot;Bogen 20&quot;</td>
<td>353 10.37</td>
<td>3194/14</td>
<td>Bogen 25 (24) 3194/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[140]</td>
<td>[140]</td>
<td>[140]</td>
<td>Bogen 25 (24) 3194/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>episode 2 bb</td>
<td>345 11.19</td>
<td>353 11.42</td>
<td>Bogen 21 (20F) 418927-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuation 375 11.21</td>
<td>continuation 351 11.30</td>
<td>continuation 359 11.55</td>
<td>Bogen 22 (21D) 6087/57-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365 11.39</td>
<td>361 11.49</td>
<td>366 12.14</td>
<td>Bogen 23 (22D) 6087/59-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climax Gb</td>
<td>383 12.31</td>
<td>385 12.42</td>
<td>Bogen 24 (23D) 6087/61-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[140]</td>
<td>353 12.50</td>
<td>[140]</td>
<td>Bogen 25 (24) 3194/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 427 12.52</td>
<td>G 403 13.12</td>
<td>G 411 13.31</td>
<td>Bogen 25 (24) 3194/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interlude Db 439 13.16</td>
<td>interlude Db 415 13.36</td>
<td>interlude Db 423 14.00</td>
<td>Bogen 25 (24) 3194/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 (slower) F#</td>
<td>B2 (slower) F#</td>
<td>B2 (slower) F#</td>
<td>Bogen 25 (24) 3194/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Finale completions chart continues next page*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carragan</th>
<th>Samale group</th>
<th>Letocart</th>
<th>source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bb 449</td>
<td>transition</td>
<td>Bb 425</td>
<td>transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F# 457</td>
<td>F# 433</td>
<td>F# 441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scale</td>
<td>Cb 465</td>
<td>scale</td>
<td>Cb 441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 inverted</td>
<td>a 477</td>
<td>B1 inverted</td>
<td>G 445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>insert &quot;Bogen 28&quot;</td>
<td>transition</td>
<td>G 453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>flute</td>
<td>a 461</td>
<td>B1 inverted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bn (A1)</td>
<td>insert &quot;Bogen 28½&quot;</td>
<td>transition</td>
<td>a 481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(III. A)</td>
<td>more</td>
<td>c 479</td>
<td>transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>493½ 15:44</td>
<td>c (accompaniment)</td>
<td>d 481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>insert &quot;Bogen 28½&quot;</td>
<td>d 497</td>
<td>cadence (Br.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d 509</td>
<td>16:08</td>
<td>16:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d 512</td>
<td>16:14</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6087/67r</td>
<td>d 6087/67r</td>
<td>d 481</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (chorale)</td>
<td>D 527</td>
<td>C (chorale)</td>
<td>D 495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>phrase 2</td>
<td>phrase 2</td>
<td>D 503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>phrase 3</td>
<td>D 511</td>
<td>phrase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>insert &quot;Bogen 31&quot;</td>
<td>B 519</td>
<td>phrase 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>phrase 4</td>
<td>phrase 4</td>
<td>D 521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>phrase 5</td>
<td>Ab 523</td>
<td>insert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>triplets</td>
<td>Eb 538</td>
<td>phrase 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>insert (catastrophe)</td>
<td>Eb 538</td>
<td>phrase 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contrabassoon</td>
<td>Eb 538</td>
<td>triplets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 2 (A1 etc.) 3194/3r</td>
<td>Sec. 1 (A1 etc.) 3194/3r</td>
<td>Bb 561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(I. mtv. A2)</td>
<td>Sec. 1 (A1 etc.) 3194/3r</td>
<td>Eb 567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 601</td>
<td>19:32</td>
<td>10:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eb 629</td>
<td>19:23</td>
<td>Sym. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 655</td>
<td>20:20</td>
<td>20:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 3 (chorale)</td>
<td>Sym. 8</td>
<td>20:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 655</td>
<td>20:13</td>
<td>Bb 610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 3 reverse chorale</td>
<td>Sym. 5</td>
<td>20:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 659</td>
<td>21:03</td>
<td>Eb 620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 4 (III. mtv. A)</td>
<td>Sec. 4 (III. mtv. A)</td>
<td>20:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 689</td>
<td>20:30</td>
<td>end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 3 (Te Deum)</td>
<td>D 653</td>
<td>22:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 701</td>
<td>21:35</td>
<td>21:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alleluia (four themes)</td>
<td>Sec. 4 (A1)</td>
<td>21:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 709</td>
<td>21:50</td>
<td>Sec. 5 (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>end</td>
<td>D 717</td>
<td>Sym. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 717</td>
<td>22:08</td>
<td>climax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* transposed
World-wide Concert Selection
Nov 2013 - early March 2014

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

Austria
17 Nov 11am, Vienna: Musikverein +43 1505 8190
Ives - The Unanswered Question
Bach - "Es ist genug", arr. winds
Berg - Violin Concerto
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Vienna Symphony Orchestra / Kent Nagano

10 Jan 7.30pm St Pölten, Festspielhaus +43(0)2742 908080 222
10 Jan 10am, public rehearsal, Vienna: Musikverein +43 1505 8190
11 Jan 3.30pm, 12 Jan 11am, Vienna: Musikverein +43 1505 8190
Sibelius - Finlandia; Violin Concerto (Leonidas Kavakos)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra / Riccardo Chailly

7 Feb 7.30pm Salzburg, Großes Festspielhaus, +43 662 840310
Beethoven - Piano Concerto No. 3
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Royal Flanders Philharmonic / Edo de Waart

20 Feb 7.30pm Vienna: Konzerthaus +43 1242 002
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Vienna Symphony Orchestra / Marek Janowski

Belgium
21 Nov 8pm, Brussels: Henry Le Boeufzaal BOZAR +32 (0)2 507 8200 22
22 Nov 8pm Antwerp, deSingel +32 (0)3 248 2828
Bartók - Piano Concerto No. 3
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Royal Flanders Philharmonic / Edo de Waart

Bulgaria
20, 21 Dec 7.40pm, Santiago, Teatro Universidad de Chile
Chile
5 Mar 12midday, Hong Kong, HK Cultural Centre + 852 2734 9009
Mozart - Symphony No. 40
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Budapest Festival Orchestra / Iván Fischer

China
11 Jan 8pm, Macao, St Dominic’s Church (free, 1hr in advance)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Orquesta de Macau / Liu Jia

5 Mar 12midday, Hong Kong, HK Cultural Centre + 852 2734 9009
Mozart - Symphony No. 40
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Budapest Festival Orchestra / Iván Fischer

Croatia
14 Feb 7.30pm Zagreb, Koncertarna dvorana Lisinski, +385 16121 167
Wagner - Tannhäuser Overture
Wagner - Wesendonck Lieder (Dubravka Mušović Šeparović)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3
Zagreb Philharmonic / Leopold Hager

Czech Republic
11,12, 13 Dec 7.30pm Prague, Rudolfinum +42 (0)227 059 352
Martinů - Double Concerto
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Czech Philharmonic / Kent Nagano

Finland
13 Dec 7pm, Helsinki Music Centre | Musikkitalo +358 600 900 900
Gilere - Harp Concerto
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Helsinki Philharmonic Orchestra / Cornelius Meister

17 Jan 7pm Tampere Hall, +358 600 9 4500
Sibelius - The Tempest, Suite no. 1
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Tampere Philharmonia / Jukka-Pekka Saraste

France
19 Dec 8pm Dijon, L’Opéra de Dijon +3 (0) 38048 8282
Schoenberg - Violin Concerto (Michael Barenboim)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
SWR Sinfonieorchester Baden-Baden und Freiburg / Michael Gielen

11 Jan 8pm, Toulouse, Halle aux Grains +33 5 6163 1313
Grieg - Piano Concerto (Khatia Buniatishvili)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Orchestre National du Capitole de Toulouse / Tugan Sokhiev

16 Jan 8pm Théâtre des Champs-Élysées +33 (0)1 4952 5050
Wagner - Prelude to Act 3, Die Meistersinger
Strauss - Tod und Verklärung
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Orchestre National de France / Danièle Gatti

19 Jan 8pm Théâtre des Champs-Élysées +33 (0)1 4952 5050
Sibelius - Finlandia; Violin Concerto (C. Tetzlaff)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Vienna Philharmonic / Riccardo Chailly

22 Jan 8pm, Dijon, L’Opéra de Dijon +3 (0) 38048 8282
Sibelius - String Quartet “Voces Intimae”
Bruckner - String Quintet
Quatuor Manfred, with Raphael Oleg, vla.

30 Jan 8pm, 1 Feb 6pm, Lyon, Auditorium de +33 (0)4 78 959595
Mozart - Violin Concerto No. 5 (A. Steinbacher)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Orchestre National de Lyon / Marek Janowski

22 Feb 8pm, Montpellier, Opera Berlioz +33 (0) 67 601999
Saint-Saëns - Cello Concerto No. 1 (C. Tierecore)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Orchestre national Montpellier Languedoc-Roussillon / Constantin Trinks

22 Feb 8pm, Toulouse, Halle aux Grains +33 5 6163 1313
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Orchestre National du Capitole de Toulouse / Joseph Swenson

Germany
1 Nov 6pm, Baden Baden, Festspielhaus +49 (0)7221 30 13101
Mendelssohn - 3 Psalms, op. 78
Brahms - Warum ist das Licht gegeben den Mühlseglen.
Bruckner - Motets: Ave Maria, Os Justi, Locus iste - Mass No. 2
RIAS Chamber Choir; Winds of the Akademie für Alte Musik Berlin / Hans-Chröstph Rademann

2 Nov 7pm, 3 Nov 11am, München Phiharmonic +49 (0)8954 818181
Beethoven - Piano Concerto No. 3 (Y. Bronfman)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Munich Philharmonic / Alan Gilbert

4 Nov 8pm, Frankfurt am Main, Alter Oper +49 (0) 6913 40400
Boulez - Notations I, II, III, IV, VII
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Berlin Phiharmonic / Sir Simon Rattle

5 Nov 7.30pm Schleswig, A. P. Møller School +49 (0) 4621 25989
6 Nov 7.30pm Flensburg, Deutsches Haus +49 (0) 4612 3388
8 Nov 7.30pm Rendsburg, Stadttheater +49 (0) 4331 23447
14 Nov 8pm Husum, Nordseekongresscentrum +49 (0) 4841 902482
Bassoon Concerto TBA, played by bassoon prize winner
Bruckner - Symphony No 5
Schleswig-Holstey Symphony Orchestra / Peter Sommerer

14, 15 Nov 8pm, Erfurt, Theater 0049 (0361) 22 33 155
Markevitch - Cantique d’amour
Beethoven - Violin Concerto, for pno (Alina Bercu)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 2
Erfurt Phiharmonic Orchestra / Samuel Bächli

17 Nov 5pm, Zwickau, St Marien Dom, +49 (0)35727 411468
18 Nov 7.30pm, Werdau, Marien Church
Nicolai - Festival Overture Ein feste Burg
Dvořák - Mass in D
Bruckner - Te Deum
Plauen-Zwickau Philharmonic / Henk Galenkamp & Dietherd Bernstein

19 Nov 8pm, Dortmund, Konzerthaus +49 231 22696 200
Ives - The Unanswered Question
Bach - "Es ist genug" arr. Winds
Berg - Violin Concerto
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Vienna Symphony Orchestra / Kent Nagano
21, 22 Nov 8pm, Stuttgart Liederhalle +49 (0)711 2027710
23 Nov 7.30pm, Wiesloch, Palatin +49 (0)6222 582660
Berg - Violin Concerto (V Repin)  Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
SWR Radio Symphony Orchestra Stuttgart / Eliahu Inbal

22, 23 Nov 8pm, Berlin, Philharmonie +49 (0)30254 88999
Bartók - Violin Concerto No. 2 (Midori)  Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Deutsches Symphonie-Orchester Berlin / Christoph Eschenbach

29, 30 Nov 8pm, Köln, Philharmonie +49 (0)221 280 280
Mozart - Sinfonia Concertante  Bruckner - Symphony No 3 (1877)
WDR Symphony Orchestra Köln / Jukka-Pekka Saraste

7, 9 Dec 7.30pm, 8 Dec 6pm, Rostock Volkstheater, +49(0)381 381 4700
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 20 (Florian Krumppöck)
Bartók - Symphony No. 4
Norddeutsche Philharmonie Rostock / Florian Krumppöck

14 Dec 7pm, Baden Baden, Festspielhaus +49 (0)7221 30 13101
17 Dec 8pm Villingen-Schwenningen, Franziskaner Konzerthaus +49 (0)7721 822525
20 Dec 8pm Freiburg im Breisgau, Konzerthaus +49 (0)761 38 81552
Schoenberg - Violin Concerto (Michael Barenboim)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
SWR Sinfonieorchester Baden-Baden und Freiburg / Michael Gielen

15 Dec 4pm, Berlin, Philharmonie +49 (0)30254 88999
Mozart - Clarinet Concerto (M. Fröst)  Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Rundfunk-Sinfonieorchester Berlin / Stanislaw Skrowaczewski

15 Dec 11am, 16 Dec 8pm, Hamburg, Laeiszhalle, +49 (0)4034 6920
Britten - Concerto for Violin & Viola  Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Philharmoniker Hamburg / Simone Young

11 Jan 7.30pm, Wiesloch, Palatin +49 (0)6222 582660
15 Jan 8pm, Lürrach, Burghof, +49 (0)7621 940 890
Messiaen - Oiseaux exotiques  Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Bundesjugendorchester / Lothar Zagrosek

13 Jan 8pm, Berlin, Philharmonie +49 (0)30254 88999
Dvořák - Carnival Overture
Ullmann - Piano Concerto (Holger Groschopp)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Junges Ensemble Berlin / Michael Riedel

13 Jan 8pm, Kassel, Staatstheater +49 (0)561 1094 222
Adès - Tevot  Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Orchester des Staatstheaters Kassel / Patrik Ringborg

16 Jan 8pm, Köln, Philharmonie +49 (0)221 280 280
Sibelius - Finlandia; Violin Concerto (Christian Tetzlaff)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Vienna Philharmonic / Riccardo Chailly

16, 17 Jan 8pm, München Philharmonie, +49 (0)8954 818181
Berg - Violin Concerto (Gil Shaham)  Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Bavarian Radio Symphony Orchestra / Mariss Jansons

17, 18, 19 Jan 8pm, Berlin, Philharmonie +49 (0)30254 88999
Crumb - Ancient Voices of Children (Marlis Peterson)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Berlin Philharmonic / Zubin Mehta

19 Jan 11.30am, Osnabrück, Theater +49 (0)541 7600076
Danielsson - Concertante Suite, for solo tuba, 4 horns
Bruckner - Andante for Wagner tubas and tuba
Bruckner - Trösterin Musik for Wagner tubas and tuba
Matthew Segger, Tuba
Sascha Hermann, Sandra Nagel, Sonja Hajek, Hilmar Hajek, Horn

20, 21 Jan 8pm, Mannheim, Rosengarten +49 (0)621 26044
Schubert - Symphony No. 5  Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Nationaltheater-Orchester Mannheim / Dan Ettinger

23, 24 Jan 8pm, Hannover, NDR Großer Sendesaal +49 (0) 1801 637637
25 Jan 7.30pm, Bad Pyrmont, Konzerthaus +49 (0)5281 151543
Britten - Cello Symphony (Alban Gerhardt) 23, 24 Jan only.
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
NDR Radiophilharmonie Hannover / Eivind Gullberg Jensen

26, 27 Jan, Weimar, Weimarhalle +49 (0)3643 755334
Liszt - “Vexilla regis prodeunt” hymn, & 2 Legends for orchestra
Bruckner - Symphony No. 2
Staatkapelle Weimar / Martin Haselböck

2 Feb 8pm, Freiburg im Breisgau, Konzerthaus +49 (0)761 38 81552
Schumann - Konzertstück 4 horn & orch.  Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Akademisches Orchester Freiburg / Hannes Reich

2 Feb 8pm, Hamburg, Laeiszhalle, +49 (0)4034 6920
Haydn - String Quartet op. 76/1 Beethoven - String Quartet Op. 74
Bruckner - String Quintet
Nathan String Quartet, viola tba.

6, 7 Feb 8pm, Essen Philharmonie +49 (0)2018122 8801
Mozart - Sinfonia Concertante K297b
Bruckner - Symphony in D minor “Die Nullte”
Essener Philharmoniker / Martin Sieghart

6, 7 Feb 8pm, Hamburg, Laeiszhalle, +49 (0)4034 6920
Bartók - Violin Concerto No. 2 (Isabelle Faust)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3
NDR Sinfonieorchester Hamburg / Michael Gielen

8 Feb 8pm, München Philharmonie im Gasteig, +49 (0)8954 818181
Tchaikovsky - Piano Concerto No. 1 (Igor Levit)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Royal Flanders Philharmonic Orchestra / Edo de Waart

11 Feb 8pm, Mannheim, Rosengarten +49 (0)621 26044
12 Feb 8pm, Wiesbaden, Kurhaus +49 (0)611 1729290
15 Feb 8pm, Essen, Philharmonie +49 (0)2018122 8801
Beethoven - Piano Concerto No.3 (Alexej Gorlatch)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Royal Flanders Philharmonic Orchestra / Edo de Waart

9 Feb 4.30pm, Nürnberg, Meistersingerhalle +49 (0)911 2314000
Bach (Webern) - Ricercar Konigold - Cello Concerto (Julian Steckel)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Nürnberger Symphoniker / Lutz Köhler

12 Feb 8pm, Erlangen, Theater +49 (0)9131 862252
13 Feb 8pm, Stuttgart Liederhalle +49 (0)711 2027710
 Brahms - Violin Concerto (Mirjam Contzen)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Stuttgarter Philharmoniker / Walter Weller

20 Feb 8pm, Gotha, Stadthalle +49 (0)3621507 8570
22 Feb 7pm, Berlin, Ernst-Reuter-Saal +49 (0)30479 9742
 Wagner - Siegfried Idyll
Strauss - Horn Concerto No.2 (Christoph Eß)
Bruckner - Symphony in D minor “Die Nullte”
Thüringen Philharmonie Gota / Frank Zacher

21, 22 Feb 8pm, Köln Philharmonie +49 (0)221 280 280
Henze - The Bassarids: Adagio, Pugno, Manadantenz
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
WDR Sinfonieorchester Köln / Christoph von Dohnanyi

20, 21 Feb 8pm, 22 Feb 7pm, München Philharmonie
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8 +49 (0)8954 818181
Bavarian Radio Symphony Orchestra / Mariss Jansons

5 Mar 8pm, Berlin, Konzerthaus +49 (0)30 203092101
Beethoven - Piano Concerto No. 1 (Alice Sara Ott)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 2
Swedish Chamber Orchestra / Thomas Dausgaard

Hungary
4 Dec 7.30pm, Budapest, Palace of the Arts +36 1555 3300
Bruckner - Te Deum & Symphony No. 9
Hungarian National Philharmonic / Hubert Soudant

19 Dec 7.30pm Budapest, Palace of the Arts +36 1555 3300
Britten - Ceremony of Carols
Respighi - Lauda per la del Signore Natività
Bruckner - Scherzo from Symphony No. 1 - Te Deum
Hungarian Radio Symphony Orchestra / Gregory Vajda
28 Feb, 2 Mar 7.45pm, 1 Mar 3.30pm, Budapest, Palace of the Arts +36 1555 3300

Schubert - Symphony No. 8  Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Budapest Festival Orchestra / Iván Fischer

Israel

16 Dec 8.30pm, 17 Dec 7pm, Tel Aviv, Heichal Hatarbut
Prokofiev - Violin Concerto (Gili Shaham) +972 (0)3 6211777
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Israel Philharmonic / Zubin Mehta

Italy

30 Nov 6pm, 2 Dec 8.30pm, 3 Dec 7.30pm, Rome, Sala Santa Cecilia +39 02 600 60 900
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 24 (Rafael Blechacz)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3
Orchestra dell’Accademia Nazionale di Santa Cecilia / Kent Nagano

19 Dec 8.30pm, Bologna, Teatro Manzoni 0039 051 6174299
Beethoven - Violin Concerto (Dmitri Sitkovetsky)
Benjamin - Dance Figures
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Vienna Philharmonic / Riccardo Chailly

Japan

3 Nov 2pm, Kawasaki, Muza Symphony Hall, +81 (0)44 520 0200
4 Nov 2pm, Tokyo Suntory Hall +81 3 3584 9999
Sibelius - Violin Concerto (Ray Chen)  Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Tokyo Symphony Orchestra / Houbert Soutdant

11 Nov 6.30pm Kawasaki, Muza Symphony Hall, +81 (0)44 520 0200
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Senzoku Gakuen College of Music / Kazuyoshi Akiyama
Stravinsky - Jeu de Cartes; Rite of Spring
Toho Gakuen College of Music / Ken Takazeki

16 Nov 2pm, Nishinomiya,
Hyogo Performing Arts Centre +81 (0)798 680255
Kotoda Symphony Orchestra / Fumio Kamo

15, 16 Jan 7pm, Tokyo Suntory Hall +81 3 3584 9999
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 20 (Rudolf Buchbinder)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
NHK Symphony Orchestra / Fabio Luisi

24 Jan 7.15pm, 25 Jan 2pm, Tokyo Triphony Hall +81 3 5608 5404
Schubert - Symphony No. 4  Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
New Japan Philharmonic / Wolf-Dieter Hauschild

21 Feb 6.45pm, 22 Feb 4pm, Nagoya Aichi Prefectural Art Theater, +81 (0)52 9715511
Bridge - The Sea  Fujikura - Mina, Concerto 5 soloists
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4 (Haas)
Nagoya Philharmonic / Martin Brabbins

21 Feb 7pm, 22 Feb 3pm, Sendai City Youth Cultural Center +8122 7271872
Liszt - Mephisto Waltz No. 1  Bruch - Scottish Fantasy (Sunao Goko)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 1
Sendai Symphony Orchestra / Kazuhiro Koizumi

22 Feb 2.30pm, Tokyo Metropolitan Art Space +81 3 59851707
Grieg - Piano Concerto (Janne Mertanen)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6 (ed. Takanobu Kawasaki)
Tokyo New City Orchestra / Akira Naito

22 Feb 2pm, Yokohama Minatomirai Hall +81 (0)45682 2000
Wagner - Prelude and Liebestod  Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Kanagawa Philharmonic / Tajiro Iimori

Netherlands

7 Nov 8.15pm, Grongingen, De Oosterpoort, +31 (0)50 3680368
8 Nov, 5pm, Drachten, De Lawei +31 (0)512 335050

Tailleferre - Concertino for harp & orchestra (Lavinia Meijer)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
North Netherlands Orchestra / Michel Tabachnik

7 Nov 8.15pm, 10 Nov. 2.15pm, Rotterdam, De Doelen, +3110 2171717
9 Nov 8.15, Den Haag, Dr Anton Philipszaal +31 (0)70 8800333
Beethoven - Symphony No. 5  Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Rotterdam Philharmonic Orchestra / Jaap van Zweden

23 Nov 2.15pm, Amsterdam, Concertgebouw +31 (0)20 6718345
Barber - Adagio for strings  Hindemith - Trauermusik; Viola Sonata
Bruckner - String Quintet
Ensemble Resonanz, Tabea Zimmermann

13 Jan 8.15pm, Amsterdam, Concertgebouw +31 (0)20 6718345
Sibelius - Finlandia, Violin Concerto (Leonidas Kavakos)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Vienna Philharmonic / Riccardo Chailly

Norway

7 Nov 7.30pm, Stavanger, Konserthus +47 5153 7000
Schoenberg - Interlude and song of the Wood-Dove, Gurrelieder
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Stavanger Symphony Orchestra / Thomas Sondergård

14 Nov 7.30, Trondheim, Olavshallen +47 73 994050
Mozart – Piano Concerto No 23 (Håvard Gimse)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Trondheim Symphony Orchestra / Antoni Wit

Poland

22 Nov 7pm, Rzeszow,
Concert Hall Podkarpacka Philharmonic +48 17 852 0272
Schumann - Piano Concerto (Valentina Igoshina)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Podkarpacka Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra / Paweł Kotła

7 Dec 6pm, Kraków, Philharmonic Hall, +48 12 619 8733
Pendergast - Adagietto from Paradise Lost
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 24 (Boris Giltburg)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 2
Kraków Philharmonic Orchestra / Stanisław Skrowaczewski

14 Dec 6pm, Warsaw, Philharmonic, Sale Koncertowa +48 22 5517111
Various Christmas pieces  Bruckner (ed. Kohs) - Te Deum
Philharmonic Choir, Julian Gembalsky - organ / Henry Wojnarowski

Taiwan

9 Nov 8pm Taipei, National Chiang Kai Shek Cultural Center +886 233939888
Boulez - Notations I, II, III, IV, VII  Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Berlin Philharmonic / Sir Simon Rattle

South Korea

12 Nov 8pm, Seoul Arts Center +82 (0)2580 1300
Boulez - Notations I, II, III, IV, VII  Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Berlin Philharmonic / Sir Simon Rattle

Spain

23, 24 Jan, 5pm, Valladolid, El Auditorio M.D. +34 983 385 604
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Orquesta Sinfónica de Castilla y León / Eliahu Inbal

13, 14 Feb, Bilbao, Palacio de Congresos, Euskalduna +34 944 035000
Schumann - Piano Concerto (Rudolf Buchbinder)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Bilbao Symphony Orchestra / Günter Neuhold

20, 21 Feb, Madrid, Teatro Monumental +34 91429 1281
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Bilbao Symphony Orchestra / Günter Neuhold

21 Feb 8pm, 22 Feb 7pm, 23 Feb 11am,
Barcelona, l’Auditori +34 (0)93 2479300
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Orquesta Sinfónica del Liceu / Josep Pons
21 Feb 7.30pm Valencia, Palau de la Musica +3496 3375020
Poulenc - Stabat Mater  Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Orquesta de Valencia / Yaron Traub

7, 8 Mar 7.30pm, 9 Mar 11.30am, Madrid,
Auditorio Nacional de Musica, +34 (0)9133 7030720
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9  Bruckner - Te Deum
Orquesta Nacional de Espana / Simone Young

Sweden
13 Dec 7pm, Vara, Konserthus +46(0)512 31500
14 Dec 3pm, Göteborgs Konserthus +46 (0)31726 5310
Handel - Concerto Grosso No. 4
Sorensson - Trumpet Concerto (Tine Thing Helseth)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6  Göteborgs Symfoniker / Mario Venzago
2 March 3pm Stockholm, Berwaldhallen +46 (0)8784 1800
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Swedish Radio Symphony Orchestra / Valery Gergiev
7 Mar 6pm, 8 Mar 3pm, Göteborgs Konserthus +46 (0)31726 5310
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5  Göteborgs Symfoniker / Stanislaw Skrowaczewski

Switzerland
21, 22 Nov 7.30pm Bern, Kultur-Casino +4131 329 5252
Schumann - Cello Concerto (Nicolas Altstaedt)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7  Bern Symphony Orchestra / Mario Venzago
14 Jan 7.30pm, Geneva, Victoria Hall +41(0)22 418 3500
15 Jan 7.30pm, Basel, Stadtcasino, +41 (0)61 273 7373
Sibelius - Finlandia; Violin Concerto (Christian Tetzlaff)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6  Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra / Riccardo Chailly

UK
16 Nov 7.30pm Bath Abbey +44 (0)1225 463 362
Bach - Jesu, meine Freude  Bruckner - Mass No. 2
Britten - Missa Brevis  City of Bath Bach Choir,
Southern Sinfonia Wind Ensemble / Nigel Perrin
23 Nov. 7.30pm Leeds Town Hall +44 (0)113 224 3801
Berlioz - Roman Carnival Overture
Ravel - Piano Concerto (Louis Lortie)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6  BBC Philharmonic Orchestra / Juanjo Mena
25 Nov 7.30pm, London, Milton Court Hall, +44 (0)207638 8891
Prokofiev - Piano Concerto No. 3 (Nikolai Demidenko)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3  Kensington Symphony Orchestra / Russell Keable
30 Nov 7.30pm Hall City Hall, +44 (0)1482 300300
Strauss - Horn Concerto No. 1 (David Pyatt)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7  Hull Philharmonic Orchestra / Peter Stark
2 Feb 3pm, Tunbridge Wells, Assembly Hall, +44 (0)1892 530613
MacCunn - Land of the Mountain and the Flood
Chopin - Piano Concerto No. 1 (Lara Melda)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4  Royal Tunbridge Wells SO / Neil Thompson
15 Feb 9pm, Gateshead Sage, Hall 2, +44 (0)191 443 4661
Bach - Die Geist hilf unser Schwacheit auf
Bruckner - Ave Maria, Afferentur regi, Virga jesse, Christus factus est
Casken - The Knight’s Stone  Bach - Jesu meine Freude
Northern Sinfonia Chorus / Alan Farrow
26 Feb 7.30pm, London Royal Festival Hall +44 (0)871 663 2500
Brahms - Double Concerto (Julia Fischer, Daniel Muller-Schott)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 2  London Philharmonic Orchestra / Vladimir Jurowski

Switzerland
22 Feb 8pm, Winnipe, Centennial Concert Hall, +1 855 985 5000
Mozart - Violin Concerto No. 2 (Gwen Hoebig)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8  Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra / Alexander Mickelthwate
22 Feb 8pm, 23 Feb 2.30pm, Buffalo,
Kleinians Music Hall, +1 716 885 5000
Mendelssohn - Violin Concerto No. 2 (Benjamin Beilman)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9  Buffalo Philharmonic / Gunther Herbig
26 Feb 8pm, New York, Carnegie Hall, +1 212247 7800
Mozart - Symphony No. 28  Staud - On Comparative Meteorology
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6  Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra / Franz Welser-Most

USA
1, 2 Nov 8pm, 3 Nov 3pm, Chicago, Symphony Center +1 312 294 3000
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 27 (Emanuel Ax)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4  Chicago Symphony Orchestra / Bernard Haitink
15,16 Nov 8pm, 17 Nov 2pm, Los Angeles,
Walt Disney Hall +1 323 850 2000
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8  Los Angeles Philharmonic /emyon Bychkov
16, 17 Nov 8pm, Birmingham, Alys Stephens Center +1 205 251 7727
Bach - Keyboard Concerto No. 1 (Justin Brown)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4  Alabama Symphony Orchestra / Justin Brown
6, 7 Dec 8pm, 8 Dec 2.30pm, Pittsburgh, Heinz Hall +1 412 392 4900
Victoria - Dum complerentur, Surrexit pastor bonus,
Ave Maria, Versa est in lucrum
Bruckner - Locus iste, Ave Maria
Allegri - Miserere  Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Tallis Scholars, Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra / Manfred Honeck

UK
16, 18 Jan 8p, 17 Jan 1.30pm Boston, Symphony Hall, +1 617 6389289
A recommended web-site for locating
Bruckner (and all other) concerts:

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